

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01852677 2

HISTORY OF READY REFERENCE



HISTORY FOR READY REFERENCE

FROM THE BEST
HISTORIANS, BIOGRAPHERS, AND SPECIALISTS

THEIR OWN WORDS IN A COMPLETE
SYSTEM OF HISTORY

FOR ALL USES, EXTENDING TO ALL COUNTRIES AND SUBJECTS,
AND REPRESENTING FOR BOTH READERS AND STUDENTS THE BETTER AND
NEWER LITERATURE OF HISTORY IN THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE

BY

J. N. LARNED

WITH NUMEROUS HISTORICAL MAPS FROM ORIGINAL STUDIES AND DRAWINGS BY

ALAN C. REILEY

REVISED AND ENLARGED EDITION

IN SIX VOLUMES

EX LIBRIS
ST. BASIL'S SCHOLASTICA

VOLUME II—ELECTRICAL to GERUSIA

959

H 72

5/2

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

THE C. A. NICHOLS CO., PUBLISHERS

1901

COPYRIGHT, 1894,
BY J. N. LARNED.

COPYRIGHT, 1901,
BY J. N. LARNED.

MAY 27 1953

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE . MASSACHUSETTS
U . S . A

LIST OF MAPS.

Map of Europe at the close of the Tenth Century,	To follow page 1048
Map of Europe in 1768,	To follow page 1114
Four maps of France, A. D. 1154, 1180, 1314 and 1360,	To follow page 1200
Two maps of Central Europe, A. D. 843 and 888,	On page 1437
Map of Germany at the Peace of Westphalia,	To follow page 1519
Maps of Germany, A. D. 1815 and 1866; of the Netherlands, 1830-1839; and of the Zollverein,	To follow page 1576

LOGICAL OUTLINES, IN COLORS.

English history,	To follow page 807
French history,	To follow page 1188
German history,	To follow page 1462

ELECTRICAL DISCOVERY AND INVENTION.—That amber when rubbed attracts light bodies was known in the earliest times. "It is the one single experiment in electricity which has come down to us from the remotest antiquity. . . . The power of certain fishes, notably what is known as the 'torpedo,' to produce electricity, was known at an early period, and was commented on by Pliny and Aristotle." Until the 16th century there was no scientific study of these phenomena. "Dr. Gilbert can justly be called the creator of the science of electricity and magnetism. His experiments were prodigious in number. . . . To him we are indebted for the name 'electricity,' which he bestowed upon the power or property which amber exhibited in attracting light bodies, borrowing the name from the substance itself, in order to define one of its attributes. . . . This application of experiment to the study of electricity, begun by Gilbert three hundred years ago, was industriously pursued by those who came after him, and the next two centuries witnessed a rapid development of science. Among the earlier students of this period were the English philosopher, Robert Boyle, and the celebrated burgo-master of Magdeburg, Otto von Guericke. The latter first noted the sound and light accompanying electrical excitation. These were afterwards independently discovered by Dr. Wall, an Englishman, who made the somewhat prophetic observation, 'This light and crackling seems in some degree to represent thunder and lightning.' Sir Isaac Newton made a few experiments in electricity, which he exhibited to the Royal Society. . . . Francis Hawksbee was an active and useful contributor to experimental investigation, and he also called attention to the resemblance between the electric spark and lightning. The most ardent student of electricity in the early years of the eighteenth century was Stephen Gray. He performed a multitude of experiments, nearly all of which added something to the rapidly accumulating stock of knowledge, but doubtless his most important contribution was his discovery of the distinction between conductors and non-conductors. . . . Some of Gray's papers fell into the hands of Dufay, an officer of the French army, who, after several years' service, had resigned his post to devote himself to scientific pursuits. . . . His most important discovery was the existence of two distinct species of electricity, which he named 'vitreous' and 'resinous.' . . . A very important advance was made in 1745 in the invention of the Leyden jar or phial. As has so many times happened in the history of scientific discovery, it seems tolerably certain that this interesting device was hit upon by at least three persons, working independently of each other. One Cuneus, a monk named Kleist, and Professor Muschenbroeck, of Leyden, are all accredited with the discovery. . . . Sir William Watson perfected it by adding the outside metallic coating, and was by its aid enabled to fire gunpowder and other inflammables."—T. C. Mendenhall, *A Century of Electricity*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1745-1747.—Franklin's identification of Electricity with Lightning.—"In 1745 Mr. Peter Collinson of the Royal Society sent a [Leyden] jar to the Library Society of Philadelphia, with instructions how to use it. This fell into the hands of Benjamin Franklin, who at once began a series of electrical experiments.

On March 28, 1747, Franklin began his famous letters to Collinson. . . . In these letters he propounded the single-fluid theory of electricity, and referred all electric phenomena to its accumulation in bodies in quantities more than their natural share, or to its being withdrawn from them so as to leave them minus their proper portion." Meantime, numerous experiments with the Leyden jar had convinced Franklin of the identity of lightning and electricity, and he set about the demonstration of the fact. "The account given by Dr. Stuber of Philadelphia, an intimate personal friend of Franklin, and published in one of the earliest editions of the works of the great philosopher, is as follows:—'The plan which he had originally proposed was to erect on some high tower, or other elevated place, a sentry-box, from which should rise a pointed iron rod, insulated by being fixed in a cake of resin. Electrified clouds passing over this would, he conceived, impart to it a portion of their electricity, which would be rendered evident to the senses by sparks being emitted when a key, a knuckle, or other conductor was presented to it. Philadelphia at this time offered no opportunity of trying an experiment of this kind. Whilst Franklin was waiting for the erection of a spire, it occurred to him that he might have more ready access to the region of clouds by means of a common kite. He prepared one by attaching two cross-sticks to a silk handkerchief, which would not suffer so much from the rain as paper. To his upright stick was fixed an iron point. The string was, as usual, of hemp, except the lower end, which was silk. Where the hempen string terminated, a key was fastened. With this apparatus, on the appearance of a thunder-gust approaching, he went into the common, accompanied by his son, to whom alone he communicated his intentions, well knowing the ridicule which, too generally for the interest of science, awaits unsuccessful experiments in philosophy. He placed himself under a shed to avoid the rain. His kite was raised. A thunder-cloud passed over it. No signs of electricity appeared. He almost despaired of success, when suddenly he observed the loose fibres of his string move toward an erect position. He now pressed his knuckle to the key, and received a strong spark. How exquisite must his sensations have been at this moment! On his experiment depended the fate of his theory. Doubt and despair had begun to prevail, when the fact was ascertained in so clear a manner, that even the most incredulous could no longer withhold their assent. Repeated sparks were drawn from the key, a phial was charged, a shock given, and all the experiments made which are usually performed with electricity.' And thus the identity of lightning and electricity was proved. . . . Franklin's proposition to erect lightning rods which would convey the lightning to the ground, and so protect the buildings to which they were attached, found abundant opponents. . . . Nevertheless, public opinion became settled . . . that they did protect buildings. . . . Then the philosophers raised a new controversy as to whether the conductors should be blunt or pointed; Franklin, Cavendish, and Watson advocating points, and Wilson blunt ends. . . . The logic of experiment, however, showed the advantage of pointed conductors; and people persisted then in preferring them, as they

have done ever since."—P. Benjamin, *The Age of Electricity*, ch. 3.

A. D. 1753-1820.—The beginnings of the Electric Telegraph.—"The first actual suggestion of an electric telegraph was made in an anonymous letter published in the Scots Magazine at Edinburgh, February 17th, 1753. The letter is initialed 'C. M.,' and many attempts have been made to discover the author's identity. . . . The suggestions made in this letter were that a set of twenty-six wires should be stretched upon insulated supports between the two places which it was desired to put in connection, and at each end of every wire a metallic ball was to be suspended, having under it a letter of the alphabet inscribed upon a piece of paper. . . . The message was to be read off at the receiving station by observing the letters which were successively attracted by their corresponding balls, as soon as the wires attached to the latter received a charge from the distant conductor. In 1787 Monsieur Lomond, of Paris, made the very important step of reducing the twenty-six wires to one, and indicating the different letters by various combinations of simple movements of an indicator, consisting of a pith-ball suspended by means of a thread from a conductor in contact with the wire. . . . In the year 1790 Chappe, the inventor of the semaphore, or optico-mechanical telegraph, which was in practical use previous to the introduction of the electric telegraph, devised a means of communication, consisting of two clocks regulated so that the second hands moved in unison, and pointed at the same instant to the same figures. . . . In the early form of the apparatus, the exact moment at which the observer at the receiving station should read off the figure to which the hand pointed was indicated by means of a sound signal produced by the primitive method of striking a copper stew-pan, but the inventor soon adopted the plan of giving electrical signals instead of sound signals. . . . In 1795 Don Francisco Salva . . . suggested . . . that instead of twenty-six wires being used, one for each letter, six or eight wires only should be employed, each charged by a Leyden jar, and that different letters should be formed by means of various combinations of signals from these. . . . Mr. (afterwards Sir Francis) Ronalds . . . took up the subject of telegraphy in the year 1816, and published an account of his experiments in 1823," based on the same idea as that of Chappe. . . . "Ronalds drew up a sort of telegraphic code by which words, and sometimes even complete sentences, could be transmitted by only three discharges. . . . Ronalds completely proved the practicability of his plan, not only on [a] short underground line, . . . but also upon an overhead line some eight miles in length, constructed by carrying a telegraph wire backwards and forwards over a wooden framework erected in his garden at Hammersmith. . . . The first attempt to employ voltaic electricity in telegraphy was made by Don Francisco Salva, whose frictional telegraph has already been referred to. On the 14th of May, 1800, Salva read a paper on 'Galvanism and its application to Telegraphy' before the Academy of Sciences at Barcelona, in which he described a number of experiments which he had made in telegraphing over a line some 310 metres in length. . . . A few years later he applied the then recent discovery of the Voltaic pile to the same purpose,

the liberation of bubbles of gas by the decomposition of water at the receiving station being the method adopted for indicating the passage of the signals. A telegraph of a very similar character was devised by Sömmering, and described in a paper communicated by the inventor to the Munich Academy of Sciences in 1809. Sömmering used a set of thirty-five wires corresponding to the twenty-five letters of the German alphabet and the ten numerals. . . . Oersted's discovery of the action of the electric current upon a suspended magnetic needle provided a new and much more hopeful method of applying the electric current to telegraphy. The great French astronomer Laplace appears to have been the first to suggest this application of Oersted's discovery, and he was followed shortly afterwards by Ampère, who in the year 1820 read a paper before the Paris Academy of Sciences."—G. W. De Tunzelmann, *Electricity in Modern Life*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1786-1800.—Discoveries of Galvani and Volta.—"The fundamental experiment which led to the discovery of dynamical electricity [1786] is due to Galvani, professor of anatomy in Bologna. Occupied with investigations on the influence of electricity on the nervous excitability of animals, and especially of the frog, he observed that when the lumbar nerves of a dead frog were connected with the crural muscles by a metallic circuit, the latter became briskly contracted. . . . Galvani had some time before observed that the electricity of machines produced in dead frogs analogous contractions, and he attributed the phenomena first described to an electricity inherent in the animal. He assumed that this electricity, which he called vital fluid, passed from the nerves to the muscles by the metallic arc, and was thus the cause of contraction. This theory met with great support, especially among physiologists, but it was not without opponents. The most considerable of these was Alexander Volta, professor of physics in Pavia. Galvani's attention had been exclusively devoted to the nerves and muscles of the frog; Volta's was directed upon the connecting metal. Resting on the observation, which Galvani had also made, that the contraction is more energetic when the connecting arc is composed of two metals than where there is only one, Volta attributed to the metals the active part in the phenomenon of contraction. He assumed that the disengagement of electricity was due to their contact, and that the animal parts only officiated as conductors, and at the same time as a very sensitive electroscope. By means of the then recently invented electroscope, Volta devised several modes of showing the disengagement of electricity on the contact of metals. . . . A memorable controversy arose between Galvani and Volta. The latter was led to give greater extension to his contact theory, and propounded the principle that when two heterogeneous substances are placed in contact, one of them always assumes the positive and the other the negative electrical condition. In this form Volta's theory obtained the assent of the principal philosophers of his time."—A. Ganot, *Elementary Treatise on Physics*; tr. by Atkinson, bk. 10, ch. 1.—Volta's theory, however, though somewhat misleading, did not prevent his making what was probably the greatest step in the science up to this time, in the invention (about 1800) of the Voltaic pile,

the first generator of electrical energy by chemical means, and the forerunner of the vast number of types of the modern "battery."

A. D. 1810-1890.—The Arc light.—"The earliest instance of applying Electricity to the production of light was in 1810, by Sir Humphrey Davy, who found that when the points of two carbon rods whose other ends were connected by wires with a powerful primary battery were brought into contact, and then drawn a little way apart, the Electric current still continued to jump across the gap, forming what is now termed an Electric Arc. . . . Various contrivances have been devised for automatically regulating the position of the two carbons. As early as 1847, a lamp was patented by Staite, in which the carbon rods were fed together by clockwork. . . . Similar devices were produced by Foucault and others, but the first really successful arc lamp was Serrin's, patented in 1857, which has not only itself survived until the present day, but has had its main features reproduced in many other lamps. . . . The Jablochkoff Candle (1876), in which the arc was formed between the ends of a pair of carbon rods placed side by side, and separated by a layer of insulating material, which slowly consumed as the carbons burnt down, did good service in accustoming the public to the new illuminant. Since then the inventions by Brush, Thomson-Houston, and others have done much to bring about its adoption for lighting large rooms, streets, and spaces out of doors."—J. B. Verity, *Electricity up to Date for Light, Power, and Traction*, ch. 3.

A. D. 1820-1825.—Oersted, Ampère, and the discovery of the Electro-Magnet.—"There is little chance . . . that the discoverer of the magnet, or the discoverer and inventor of the magnetic needle, will ever be known by name, or that even the locality and date of the discovery will ever be determined [see COMPASS]. . . . The magnet and magnetism received their first scientific treatment at the hands of Dr. Gilbert. During the two centuries succeeding the publication of his work, the science of magnetism was much cultivated. . . . The development of the science went along parallel with that of the science of electricity . . . although the latter was more fruitful in novel discoveries and unexpected applications than the former. It is not to be imagined that the many close resemblances of the two classes of phenomena were allowed to pass unnoticed. . . . There was enough resemblance to suggest an intimate relation; and the connecting link was sought for by many eminent philosophers during the last years of the eighteenth and the earlier years of the present century."—T. C. Mendenhall, *A Century of Electricity*, ch. 3.—"The effect which an electric current, flowing in a wire, can exercise upon a neighbouring compass needle was discovered by Oersted in 1820. This first announcement of the possession of magnetic properties by an electric current was followed speedily by the researches of Ampère, Arago, Davy, and by the devices of several other experimenters, including De la Rive's floating battery and coil, Schweigger's multiplier, Cumming's galvanometer, Faraday's apparatus for rotation of a permanent magnet, Marsh's vibrating pendulum and Barlow's rotating star-wheel. But it was not until 1825 that the electromagnet was invented. Arago announced, on 25th September 1820, that a copper wire uniting the poles

of a voltaic cell, and consequently traversed by an electric current, could attract iron filings to itself laterally. In the same communication he described how he had succeeded in communicating permanent magnetism to steel needles laid at right angles to the copper wire, and how, on showing this experiment to Ampère, the latter had suggested that the magnetizing action would be more intense if for the straight copper wire there were substituted one wrapped in a helix, in the centre of which the steel needle might be placed. This suggestion was at once carried out by the two philosophers. 'A copper wire wound in a helix was terminated by two rectilinear portions which could be adapted, at will, to the opposite poles of a powerful horizontal voltaic pile; a steel needle wrapped up in paper was introduced into the helix.' 'Now, after some minutes' sojourn in the helix, the steel needle had received a sufficiently strong dose of magnetism.' Arago then wound upon a little glass tube some short helices, each about 2½ inches long, coiled alternately right-handedly and left-handedly, and found that on introducing into the glass tube a steel wire, he was able to produce 'consequent poles' at the places where the winding was reversed. Ampère, on October 23rd, 1820, read a memoir, claiming that these facts confirmed his theory of magnetic actions. Davy had, also, in 1820, surrounded with temporary coils of wire the steel needles upon which he was experimenting, and had shown that the flow of electricity around the coil could confer magnetic power upon the steel needles. . . . The electromagnet, in the form which can first claim recognition . . . was devised by William Sturgeon, and is described by him in the paper which he contributed to the Society of Arts in 1825."—S. P. Thompson, *The Electromagnet*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1825-1874.—The Perfected Telegraph.—"The European philosophers kept on groping. At the end of five years [after Oersted's discovery], one of them reached an obstacle which he made up his mind was so entirely insurmountable, that it rendered the electric telegraph an impossibility for all future time. This was [1825] Mr. Peter Barlow, fellow of the Royal Society, who had encountered the question whether the lengthening of the conducting wire would produce any effect in diminishing the energy of the current transmitted, and had undertaken to resolve the problem. . . . 'I found [he said] such a considerable diminution with only 200 feet of wire as at once to convince me of the impracticability of the scheme.' . . . The year following the announcement of Barlow's conclusions, a young graduate of the Albany (N. Y.) Academy—by name Joseph Henry—was appointed to the professorship of mathematics in that institution. Henry there began the series of scientific investigations which is now historic. . . . Up to that time, electro-magnets had been made with a single coil of naked wire wound spirally around the core, with large intervals between the strands. The core was insulated as a whole: the wire was not insulated at all. Professor Schweigger, who had previously invented the multiplying galvanometer, had covered his wires with silk. Henry followed this idea, and, instead of a single coil of wire, used several. . . . Barlow had said that the gentle current of the galvanic battery became so weakened, after traversing 200 feet of wire, that it was idle to consider the possibility of

making it pass over even a mile of conductor and then affect a magnet. Henry's reply was to point out that the trouble lay in the way Barlow's magnet was made. . . . Make the magnet so that the diminished current will exercise its full effect. Instead of using one short coil, through which the current can easily slip, and do nothing, make a coil of many turns; that increases the magnetic field: make it of fine wire, and of higher resistance. And then, to prove the truth of his discovery, Henry put up the first electro-magnetic telegraph ever constructed. In the academy at Albany, in 1831, he suspended 1,060 feet of bell-wire, with a battery at one end and one of his magnets at the other; and he made the magnet attract and release its armature. The armature struck a bell, and so made the signals. Annihilating distance in this way was only one part of Henry's discovery. He had also found, that, to obtain the greatest dynamic effect close at hand, the battery should be composed of a very few cells of large surface, combined with a coil or coils of short coarse wire around the magnet,—conditions just the reverse of those necessary when the magnet was to be worked at a distance. Now, he argued, suppose the magnet with the coarse short coil, and the large-surface battery, be put at the receiving station; and the current coming over the line be used simply to make and break the circuit of that local battery. . . . This is the principle of the telegraphic 'relay.' In 1835 Henry worked a telegraph-line in that way at Princeton. And thus the electro-magnetic telegraph was completely invented and demonstrated. There was nothing left to do, but to put up the posts, string the lines, and attach the instruments."—P. Benjamin, *The Age of Electricity*, ch. 11.—"At last we leave the territory of theory and experiment and come to that of practice. 'The merit of inventing the modern telegraph, and applying it on a large scale for public use, is, beyond all question, due to Professor Morse of the United States.' So writes Sir David Brewster, and the best authorities on the question substantially agree with him. . . . Leaving for future consideration Morse's telegraph, which was not introduced until five years after the time when he was impressed with the notion of its feasibility, we may mention the telegraph of Gauss and Weber of Göttingen. In 1833, they erected a telegraphic wire between the Astronomical and Magnetical Observatory of Göttingen, and the Physical Cabinet of the University, for the purpose of carrying intelligence from the one locality to the other. To these great philosophers, however, rather the theory than the practice of Electric Telegraphy was indebted. Their apparatus was so improved as to be almost a new invention by Steinhilf of Munich, who, in 1837 . . . succeeded in sending a current from one end to the other of a wire 36,000 feet in length, the action of which caused two needles to vibrate from side to side, and strike a bell at each movement. To Steinhilf the honour is due of having discovered the important and extraordinary fact that the earth might be used as a part of the circuit of an electric current. The introduction of the Electric Telegraph into England dates from the same year as that in which Steinhilf's experiments took place. William Fothergill Cooke, a gentleman who held a commission in the Indian army, returned from India on leave of absence, and

afterwards, because of his bad health, resigned his commission, and went to Heidelberg to study anatomy. In 1836, Professor Mönke, of Heidelberg, exhibited an electro-telegraphic experiment, 'in which electric currents, passing along a conducting wire, conveyed signals to a distant station by the deflexion of a magnetic needle enclosed in Schweigger's galvanometer or multiplier.' . . . Cooke was so struck with this experiment, that he immediately resolved to apply it to purposes of higher utility than the illustration of a lecture. . . . In a short time he produced two telegraphs of different construction. When his plans were completed, he came to England, and in February, 1837, having consulted Faraday and Dr. Roget on the construction of the electric-magnet employed in a part of his apparatus, the latter gentleman advised him to apply to Professor Wheatstone. . . . The result of the meeting of Cooke and Wheatstone was that they resolved to unite their several discoveries; and in the month of May 1837, they took out their first patent 'for improvements in giving signals and sounding alarms in distant places by means of electric currents transmitted through metallic circuits.' . . . By-and-by, as might probably have been anticipated, difficulties arose between Cooke and Wheatstone, as to whom the main credit of introducing the Electric Telegraph into England was due. . . . Mr. Cooke accused Wheatstone (with a certain amount of justice, it should seem) of entirely ignoring his claims; and in doing so Mr. Cooke appears to have rather exaggerated his own services. Most will readily agree to the wise words of Mr. Sabine: 'It was once a popular fallacy in England that Messrs. Cooke and Wheatstone were the original inventors of the Electric Telegraph. The Electric Telegraph had, properly speaking, no inventor; it grew up as we have seen little by little.'—H. J. Nicoll, *Great Movements*, pp. 424-429.—"In the latter part of the year 1832, Samuel F. B. Morse, an American artist, while on a voyage from France to the United States, conceived the idea of an electro-magnetic telegraph which should consist of the following parts, viz: A single circuit of conductors from some suitable generator of electricity; a system of signs, consisting of dots or points and spaces to represent numerals; a method of causing the electricity to mark or imprint these signs upon a strip or ribbon of paper by the mechanical action of an electro-magnet operating upon the paper by means of a lever, armed at one end with a pen or pencil; and a method of moving the paper ribbon at a uniform rate by means of clock-work to receive the characters. . . . In the autumn of the year 1835 he constructed the first rude working model of his invention. . . . The first public exhibition . . . was on the 2d of September, 1837, on which occasion the marking was successfully effected through one third of a mile of wire. Immediately afterwards a recording instrument was constructed . . . which was subsequently employed upon the first experimental line between Washington and Baltimore. This line was constructed in 1843-44 under an appropriation by Congress, and was completed by May of the latter year. On the 27th of that month the first despatch was transmitted from Washington to Baltimore. . . . The experimental line was originally constructed with two wires, as Morse was not at that time acquainted with the discovery of Steinhilf, that

the earth might be used to complete the circuit. Accident, however, soon demonstrated this fact. . . . The following year (1845) telegraph lines began to be built over other routes. . . . In October, 1851, a convention of deputies from the German States of Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Württemberg and Saxony, met at Vienna, for the purpose of establishing a common and uniform telegraphic system, under the name of the German-Austrian Telegraph Union. The various systems of telegraphy then in use were subjected to the most thorough examination and discussion. The convention decided with great unanimity that the Morse system was practically far superior to all others, and it was accordingly adopted. Prof. Steinheil, although himself . . . the inventor of a telegraphic system, with a magnanimity that does him high honor, strongly urged upon the convention the adoption of the American system." . . . The first of the printing telegraphs was patented in the United States by Royal E. House, in 1846. The Hughes printing telegraph, a remarkable piece of mechanism, was patented by David E. Hughes, of Kentucky, in 1855. A system known as the automatic method, in which the signals representing letters are transmitted over the line through the instrumentality of mechanism, was originated by Alexander Bain of Edinburgh, whose first patents were taken out in 1846. An autographic telegraph, transmitting despatches in the reproduced hand-writing of the sender, was brought out in 1850, by F. C. Bakewell, of London. The same result was afterwards accomplished with variations of method by Chas. Cros, of Paris, Abbé Caselli, of Florence, and others; but none of these inventions has been extensively used. "The possibility of making use of a single wire for the simultaneous transmission of two or more communications seems to have first suggested itself to Moses G. Farmer, of Boston, about the year 1852." The problem was first solved with partial success by Dr. Gintl, on the line between Prague and Vienna, in 1853, but more perfectly by Carl Frischen, of Hanover, in the following year. Other inventors followed in the same field, among them Thomas A. Edison, of New Jersey, who was led by his experiments finally, in 1874 to devise a system "which was destined to furnish the basis of the first practical solution of the curious and interesting problem of quadruplex telegraphy."—G. B. Prescott, *Electricity and the Electric Telegraph*, ch. 29-40.

A. D. 1831-1872.—Dynamo-Electrical Machines, and Electric Motors.—"The discovery of induction by Faraday, in 1831, gave rise to the construction of magneto-electro machines. The first of such machines that was ever made was probably a machine that never came into practical use, the description of which was given in a letter, signed 'P. M.,' and directed to Faraday, published in the *Philosophical Magazine* of 2nd August, 1832. We learn from this description that the essential parts of this machine were six horse-shoe magnets attached to a disc, which rotated in front of six coils of wire wound on bobbins." Sept. 3rd, 1832, Pixii constructed a machine in which a single horse-shoe magnet was made to rotate before two soft iron cores, wound with wire. In this machine he introduced the commutator, an essential element in all modern continuous current machines. "Almost at the same time, Ritchie, Saxton, and Clarke con-

structed similar machines. Clarke's is the best known, and is still popular in the small and portable 'medical' machines so commonly sold. . . . A larger machine [was] constructed by Stöhrer (1843), on the same plan as Clarke's, but with six coils instead of two, and three compound magnets instead of one. . . . The machines, constructed by Nollet (1849) and Shepard (1856) had still more magnets and coils. Shepard's machine was modified by Van Malderen, and was called the Alliance machine. . . . Dr. Werner Siemens, while considering how the inducing effect of the magnet can be most thoroughly utilised, and how to arrange the coils in the most efficient manner for this purpose, was led in 1857 to devise the cylindrical armature. . . . Sinnsden in 1851 pointed out that the current of the generator may itself be utilised to excite the magnetism of the field magnets. . . . Wilde [in 1863] carried out this suggestion by using a small steel permanent magnet and larger electro magnets. . . . The next great improvement of these machines arose from the discovery of what may be called the dynamo-electric principle. This principle may be stated as follows:—For the generation of currents by magneto-electric induction it is not necessary that the machine should be furnished with permanent magnets; the residual or temporary magnetism of soft iron quickly rotating is sufficient for the purpose. . . . In 1867 the principle was clearly enunciated and used simultaneously, but independently, by Siemens and by Wheatstone. . . . It was in February, 1867, that Dr. C. W. Siemens' classical paper on the conversion of dynamical into electrical energy without the aid of permanent magnetism was read before the Royal Society. Strangely enough, the discovery of the same principle was enunciated at the same meeting of the Society by Sir Charles Wheatstone. . . . The starting-point of a great improvement in dynamo-electric machines, was the discovery by Pacinotti of the ring armature . . . in 1860. . . . Gramme, in 1871, modified the ring armature, and constructed the first machine, in which he made use of the Gramme ring and the dynamic principle. In 1872, Hefner-Alteneck, of the firm of Siemens and Halske, constructed a machine in which the Gramme ring is replaced by a drum armature, that is to say, by a cylinder round which wire is wound. . . . Either the Pacinotti-Gramme ring armature, or the Hefner-Alteneck drum armature, is now adopted by nearly all constructors of dynamo-electric machines, the parts varying of course in minor details." The history of the dynamo since has been one of a gradual perfection of parts, resulting in the production of a great number of types, which can not here even be mentioned.—A. R. von Urbanitzky, *Electricity in the Service of Man*, pp. 227-242.—S. P. Thompson, *Dynamo Electrical Machines.—Electric Motors*.—"It has been known for forty years that every form of electric motor which operated on the principle of mutual mechanical force between a magnet and a conducting wire or coil could also be made to act as a generator of induced currents by the reverse operation of producing the motion mechanically. And when, starting from the researches of Siemens, Wilde, Nollet, Holmes and Gramme, the modern forms of magneto-electric and dynamo-electric machines began to come into commercial use, it was discovered that any one of

the modern machines designed as a generator of currents constituted a far more efficient electric motor than any of the previous forms which had been designed specially as motors. It required no new discovery of the law of reversibility to enable the electrician to understand this; but to convince the world required actual experiment."—A. Guillemin, *Electricity and Magnetism*, pt. 2, ch. 10, sect. 3.

A. D. 1835-1889.—The Electric Railway.—"Thomas Davenport, a poor blacksmith of Brandon, Vt., constructed what might be termed the first electric railway. The invention was crude and of little practical value, but the idea was there. In 1835 he exhibited in Springfield, Mass., a small model electric engine running upon a circular track, the circuit being furnished by primary batteries carried in the car. Three years later, Robert Davidson, of Aberdeen, Scotland, began his experiments in this direction. . . . He constructed quite a powerful motor, which was mounted upon a truck. Forty battery cells, carried on the car, furnished power to propel the motor. The battery elements were composed of amalgamated zinc and iron plates, the exciting liquid being dilute sulphuric acid. This locomotive was run successfully on several steam railroads in Scotland, the speed attained was four miles an hour, but this machine was afterwards destroyed by some malicious person or persons while it was being taken home to Aberdeen. In 1849 Moses Farmer exhibited an electric engine which drew a small car containing two persons. In 1851, Dr. Charles Grafton Page, of Salem, Mass., perfected an electric engine of considerable power. On April 29 of that year the engine was attached to a car and a trip was made from Washington to Bladensburg, over the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad track. The highest speed attained was nineteen miles an hour. The electric power was furnished by one hundred Grove cells carried on the engine. . . . The same year, Thomas Hall, of Boston, Mass., built a small electric locomotive called the Volta. The current was furnished by two Grove battery cells which were conducted to the rails, thence through the wheels of the locomotive to the motor. This was the first instance of the current being supplied to the motor on a locomotive from a stationary source. It was exhibited at the Charitable Mechanics fair by him in 1860. . . . In 1879, Messrs. Slemen and Halske, of Berlin, constructed and operated an electric railway at the Industrial Exposition. A third rail placed in the centre of the two outer rails, supplied the current, which was taken up into the motor through a sliding contact under the locomotive. . . . In 1880 Thomas A. Edison constructed an experimental road near his laboratory in Menlo Park, N. J. The power from the locomotive was transferred to the car by belts running to and from the shafts of each. The current was taken from and returned through the rails. Early in the year of 1881 the Lichterfelde, Germany, electric railway was put into operation. It is a third rail system and is still running at the present time. This may be said to be the first commercial electric railway constructed. In 1883 the Daft Electric Co. equipped and operated quite successfully an electric system on the Saratoga & Mt. McGregor Railroad, at Saratoga, N. Y." During the next five or six years numerous electric railroads, more or less experimental, were built. "Octo-

ber 31, 1888, the Council Bluffs & Omaha Railway and Bridge Co. was first operated by electricity, they using the Thomson-Houston system. The same year the Thomson-Houston Co. equipped the Highland Division of the Lynn & Boston Horse Railway at Lynn, Mass. Horse railways now began to be equipped with electricity all over the world, and especially in the United States. In February, 1889, the Thomson-Houston Electric Co. had equipped the line from Bowdoin Square, Boston, to Harvard Square, Cambridge, of the West End Railway with electricity and operated twenty cars, since which time it has increased its electrical apparatus, until now it is the largest electric railway line in the world."—E. Trevert, *Electric Railway Engineering*, app. A.

A. D. 1841-1880.—The Incandescent Electric Light.—"While the arc lamp is well adapted for lighting large areas requiring a powerful, diffused light, similar to sunlight, and hence is suitable for outdoor illumination, and for workshops, stores, public buildings, and factories, especially those where colored fabrics are produced, its use in ordinary dwellings, or for a desk light in offices, is impractical, a softer, steadier, and more economical light being required. Various attempts to modify the arc-light by combining it with the incandescent were made in the earlier stages of electric lighting. . . . The first strictly incandescent lamp was invented in 1841 by Frederick de Molyens of Cheltenham, England, and was constructed on the simple principle of the incandescence produced by the high resistance of a platinum wire to the passage of the electric current. In 1849 Pétie employed iridium for the same purpose, also alloys of iridium and platinum, and iridium and carbon. In 1845 J. W. Starr of Cincinnati first proposed the use of carbon, and, associated with King, his English agent, produced, through the financial aid of the philanthropist Peabody, an incandescent lamp. . . . In all these early experiments, the battery was the source of electric supply; and the comparatively small current required for the incandescent light as compared with that required for the arc light, was an argument in favor of the former. . . . Still, no substantial progress was made with either system till the invention of the dynamo resulted in the practical development of both systems, that of the incandescent following that of the arc. Among the first to make incandescent lighting a practical success were Sawyer and Man of New York, and Edison. For a long time, Edison experimented with platinum, using fine platinum wire coiled into a spiral, so as to concentrate the heat, and produce incandescence; the same current producing only a red heat when the wire, whether of platinum or other metal, is stretched out. . . . Failing to obtain satisfactory results from platinum, Edison turned his attention to carbon, the superiority of which as an incandescent illuminant had already been demonstrated; but its rapid consumption, as shown by the Reynier and similar lamps, being unfavorable to its use, as compared with the durability of platinum and iridium, the problem was, to secure the superior illumination of the carbon, and reduce or prevent its consumption. As this consumption was due chiefly to oxidation, it was questionable whether the superior illumination were not due to the same cause, and whether, if the carbon

were inclosed in a glass globe, from which oxygen was eliminated, the same illumination could be obtained. Another difficulty of equal magnitude was to obtain a sufficiently perfect vacuum, and maintain it in a hermetically sealed globe inclosing the carbon, and at the same time maintain electric connection with the generator through the glass by a metal conductor, subject to expansion and contraction different from that of the glass, by the change of temperature due to the passage of the electric current. Sawyer and Man attempted to solve this problem by filling the globe with nitrogen, thus preventing combustion by eliminating the oxygen. . . . The results obtained by this method, which at one time attracted a great deal of attention, were not sufficiently satisfactory to become practical; and Edison and others gave their preference to the vacuum method, and sought to overcome the difficulties connected with it. The invention of the mercurial air pump, with its subsequent improvements, made it possible to obtain a sufficiently perfect vacuum, and the difficulty of introducing the current into the interior of the globe was overcome by imbedding a fine platinum wire in the glass, connecting the inclosed carbon with the external circuit; the expansion and contraction of the platinum not differing sufficiently from that of the glass, in so fine a wire, as to impair the vacuum. . . . The carbons made by Edison under his first patent in 1879, were obtained from brown paper or cardboard. . . . They were very fragile and short-lived, and consequently were soon abandoned. In 1880 he patented the process which, with some modifications, he still adheres to. In this process he uses filaments of bamboo, which are taken from the interior, fibrous portion of the plant."—P. Atkinson, *Elements of Electric Lighting*, ch. 8.

A. D. 1854-1866.—The Atlantic Cable.—"Cyrus Field . . . established a company in America (in 1854), which . . . obtained the right of landing cables in Newfoundland for fifty years. Soundings were made in 1856 between Ireland and Newfoundland, showing a maximum depth of 4,400 metres. Having succeeded after several attempts in laying a cable between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, Field founded the Atlantic Telegraph Company in England. . . . The length of the . . . cable [used] was 4,000 kilometres, and was carried by the two ships *Agamemnon* and *Niagara*. The distance between the two stations on the coasts was 2,640 kilometres. The laying of the cable commenced on the 7th of August, 1857, at Valentia (Ireland); on the third day the cable broke at a depth of 3,660 metres, and the expedition had to return. A second expedition was sent in 1858; the two ships met each other half-way, the ends of the cable were joined, and the lowering of it commenced in both directions; 149 kilometres were thus lowered, when a fault in the cable was discovered. It had, therefore, to be brought on board again, and was broken during the process. After it had been repaired, and when 476 kilometres had been already laid, another fault was discovered, which caused another breakage; this time it was impossible to repair it, and the expedition was again unsuccessful, and had to return. In spite of the repeated failures, two ships were again sent out in the same year, and this time one end of the cable was landed in Ireland, and the other at New-

foundland. The length of the sunk cable was 3,745 kilometres. Field's first telegram was sent on the 7th of August, from America to Ireland. The insulation of the cable, however, became more defective every day, and failed altogether on the 1st of September. From the experience obtained, it was concluded that it was possible to lay a trans-Atlantic cable, and the company, after consulting a number of professional men, again set to work. . . . The *Great Eastern* was employed in laying this cable. This ship, which is 211 metres long, 25 metres broad, and 16 metres in height, carried a crew of 500 men, of which 120 were electricians and engineers, 179 mechanics and stokers, and 115 sailors. The management of all affairs relating to the laying of the cable was entrusted to Canning. The coast cable was laid on the 21st of July, and the end of it was connected with the Atlantic cable on the 23rd. After 1,326 kilometres had been laid, a fault was discovered, an iron wire was found stuck right across the cable, and Canning considered the mischief to have been done with a malevolent purpose. On the 2nd of August, 2,196 kilometres of cable were sunk, when another fault was discovered. While the cable was being repaired it broke, and attempts to recover it at the time were all unsuccessful; in consequence of this the *Great Eastern* had to return without having completed the task. A new company, the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, was formed in 1866, and at once entrusted Messrs. Glass, Elliott and Company with the construction of a new cable of 3,000 kilometres. Different arrangements were made for the outer envelope of the cable, and the *Great Eastern* was once more equipped to give effect to the experiments which had just been made. The new expedition was not only to lay a new cable, but also to take up the end of the old one, and join it to a new piece, and thus obtain a second telegraph line. The sinking again commenced in Ireland on the 13th of July, 1866, and it was finished on the 27th. On the 4th of August, 1866, the Trans-Atlantic Telegraph Line was declared open."—A. R. von Urbanitzky, *Electricity in the Service of Man*, pp. 767-768.

A. D. 1876-1892.—The Telephone.—"The first and simplest of all magnetic telephones is the Bell Telephone." In "the first form of this instrument, constructed by Professor Graham Bell, in 1876 . . . a harp of steel rods was attached to the poles of a permanent magnet. . . . When we sing into a piano, certain of the strings of the instrument are set in vibration sympathetically by the action of the voice with different degrees of amplitude, and a sound, which is an approximation to the vowel uttered, is produced from the piano. Theory shows that, had the piano a much larger number of strings to the octave, the vowel sounds would be perfectly reproduced. It was upon this principle that Bell constructed his first telephone. The expense of constructing such an apparatus, however, deterred Bell from making the attempt, and he sought to simplify the apparatus before proceeding further in this direction. After many experiments with more or less unsatisfactory results, he constructed the instrument . . . which he exhibited at Philadelphia in 1876. In this apparatus, the transmitter was formed by an electro-magnet, through which a current flowed, and a membrane, made of gold-beater's skin, on which was placed as a sort of armature, a piece of soft iron, which thus

vibrated in front of the electro-magnet when the membrane was thrown into sonorous vibration. . . . It is quite clear that when we speak into a Bell transmitter only a small fraction of the energy of the sonorous vibrations of the voice can be converted into electric currents, and that these currents must be extremely weak. Edison applied himself to discover some means by which he could increase the strength of these currents. Elisha Gray had proposed to use the variation of resistance of a fine platinum wire attached to a diaphragm dipping into water, and hoped that the variation of extent of surface in contact would so vary the strength of current as to reproduce sonorous vibrations; but there is no record of this experiment having been tried. Edison proposed to utilise the fact that the resistance of carbon varied under pressure. He had independently discovered this peculiarity of carbon, but it had been previously described by Du Moncel. . . . The first carbon transmitter was constructed in 1878 by Edison."—W. H. Preece, and J. Maier, *The Telephone*, ch. 3-4.—In a pamphlet distributed at the Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893, entitled "*Exhibit of the American Bell Telephone Co.*," the following statements are made: "At the Centennial Exposition, in Philadelphia, in 1876, was given the first general public exhibition of the telephone by its inventor, Alexander Graham Bell. To-day, seventeen years later, more than half a million instruments are in daily use in the United States alone, six hundred million talks by telephone are held every year, and the human voice is carried over a distance of twelve hundred miles without loss of sound or syllable. The first use of the telephone for business purposes was over a single wire connecting only two telephones. At once the need of general intercommunication made itself felt. In the cities and larger towns exchanges were established and all the subscribers to any one exchange were enabled to talk to one another through a central office. Means were then devised to connect two or more exchanges by trunk lines, thus affording means of communication between all the subscribers of all the exchanges so connected. This work has been pushed forward until now have been gathered into what may be termed one great exchange all the important cities from Augusta on the east to Milwaukee on the west, and from Burlington and Buffalo on the north to Washington on the south, bringing more than one half the people of this country and a much larger proportion of the business interests, within talking distance of one another. . . . The lines which connect Chicago with Boston, via New York, are of copper wire of extra size. It is about one sixth of an inch in diameter, and weighs 435 pounds to the mile. Hence each circuit contains 1,044,000 pounds of copper. . . . In the United States there are over a quarter of a million exchange subscribers, and . . . these make use of the telephone to carry on 600,000,000 conversations annually. There is hardly a city or town of 5,000 inhabitants that has not its Telephone Exchange, and these are so knit together by connecting lines that intercommunication is constant." The number of telephones in use in the United States, on the 20th of December in each year since the first introduction, is given as follows: 1877, 5,187; 1878, 17,567; 1879, 52,517; 1880, 123,380; 1881, 180,592; 1882, 237,728; 1883, 298,580; 1884, 325,574; 1885, 330,040; 1886, 353,-

518; 1887, 380,277; 1888, 411,511; 1889, 444,861; 1890, 483,790; 1891, 512,407; 1892, 552,720.

ELEPHANT, Order of the.—A Danish order of knighthood instituted in 1693 by King Christian V.

ELEPHANTINE. See EGYPT: THE OLD EMPIRE AND THE MIDDLE EMPIRE.

ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES, The.—Among the ancient Greeks, "the mysteries were a source of faith and hope to the initiated, as are the churches of modern times. Secret doctrines, regarded as holy, and to be kept with inviolable fidelity, were handed down in these brotherhoods, and no doubt were fondly believed to contain a saving grace by those who were admitted, amidst solemn and imposing rites, under the veil of midnight, to hear the tenets of the ancient faith, and the promises of blessings to come to those who, with sincerity of heart and pious trust, took the obligations upon them. The Eleusinian mysteries were the most imposing and venerable. Their origin extended back into a mythical antiquity, and they were among the few forms of Greek worship which were under the superintendence of hereditary priest-hoods. Thirlwall thinks that 'they were the remains of a worship which preceded the rise of the Hellenic mythology and its attendant rites, grounded on a view of Nature less fanciful, more earnest, and better fitted to awaken both philosophical thought and religious feeling.' This conclusion is still further confirmed by the moral and religious tone of the poets,—such as Æschylus,—whose ideas on justice, sin and retribution are as solemn and elevated as those of a Hebrew prophet. The secrets, whatever they were, were never revealed in express terms; but Isocrates uses some remarkable expressions, when speaking of their importance to the condition of man. 'Those who are initiated,' says he 'entertain sweeter hopes of eternal life'; and how could this be the case, unless there were imparted at Eleusis the doctrine of eternal life, and some idea of its state and circumstances more compatible with an elevated conception of the Deity and of the human soul than the vague and shadowy images which haunted the popular mind. The Eleusinian communion embraced the most eminent men from every part of Greece,—statesmen, poets, philosophers, and generals; and when Greece became a part of the Roman Empire, the greatest minds of Rome drew instruction and consolation from its doctrines. The ceremonies of initiation—which took place every year in the early autumn, a beautiful season in Attica—were a splendid ritual, attracting visitors from every part of the world. The processions moving from Athens to Eleusis over the Sacred Way, sometimes numbered twenty or thirty thousand people, and the exciting scenes were well calculated to leave a durable impression on susceptible minds. . . . The formula of the dismissal, after the initiation was over, consisted in the mysterious words 'konx,' 'ompax'; and this is the only Eleusinian secret that has illuminated the world from the recesses of the temple of Demeter and Persephone. But it is a striking illustration of the value attached to these rites and doctrines, that, in moments of extremest peril—as of impending shipwreck, or massacre by a victorious enemy,—men asked one another, 'Are you initiated?' as if this were the anchor of their hopes

for another life."—C. C. Felton, *Greece, Ancient and Modern*, c. 2, lect. 10.—"The Eleusinian mysteries continued to be celebrated during the whole of the second half of the fourth century, till they were put an end to by the destruction of the temple at Eleusis, and by the devastation of Greece in the invasion of the Goths under Alaric in 395" (see *GOths*: A. D. 395).—W. Smith, *Note to Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 25.

ALSO IN: R. Brown, *The Great Dionysiak Myth*, ch. 6, sect. 2.—J. J. I. von Dollinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, bk. 3 (v. 1).—See, also, ELEUSIS.

ELEUSIS.—Eleusis was originally one of the twelve confederate townships into which Attica was said to have been divided before the time of Theseus. It "was advantageously situated [about fourteen miles N. W. of Athens] on a height, at a small distance from the shore of an extensive bay, to which there is access only through narrow channels, at the two extremities of the island of Salamis; its position was important, as commanding the shortest and most level route by land from Athens to the Isthmus by the pass which leads at the foot of Mount Cerata along the shore to Megara. . . . Eleusis was built at the eastern end of a low rocky hill, which lies parallel to the sea-shore. . . . The eastern extremity of the hill was levelled artificially for the reception of the Hierum of Ceres and the other sacred buildings. Above these are the traces of an Acropolis. A triangular space of about 500 yards each side, lying between the hill and the shore, was occupied by the town of Eleusis. . . . To those who approached Eleusis from Athens, the sacred buildings standing on the eastern extremity of the height concealed the greater part of the town, and on a nearer approach presented a succession of magnificent objects, well calculated to heighten the solemn grandeur of the ceremonies and the awe and reverence of the Mystæ in their initiation. . . . In the plurality of enclosures, in the magnificence of the pylæ or gateways, in the absence of any general symmetry of plan, in the small auxiliary temples, we recognize a great resemblance between the sacred buildings of Eleusis and the Egyptian Hiera of Thebes and Philæ. And this resemblance is the more remarkable, as the Demeter of Attica was the Isis of Egypt. We cannot suppose, however, that the plan of all these buildings was even thought of when the worship of Ceres was established at Eleusis. They were the progressive creation of successive ages. . . . Under the Roman Empire . . . it was fashionable among the higher order of Romans to pass some time at Athens in the study of philosophy and to be initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries. Hence Eleusis became at that time one of the most frequented places in Greece; and perhaps it was never so populous as under the emperors of the first two centuries of our æra. During the two following centuries, its mysteries were the chief support of declining polytheism, and almost the only remaining bond of national union among the Greeks; but at length the destructive visit of the Goths in the year 396, the extinction of paganism and the ruin of maritime commerce, left Eleusis deprived of every source of prosperity, except those which are inseparable from its fertile plain, its noble bay, and its position on the road from Attica to the Isthmus. . . . The village still preserves the ancient name, no further altered than is customary in Roman conver-

sions."—W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens*, v. 2: *The Demi*, sect. 5.

ELGIN, Lord.—The Indian administration of. See INDIA: A. D. 1862–1876.

ELIS.—Elis was an ancient Greek state, occupying the country on the western coast of Peloponnesus, adjoining Arcadia, and between Messenia at the south and Achaia on the north. It was noted for the fertility of its soil and the rich yield of its fisheries. But Elis owed greater importance to the inclusion within its territory of the sacred ground of Olympia, where the celebration of the most famous festival of Zeus came to be established at an early time. The Elians had acquired Olympia by conquest of the city and territory of Pisa, to which it originally belonged, and the presidency of the Olympic games was always disputed with them by the latter. Elis was the close ally of Sparta down to the year B. C. 421, when a bitter quarrel arose between them, and Elis suffered heavily in the wars which ensued. It was afterwards at war with the Arcadians, and joined the Ætolian League against the Achaian League. The city of Elis was one of the most splendid in Greece; but little now remains, even of ruins, to indicate its departed glories. See, also, OLYMPIC GAMES.

ELISII, The. See LYGIANS.

ELIZABETH, Czarina of Russia, A. D. 1741–1761. . . . Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, and the Thirty Years War. See GERMANY: A. D. 1618–1620; 1620; 1621–1623; 1631–1632, and 1648. . . . Elizabeth, Queen of England, A. D. 1558–1603. . . . Elizabeth Farnese, Queen of Spain. See ITALY: A. D. 1715–1735; and SPAIN: A. D. 1713–1735, and 1726–1731.

ELIZABETH, N. J.—The first settlement of. See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1664–1667.

ELK HORN, OR PEA RIDGE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—MARCH: MISSOURI—ARKANSAS).

ELKWATER, OR CHEAT SUMMIT, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (AUGUST—DECEMBER: WEST VIRGINIA).

ELLANDUM, Battle of.—Decisive victory of Egbert, the West Saxon king, over the Mercians, A. D. 823.

ELLEBRI, The. See IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

ELLENBOROUGH, Lord, The Indian administration of. See INDIA: A. D. 1836–1845.

ELLICE ISLANDS. See POLYNESIA.

ELLSWORTH, Colonel. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (MAY: VIRGINIA).

ELMET.—A small kingdom of the Britons which was swallowed up in the English kingdom of Northumbria early in the seventh century. It answered, roughly speaking, to the present West-Riding of Yorkshire. . . . Leeds "preserves the name of Loidis, by which Elmet seems also to have been known."—J. R. Green, *The Making of Eng.*, p. 254.

ELMIRA, N. Y. (then Newtown).—Gen. Sullivan's Battle with the Senecas. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1779 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

ELSASS. See ALSACE.

ELTEKEH, Battle of.—A victory won by the Assyrian, Sennacherib, over the Egyptians, before the disaster befel his army which is related in 2 Kings xix. 35. Sennacherib's own account of the battle has been found among the

Assyrian records.—A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, ch. 6.

ELUSATES, The. See **AQUITAINE**, TRIBES OF ANCIENT.

ELVIRA, Battle of (1319). See **SPAIN**: A. D. 1273-1460.

ELY, The Camp of Refuge at. See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1069-1071.

ELYMAIS. See **ELAM**.

ELYMEIA. See **MACEDONIA**.

ELYMANS, The. See **SICILY**: **EARLY INHABITANTS**.

ELYSIAN FIELDS. See **CANARY ISLANDS**.

ELZEVIRS. See **PRINTING**: A. D. 1617-1680.

EMANCIPATION, Catholic. See **IRELAND**: A. D. 1811-1829.

EMANCIPATION, Compensated; Proposal of President Lincoln. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1862 (MARCH).

EMANCIPATION, Prussian Edict of. See **GERMANY**: A. D. 1807-1808.

EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATIONS, President Lincoln's. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1862 (SEPTEMBER), and 1863 (JANUARY).

EMANUEL, King of Portugal, A. D. 1495-1521.... **Emannell Philibert**, Duke of Savoy, A. D. 1553-1580.

EMBARGO OF 1807, The American. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1804-1809, and 1808.

EMERICH, King of Hungary, A. D. 1196-1204.

EMERITA AUGUSTA.—A colony of Roman veterans settled in Spain, B. C. 27, by the emperor Augustus. It is identified with modern Merida, in Estremadura.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 34, note.

EMESSA.—Capture by the Arabs (A. D. 636). See **MAHOMETAN CONQUEST**: A. D. 632-639.

ÉMIGRÉS OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1789 (JULY—AUGUST), (AUGUST—OCTOBER); 1789-1791; 1791 (JULY—SEPTEMBER); and 1791-1792.

EMITES, The. See **JEWS**: **EARLY HEBREW**.

EMMAUS, Battle of.—Defeat of a Syrian army under Gorgias by Judas Maccabæus, B. C. 166.—Josephus, *Antiq. of the Jews*, bk. 12, ch. 7.

EMMENDINGEN, Battle of. See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER).

EMMET INSURRECTION, The. See **IRELAND**: A. D. 1801-1803.

EMPEROR.—A title derived from the Roman title Imperator. See **IMPERATOR**.

EMPORIA, The. See **CARTHAGE**, THE DOMINION OF.

ENCOMIENDAS. See **SLAVERY**, MODERN: OF THE INDIANS; also, **REPARTIMIENTOS**.

ENCUMBERED ESTATES ACT, The. See **IRELAND**: A. D. 1843-1848.

ENCYCLICAL AND SYLLABUS OF 1864, The. See **PAPACY**: A. D. 1864.

ENCYCLOPÆDISTS, The.—“French literature had never been so brilliant as in the second half of the 18th century. Buffon, Diderot, D'Alembert, Rousseau, Duclos, Condillac, Helvétius, Holbach, Raynal, Condorcet, Mably, and many others adorned it, and the ‘Encyclopædia,’ which was begun in 1751 under the direction of Diderot, became the focus of an intellectual influence which has rarely been equalled. The name and idea were taken from a work published by Ephraim Chambers in Dublin, in 1728. A noble preliminary discourse was written by D'Alembert; and all the best pens in France were enlisted in the enterprise, which was constantly encouraged and largely assisted by Voltaire. Twice it was suppressed by authority, but the interdiction was again raised. Popular favour now ran with an irresistible force in favour of the philosophers, and the work was brought to its conclusion in 1771.”—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 20 (v. 5).

Also in: J. Morley, *Diderot and the Encyclopædists*, ch. 5 (v. 1).—E. J. Lowell, *The Eve of the French Revolution*, ch. 16.

ENDICOTT, John, and the Colony of Massachusetts Bay. See **MASSACHUSETTS**: A. D. 1623-1629, and after.

ENDIDJAN, Battle of (1876). See **RUSSIA**: A. D. 1859-1876.

ENGADINE, The. See **SWITZERLAND**: A. D. 1396-1499.

ENGEN, Battle of (1800). See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1800-1801 (MAY—FEBRUARY).

ENGERN, Duchy of. See **SAXONY**: THE OLD DUCHY.

ENGHIEN, Duc d', The abduction and execution of. See **FRANCE**: 1804-1805.

ENGLAND.

Before the coming of the English.—The Celtic and Roman periods. See **BRITAIN**.

A. D. 449-547.—The three tribes of the English conquest.—The naming of the country.—“It was by . . . three tribes [from Northwestern Germany], the Saxons, the Angles, and the Jutes, that southern Britain was conquered and colonized in the fifth and sixth centuries, according to the most ancient testimony. . . . Of the three, the Angli almost if not altogether pass away into the migration: the Jutes and the Saxons, although migrating in great numbers, had yet a great part to play in their own homes and in other regions besides Britain; the former at a later period in the train and under the name of the Danes; the latter in German history from the eighth century to the present day.”—W.

Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of England*, v. 1, ch. 3.—“Among the Teutonic settlers in Britain some tribes stand out conspicuously; Angles, Saxons, and Jutes stand out conspicuously above all. The Jutes led the way; from the Angles the land and the united nation took their name; the Saxons gave us the name by which our Celtic neighbours have ever known us. But there is no reason to confine the area from which our forefathers came to the space which we should mark on the map as the land of the continental Angles, Saxons, and Jutes. So great a migration is always likely to be swollen by some who are quite alien to the leading tribe; it is always certain to be swollen by many who are of stocks akin to the leading tribe, but who do not actually belong to it. As we in Britain are those who

A Logical Outline of English History

IN WHICH THE DOMINANT CONDITIONS AND

INFLUENCES ARE DISTINGUISHED BY COLORS.

Physical or material.
Ethnological.

Social and political.
Intellectual, moral and religious.
Foreign.

The Island of Britain, separated from the Continent of Europe by a narrow breadth of sea, which makes friendly commerce easy and hostile invasion difficult;—its soil in great part excellent; its northern climate tempered by the humid warmth of the Gulf Stream; its conditions good for breeding a robust population, strongly fed upon corn and meats; holding, moreover, in store, for later times, a rare deposit of iron and coal, of tin and potter's clay, and other minerals of like utility; was occupied and possessed by tribes from Northern Europe, of the strongest race in history; already schooled in courage and trained to enterprise by generations of sea-faring adventure; uncorrupted by any mercenary contact with the decaying civilization of Rome, but ready for the knowledge it could give.

Fused, after much warring with one another and with their Danish kin, into a nation of Englishmen, **they lived, for five centuries, an isolated life, until their insular and independent character had become deeply ingrained,** and the primitive system of their social and political organization—their Townships, their Hundreds, their Shires, and the popular Moots, or courts, which determined and administered law in each—was rooted fast; though their king's power waxed and the nobles and the common people drew farther apart.

Then they were mastered (in the last successful invasion that their Island ever knew) by another people, **sprung from their own stock, but whose blood had been warmed and whose wit had been quickened by Latin and Gallic influences in the country of the Franks.**

A new social and political system now formed itself in England as the result:—Feudalism modified by the essential democracy inherent in Old English institutions—producing a stout commonalty to daunt the lords, and a strong aristocracy to curb the king.

English royalty soon weakened itself yet more by ambitious strivings to maintain and extend a wide dominion over-sea, in Normandy and Aquitaine; and was helpless to resist when barons and commons came together to demand the signing and sealing of the Great Charter of Englishmen's rights.

Out of the conditions which gave birth to Magna Charta there followed, soon, the development of the English Parliament as a representative legislature, from the Curia Regis of the Normans and the Witenagemot of the older English time.

From the woful wars of a hundred years with France, which another century brought upon it, the nation, as a whole, suffered detriment, no doubt, and its progress was hindered in many ways; but politically the people took some good from the troubled times, because their kings were more dependent upon them for money and men.

5th–7th centuries.
Conquest and settlement by Saxons, Angles and Jutes.

7th–11th centuries

A. D. 1066.
Norman conquest.

11th–13th centuries.

A. D. 1215.
Magna Charta.

A. D. 1295–1296.
Parliament.

A. D. 1337–1453.
The Hundred Years War.

thirty years. The nobles well-nigh perished, as an order, in these wars, while the middle-class people at large suffered relatively little, in numbers or estate.

But, previously, the great Plague, by diminishing the ranks of the laboring class, had raised wages and the standard of living among them, and had helped, with other causes, to multiply the small landowners and tenant farmers of the country, increasing the independent common class.

Moreover, from the time of Edward III., who encouraged Flemish weavers to settle in England and to teach their art to his people, manufactures began to thrive; trade extended; towns grew in population and wealth, and the great burgher middle-class rose rapidly to importance and weight in the land.

But the commons of England were not prepared to make use of the actual power which they held. The nobles had led them in the past; it needed time to raise leaders among themselves, and time to organize their ranks. Hence no new checks on royalty were ready to replace those constraints which had been broken by the ruin of great houses in the civil wars, and the crown made haste to improve its opportunity for grasping power. There followed, under the Tudors, a period of absolutism greater than England had known before.

But this endured only for the time of the education of the commons, who conned the lessons of the age with eagerness and with understanding. The new learning from Greece and Rome; the new world-knowledge that had been found in the West; the new ideas which the new art of the printer had furnished with wings,—all these had now gained their most fertile planting in the English mind. Their flower was the splendid literature of the Elizabethan age; they ripened fruits more substantial at a later day.

The intellectual development of the nation tended first toward a religious independence, which produced two successive revolts — from Roman Papacy and from the Anglican Episcopacy that succeeded it.

This religious new-departure of the English people gave direction to a vast expansion of their energies in the outside world. It led them into war with Spain, and sent forth Drake and Hawkins and the Buccaneers, to train the sailors and pilot the merchant adventurers who would soon make England mistress of all the wide seas.

Then, when these people, strong, prosperous and intelligent, had come to be ripely sufficient for self-government, there fell to them a foolish race of kings, who challenged them to a struggle which stripped royalty of all but its fictions, and established the sovereignty of England in its House of Commons for all time.

Unassailable in its island, — taking part in the great wars of the 18th century by its fleets and its subsidies chiefly, — busy with its undisturbed labors at home, — vigorous in its conquests, its settlements and its trade, which it pushed into the farthest parts of the earth, — creating wealth and protecting it from spoliation and from waste, — the English nation now became the industrial and economic school of the age. It produced the mechanical inventions which first opened a new era in the life of mankind on the material side; it attained to the splendid enlightenment of freedom in trade; it made England the workshop and mart of the world, and it spread her Empire to every Continent, through all the seas.

A. D. 1453–1485.
Wars of the Roses.

A. D. 1348.
The great Plague.

A. D. 1327–1377.
Immigration of
Flemish weavers.

A. D. 1485–1603.
Absolutism
of the Tudors.

15th–16th centuries
Renaissance.

16th century.

A. D. 1603–1688.
The Stuarts.—The Civil
War.—The Common-
wealth.—The Revolu-
tion.

18th–19th centuries
Science.—Invention.—
Material progress.—
Economic enlighten-
ment.

stayed behind at the time of the second great migration of our people [to America], so I venture to look on all our Low-Dutch kinsfolk on the continent of Europe as those who stayed behind at the time of the first great migration of our people. Our special hearth and cradle is doubtless to be found in the immediate march-land of Germany and Denmark, but the great common home of our people is to be looked on as stretching along the whole of that long coast where various dialects of the Low-Dutch tongue are spoken. If Angles and Saxons came, we know that Frisians came also, and with Frisians as an element among us, it is hardly too bold to claim the whole Netherlands as in the widest sense Old England, as the land of one part of the kinsfolk who stayed behind. Through that whole region, from the special Anglian corner far into what is now northern France, the true tongue of the people, sometimes overshadowed by other tongues, is some dialect or other of that branch of the great Teutonic family which is essentially the same as our own speech. From Flanders to Sleswick the natural tongue is one which differs from English only as the historical events of fourteen hundred years of separation have inevitably made the two tongues—two dialects, I should rather say, of the same tongue—to differ. From these lands we came as a people. That was our first historical migration. Our remote forefathers must have made endless earlier migrations as parts of the great Aryan body, as parts of the smaller Teutonic body. But our voyage from the Low-Dutch mainland to the isle of Britain was our first migration as a people. . . . Among the Teutonic tribes which settled in Britain, two, the Angles and the Saxons, stood out foremost. These two between them occupied by far the greater part of the land that was occupied at all. Each of these two gave its name to the united nation, but each gave it on different lips. The Saxons were the earlier invaders; they had more to do with the Celtic remnant which abode in the land. On the lips then of the Celtic inhabitants of Britain, the whole of the Teutonic inhabitants of Britain were known from the beginning, and are known still, as Saxons. But, as the various Teutonic settlements drew together, as they began to have common national feelings and to feel the need of a common national name, the name which they chose was not the same as that by which their Celtic neighbours called them. They did not call themselves Saxons and their land Saxony; they called themselves English and their land England. I used the word Saxony in all seriousness; it is a real name for the Teutonic part of Britain, and it is an older name than the name England. But it is a name used only from the outside by Celtic neighbours and enemies; it was not used from the inside by the Teutonic people themselves. In their mouths, as soon as they took to themselves a common name, that name was English; as soon as they gave their land a common name, that name was England. . . . And this is the more remarkable, because the age when English was fully established as the name of the people, and England as the name of the land, was an age of Saxon supremacy, an age when a Saxon state held the headship of England and of Britain, when Saxon kings grew step by step to be kings of the English and lords of the whole British island. In common use

then, the men of the tenth and eleventh centuries knew themselves by no name but English.”—E. A. Freeman, *The English People in its Three Homes (Lectures to American Audiences, pp. 30-31, and 45-47)*.—See **ANGLES AND JUTES**, and **SAXONS**.

A. D. 449-473.—The Beginning of English history.—The conquest of Kent by the Jutes.—“In the year 449 or 450 a band of warriors was drawn to the shores of Britain by the usual pledges of land and pay. The warriors were Jutes, men of a tribe which has left its name to Jutland, at the extremity of the peninsula that projects from the shores of North-Germany, but who were probably akin to the race that was fringing the opposite coast of Scandinavia and settling in the Danish Isles. In three ‘keels’—so ran the legend of their conquest—and with their Ealdormen, Hengest and Horsa, at their head, these Jutes landed at Ebbsfleet in the Isle of Thanet. With the landing of Hengest and his war-band English history begins. . . . In the first years that followed after their landing, Jute and Briton fought side by side; and the Picts are said to have been scattered to the winds in a great battle on the eastern coast of Britain. But danger from the Pict was hardly over when danger came from the Jutes themselves. Their numbers probably grew fast as the news of their settlement in Thanet spread among their fellow pirates who were haunting the channel; and with the increase of their number must have grown the difficulty of supplying them with rations and pay. The dispute which rose over these questions was at last closed by Hengest’s men with a threat of war.” The threat was soon executed; the forces of the Jutes were successfully transferred from their island camp to the main shore, and the town of Durovernum (occupying the site of modern Canterbury) was the first to experience their rage. “The town was left in blackened and solitary ruin as the invaders pushed along the road to London. No obstacle seems to have checked their march from the Stour to the Medway.” At Aylesford (A. D. 455), the lowest ford crossing the Medway, “the British leaders must have taken post for the defence of West Kent; but the Chronicle of the conquering people tells . . . only that Horsa fell in the moment of victory; and the flint-heap of Horsted which has long preserved his name . . . was held in after-time to mark his grave. . . . The victory of Aylesford was followed by a political change among the assailants, whose loose organization around ealdormen was exchanged for a stricter union. Aylesford, we are told, was no sooner won than ‘Hengest took to the kingdom, and Ælle, his son.’ . . . The two kings pushed forward in 457 from the Medway to the conquest of West Kent.” Another battle at the passage of the Cray was another victory for the invaders, and, “as the Chronicle of their conquerors tells us, the Britons ‘forsook Kent-land and fled with much fear to London.’ . . . If we trust British tradition, the battle at Crayford was followed by a political revolution in Britain itself. . . . It would seem . . . that the Romanized Britons rose in revolt under Aurelius Ambrosianus, a descendant of the last Roman general who claimed the purple as an Emperor in Britain. . . . The revolution revived for a while the energy of the province.” The Jutes were driven back into the Isle of Thanet, and held there, apparently, for some

years, with the help of the strong fortresses of Richborough and Reculver, guarding the two mouths of the inlet which then parted Thanet from the mainland. "In 465 however the petty conflicts which had gone on along the shores of the Wantsum made way for a decisive struggle. . . . The overthrow of the Britons at Wipped's-fleet was so terrible that all hope of preserving the bulk of Kent seems from this moment to have been abandoned; and . . . no further struggle disturbed the Jutes in its conquest and settlement. It was only along its southern shore that the Britons now held their ground. . . . A final victory of the Jutes in 473 may mark the moment when they reached the rich pastures which the Roman engineers had reclaimed from Romney Marsh. . . . With this advance to the mouth of the Weald the work of Hengest's men came to an end; nor did the Jutes from this time play any important part in the attack on the island, for their after-gains were limited to the Isle of Wight and a few districts on the Southampton Water."

—J. R. Green, *The Making of England*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: J. M. Lappenberg, *Hist. of Eng. under the Anglo-Saxon Kings*, v. 1. pp. 67-101.

A. D. 477-527.—The conquests of the Saxons.—The founding of the kingdoms of Sussex, Wessex and Essex.—"Whilst the Jutes were conquering Kent, their kindred took part in the war. Ship after ship sailed from the North Sea, filled with eager warriors. The Saxons now arrived—Ella and his three sons landed in the ancient territory of the Regni (A. D. 477-491). The Britons were defeated with great slaughter, and driven into the forest of Andreade, whose extent is faintly indicated by the wastes and commons of the Weald. A general confederacy of the Kings and 'Tyrants' of the Britons was formed against the invaders, but fresh reinforcements arrived from Germany; the city of Andreades-Ceastre was taken by storm, all its inhabitants were slain and the buildings razed to the ground, so that its site is now entirely unknown. From this period the kingdom of the South Saxons was established in the person of Ella; and though ruling only over the narrow boundary of modern Sussex, he was accepted as the first of the Saxon Bretwaldas, or Emperors of the Isle of Britain. Encouraged, perhaps, by the good tidings received from Ella, another band of Saxons, commanded by Cerdic and his son Cynric, landed on the neighbouring shore, in the modern Hampshire (A. D. 494). At first they made but little progress. They were opposed by the Britons; but Geraint, whom the Saxon Chroniclers celebrate for his nobility, and the British Bards extol for his beauty and valour, was slain (A. D. 501). The death of the Prince of the 'Woodlands of Dyfnaint,' or Damnonia, may have been avenged, but the power of the Saxons overwhelmed all opposition; and Cerdic, associating his son Cynric in the dignity, became the King of the territory which he gained. Under Cynric and his son Ceaulin, the Saxons slowly, yet steadily, gained ground. The utmost extent of their dominions towards the North cannot be ascertained; but they had conquered the town of Bedford; and it was probably in consequence of their geographical position (A. D. 571) with respect to the countries of the Middle and East Saxons, that the name of the West Saxons was given to this colony. The tract north of the Thames was soon lost; but on the south of that river and of the

Severn, the successors of Cerdic, Kings of Wessex, continued to extend their dominions. The Hampshire Avon, which retains its old Celtic name, signifying 'the Water,' seems at first to have been their boundary. Beyond this river, the British princes of Damnonia retained their power; and it was long before the country as far as the Exe became a Saxon March-land, or border. About the time that the Saxons under Cerdic and Cynric were successfully warring against the Britons, another colony was seen to establish itself in the territory or kingdom which, from its geographical position, obtained the name of East Saxony; but whereof the district of the Middle Saxons, now Middlesex, formed a part. London, as you well know, is locally included in Middle Saxony; and the Kings of Essex, and the other sovereigns who afterwards acquired the country, certainly possessed many extensive rights of sovereignty in the city. Yet, I doubt much whether London was ever incorporated in any Anglo-Saxon kingdom; and I think we must view it as a weak, tributary, vassal state, not very well able to resist the usurpations of the supreme Lord or Suzerain, Æscwin, or Ercenwine, who was the first King of the East Saxons (A. D. 527). His son Sleda was married to Ricola, daughter to Ethelbert of Kent, who afterwards appears as the superior, or sovereign of the country; and though Sleda was King, yet Ethelbert joined in all important acts of government. This was the fate of Essex—it is styled a kingdom, but it never enjoyed any political independence, being always subject to the adjoining kings."—F. Palgrave, *Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons*, ch. 2.—"The descents of [the West Saxons], Cerdic and Cynric, in 495 at the mouth of the Itchen, and a fresh descent on Portchester in 501, can have been little more than plunder raids; and though in 508 a far more serious conflict ended in the fall of 5,000 Britons and their chief, it was not till 514 that the tribe whose older name seems to have been that of the Gewissas, but who were to be more widely known as the West Saxons, actually landed with a view to definite conquest."—J. R. Green, *The Making of England*, ch. 3.—"The greatness of Sussex did not last beyond the days of its founder Ælle, the first Bretwalda. Whatever importance Essex, or its offshoot, Middlesex, could claim as containing the great city of London was of no long duration. We soon find London fluctuating between the condition of an independent commonwealth, and that of a dependency of the Mercian Kings. Very different was the destiny of the third Saxon Kingdom. Wessex has grown into England, England into Great Britain, Great Britain into the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom into the British Empire. Every prince who has ruled England before and since the eleventh century [the interval of the Danish kings, Harold, son of Godwine, and William the Conqueror, who were not of the West Saxon house] has had the blood of Cerdic the West Saxon in his veins. At the close of the sixth century Wessex had risen to high importance among the English Kingdoms, though the days of its permanent supremacy were still far distant."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 2, sect 1.

A. D. 547-633.—The conquests of the Angles.—The founding of their kingdoms.—"Northwards of the East Saxons was established the kingdom of the East Angles, in which a

northern and a southern people (Northfolc and Suthfolc) were distinguished. It is probable that, even during the last period of the Roman sway, Germans were settled in this part of Britain; a supposition that gains probability from several old Saxon sagas, which have reference to East Anglia at a period anterior to the coming of Hengest and Horsa. The land of the Gyrwas, containing 1,200 hides . . . comprised the neighbouring marsh districts of Ely and Huntingdonshire, almost as far as Lincoln. Of the East Angles Welhwa, or Wewa, or more commonly his son Uffa, or Wuffa, from whom his race derived their patronymic of Uffings or Wuffings, is recorded as the first king. The neighbouring states of Mercia originated in the marsh districts of the Lindisware, or inhabitants of Lindsey (Lindesig), the northern part of Lincolnshire. With these were united the Middle Angles. This kingdom, divided by the Trent into a northern and a southern portion, gradually extended itself to the borders of Wales. Among the states which it comprised was the little kingdom of the Hwiccas, continuous with the later diocese of Worcester, or the counties of Gloucester, Worcester, and a part of Warwick. This state, together with that of the Heccanas, bore the common Germanic appellation of the land of the Magesetas. . . . The country to the north of the Humber had suffered the most severely from the inroads of the Piets and Scots. It became at an early period separated into two British states, the names of which were retained for some centuries, viz.: Deifyr (Deora rice), afterwards Latinized into Deira, extending from the Humber to the Tyne, and Berneich (Beorna rice), afterwards Bernicia, from the Tyne to the Clyde. Here also the settlements of the German races appear anterior to the date given in the common accounts of the first Anglian kings of those territories, in the middle of the sixth century."—J. M. Lappenberg, *Hist. of Eng. under the Anglo-Saxon Kings (Thorpe)*, v. 1, pp. 112-117. —The three Anglian kingdoms of Northumberland, Mercia and East Anglia, "are altogether much larger than the Saxon and Jutish Kingdoms, so you see very well why the land was called 'England' and not 'Saxony.' . . . 'Saxonia' does occur now and then, and it was really an older name than 'Anglia,' but it soon went quite out of use. . . . But some say that there were either Jutes or Saxons in the North of England as soon or sooner than there were in the south. If so, there is another reason why the Scotch Celts as well as the Welsh, call us Saxons. It is not unlikely that there may have been some small Saxon or Jutish settlements there very early, but the great Kingdom of Northumberland was certainly founded by Ida the Angle in 547. It is more likely that there were some Teutonic settlements there before him, because the Chronicle does not say of him, as it does of Hengest, Cissa and Cerdic, that he came into the land by the sea, but only that he began the Kingdom. . . . You must fully understand that in the old times Northumberland meant the whole land north of the Humber, reaching as far as the Firth of Forth. It thus takes in part of what is now Scotland, including the city of Edinburgh, that is Eadwinesburh, the town of the great Northumbrian King Eadwine, or Edwin [Edwin of Deira, A. D. 617-633]. . . . You must not forget that Lothian and all that part of

Scotland was part of Northumberland, and that the people there are really English, and still speak a tongue which has changed less from the Old-English than the tongue of any other part of England. And the real Scots, the Gael in the Highlands, call the Lowland Scots 'Saxons,' just as much as they do the people of England itself. This Northumbrian Kingdom was one of the greatest Kingdoms in England, but it was often divided into two, Beornicia [or Bernicia] and Deira, the latter of which answered pretty nearly to Yorkshire. The chief city was the old Roman town of Eboracum, which in Old-English is Eoforwic, and which we cut short into York. York was for a long time the greatest town in the North of England. There are now many others much larger, but York is still the second city in England in rank, and it gives its chief magistrate the title of Lord-Mayor, as London does, while in other cities and towns the chief magistrate is merely the Mayor, without any Lord. . . . The great Anglian Kingdom of the Mercians, that is the Marchmen, the people on the march or frontier, seems to have been the youngest of all, and to have grown up gradually by joining together several smaller states, including all the land which the West Saxons had held north of the Thames. Such little tribes or states were the Lindesfaras and the Gaiinas in Lincolnshire, the Magesetas in Herefordshire, the Hwiccas in Gloucester, Worcester, and part of Warwick, and several others. . . . When Mercia was fully joined under one King, it made one of the greatest states in England, and some of the Mercian Kings were very powerful princes. It was chiefly an Anglian Kingdom, and the Kings were of an Anglian stock, but among the Hwiccas and in some of the other shires in southern and western Mercia, most of the people must really have been Saxons."—E. A. Freeman, *Old English Hist. for Children*, ch. 5.

A. D. 560.—Ethelbert becomes king of Kent.

A. D. 593.—Ethelfrith becomes king of Northumbria.

A. D. 597-685.—The conversion of the English.—"It happened that certain Saxon children were to be sold for slaves at the marketplace at Rome; when Divine Providence, the great clock-keeper of time, ordering not only hours, but even instants (Luke ii. 38), to his own honour, so disposed it, that Gregory, afterwards first bishop of Rome of that name, was present to behold them. It grieved the good man to see the disproportion betwixt the faces and fortunes, the complexions and conditions, of these children, condemned to a servile estate, though carrying liberal looks, so legible was ingenuity in their faces. It added more to his sorrow, when he conceived that those youths were twice vassals, bought by their masters, and 'sold under sin' (Rom. vii. 14), servants in their bodies, and slaves in their souls to Satan; which occasioned the good man to enter into further inquiry with the merchants (which set them to sale) what they were and whence they came, according to this ensuing dialogue:—Gregory.—'Whence come these captives?' Merchants.—'From the isle of Britain.' Gregory.—'Are those islanders Christians?' Merchants.—'O no, they are Pagans.' Gregory.—'It is sad that the author of darkness should possess men with so bright faces. But what is the name of their particular nation?' Merchants.—'They are called Angli.' Gregory.

—‘And well may, for their “angel like faces”; it becometh such to be coheirs with the angels in heaven. In what province of England did they live?’ Merchants.—‘In Deira,’ Gregory.—‘They are to be freed de Dei ira, “from the anger of God.” How call ye the king of that country?’ Merchants.—‘Ella,’ Gregory.—‘Surely hallelujah ought to be sung in his kingdom to the praise of that God who created all things.’ Thus Gregory’s gracious heart set the sound of every word to the time of spiritual goodness. Nor can his words be justly censured for levity, if we consider how, in that age, the elegance of poetry consisted in rhythm, and the eloquence of prose in allusions. And which was the main, where his pleasant conceits did end, there his pious endeavours began; which did not terminate in a verbal jest, but produce real effects, which ensued hereupon.”—Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain*, bk. 2, sect. 1.—In 590 the good Gregory became Bishop of Rome, or Pope, and six years later, still retaining the interest awakened in him by the captive English youth, he dispatched a band of missionary monks to Britain, with their prior, Augustine, at their head. Once they turned back, affrighted by what they heard of the ferocity of the new heathen possessors of the once-Christian island of Britain; but Gregory laid his commands upon them again, and in the spring of 597 they crossed the channel from Gaul, landing at Ebbsfleet, in the Isle of Thanet, where the Jutish invaders had made their first landing, a century and a half before. They found Ethelbert of Kent, the most powerful of the English kings at that time, already prepared to receive them with tolerance, if not with favor, through the influence of a Christian wife—queen Bertha, of the royal family of the Franks. The conversion and baptism of the Kentish king and court, and the acceptance of the new faith by great numbers of the people followed quickly. In November of the same year, 597, Augustine returned to Gaul to receive his consecration as “Archbishop of the English,” establishing the See of Canterbury, with the primacy which has remained in it to the present day. The East Saxons were the next to bow to the cross and in 604 a bishop, Mellitus, was sent to London. This ended Augustine’s work—and Gregory’s—for both died that year. Then followed an interval of little progress in the work of the mission, and, afterwards, a reaction towards idolatry which threatened to destroy it altogether. But just at this time of discouragement in the south, a great triumph of Christianity was brought about in Northumberland, and due, there, as in Kent, to the influence of a Christian queen. Edwin, the king, with many of his nobles and his people, were baptised on Easter Eve, A. D. 627, and a new center of missionary work was established at York. There, too, an appalling reverse occurred, when Northumberland was overrun, in 633, by Penda, the heathen king of Mercia; but the kingdom rallied, and the Christian Church was reestablished, not wholly, as before, under the patronage and rule of Rome, but partly by a mission from the ancient Celtic Church, which did not acknowledge the supremacy of Rome. In the end, however, the Roman forms of Christianity prevailed, throughout Britain, as elsewhere in western Europe. Before the end of the 7th century the religion of the

Cross was established firmly in all parts of the island, the South Saxons being the latest to receive it. In the 8th century English missionaries were laboring zealously for the conversion of their Saxon and Frisian brethren on the continent.—G. F. Maclear, *Conversion of the West: The English*.

ALSO IN: The Venerable Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*.—H. Soames, *The Anglo Saxon Church*.—R. C. Jenkins, *Canterbury*, ch. 2.

End of the 6th Century.—The extent, the limits and the character of the Teutonic conquest.—“Before the end of the 6th century the Teutonic dominion stretched from the German ocean to the Severn, and from the English Channel to the Firth of Forth. The northern part of the island was still held by Picts and Scots, Celtic tribes, whose exact ethnical relation to each other hardly concerns us. And the whole west side of the island, including not only modern Wales, but the great Kingdom of Strathclyde, stretching from Dumbarton to Chester, and the great peninsula containing Cornwall, Devon and part of Somerset, was still in the hands of independent Britons. The struggle had been a long and severe one, and the natives often retained possession of a defensible district long after the surrounding country had been occupied by the invaders. It is therefore probable that, at the end of the 6th century and even later, there may have been within the English frontier inaccessible points where detached bodies of Welshmen still retained a precarious independence. It is probable also that, within the same frontier, there still were Roman towns, tributary to the conquerors rather than occupied by them. But by the end of the 6th century even these exceptions must have been few. The work of the Conquest, as a whole, was accomplished. The Teutonic settlers had occupied by far the greater part of the territory which they ever were, in the strictest sense, to occupy. The complete supremacy of the island was yet to be won; but that was to be won, when it was won, by quite another process. The English Conquest of Britain differed in several important respects from every other settlement of a Teutonic people within the limits of the Roman Empire. . . . Though the literal extirpation of a nation is an impossibility, there is every reason to believe that the Celtic inhabitants of those parts of Britain which had become English at the 6th century had been as nearly extirpated as a nation can be. The women would doubtless be largely spared, but as far as the male sex is concerned, we may feel sure that death, emigration or personal slavery were the only alternatives which the vanquished found at the hands of our fathers. The nature of the small Celtic element in our language would of itself prove the fact. Nearly every Welsh word which has found its way into English expresses some small domestic matter, such as women and slaves would be concerned with.”—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conquest of Eng.*, ch. 2, sect. 1.—“A glance at the map shows that the mass of the local nomenclature of England begins with the Teutonic conquest, while the mass of the local nomenclature of France is older than the Teutonic conquest. And, if we turn from the names on the map to the living speech of men, there is the most obvious, but the most important, of all facts, the fact that Englishmen speak English and that Frenchmen speak French.

That is to say, in Gaul the speech of Rome lived through the Teutonic conquest, while in Britain it perished in the Teutonic conquest, if it had not passed away before. And behind this is the fact, very much less obvious, a good deal less important, but still very important, that in Gaul tongues older than Latin live on only in corners as mere survivals, while in Britain, while Latin has utterly vanished, a tongue older than Latin still lives on as the common speech of an appreciable part of the land. Here then is the final result open to our own eyes. And it is a final result which could not have come to pass unless the Teutonic conquest of Britain had been something of an utterly different character from the Teutonic conquest of Gaul—unless the amount of change, of destruction, of havoc of every kind, above all, of slaughter and driving out of the existing inhabitants, had been far greater in Britain than it was in Gaul. If the Angles and Saxons in Britain had been only as the Goths in Spain, or even as the Franks in Gaul, it is inconceivable that the final results should have been so utterly different in the two cases. There is the plain fact: Gaul remained a Latin-speaking land; England became a Teutonic-speaking land. The obvious inference is that, while in Gaul the Teutonic conquest led to no general displacement of the inhabitants, in England it did lead to such a general displacement. In Gaul the Franks simply settled among a subject people, among whom they themselves were gradually merged; in Britain the Angles and Saxons slew or drove out the people whom they found in the land, and settled it again as a new people.”—E. A. Freeman, *The English People in its Three Homes (Lectures to American Audiences)*, pp. 114-115.—“Almost to the close of the 6th century the English conquest of Britain was a sheer dispossession of the conquered people; and, so far as the English sword in these earlier days reached, Britain became England, a land, that is, not of Britons, but of Englishmen. There is no need to believe that the clearing of the land meant the general slaughter of the men who held it, or to account for such a slaughter by supposed differences between the temper of the English and those of other conquerors. . . . The displacement of the conquered people was only made possible by their own stubborn resistance, and by the slow progress of the conquerors in the teeth of it. Slaughter no doubt there was on the battle-field or in towns like Anderida, whose long defence woke wrath in their besiegers. But for the most part the Britons cannot have been slaughtered; they were simply defeated and drew back.”—J. R. Green, *The Making of England*, ch. 4.—The view strongly stated above, as to the completeness of the erasure of Romano-British society and influence from the whole of England except its southwestern and northwestern counties, by the English conquest, is combated as strongly by another less prominent school of recent historians, represented, for example, by Mr. Henry C. Coote (*The Romans of Britain*) and by Mr. Charles H. Pearson, who says: “We know that fugitives from Britain settled largely during the 5th century in Armorica and in Ireland; and we may perhaps accept the legend of St. Ursula as proof that the flight, in some instances, was directed to the more civilized parts of the continent. But even the pious story of the 11,000 virgins is sober and credible

by the side of that history which assumes that some million men and women were slaughtered or made homeless by a few ship-loads of conquerors.”—C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. during the Early and Middle Ages*, v. 1, ch. 6.—The opinion maintained by Prof. Freeman and Mr. Green (and, no less, by Dr. Stubbs) is the now generally accepted one.

7th Century.—The so-called “Heptarchy.”—“The old notion of an Heptarchy, of a regular system of seven Kingdoms, united under the regular supremacy of a single over-lord, is a dream which has passed away before the light of historic criticism. The English Kingdoms in Britain were ever fluctuating, alike in their number and in their relations to one another. The number of perfectly independent states was sometimes greater and sometimes less than the mystical seven, and, till the beginning of the ninth century, the whole nation did not admit the regular supremacy of any fixed and permanent over-lord. Yet it is no less certain that, among the mass of smaller and more obscure principalities, seven Kingdoms do stand out in a marked way, seven Kingdoms of which it is possible to recover something like a continuous history, seven Kingdoms which alone supplied candidates for the dominion of the whole island.” These seven kingdoms were Kent, Sussex, Essex, Wessex, East Anglia, Northumberland and Mercia.—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 2.—“After the territorial boundaries had become more settled, there appeared at the commencement of the seventh century seven or eight greater and smaller kingdoms. . . . Historians have described this condition of things as the Heptarchy, disregarding the early disappearance of Sussex, and the existence of still smaller kingdoms. But this grouping was neither based upon equality, nor destined to last for any length of time. It was the common interest of these smaller states to withstand the sudden and often dangerous invasions of their western and northern neighbours; and, accordingly, whichever king was capable of successfully combating the common foe, acquired for the time a certain superior rank, which some historians denote by the title of Bretwalda. By this name can only be understood an actual and recognized temporary superiority; first ascribed to Ælla of Sussex, and later passing to Northumbria, until Wessex finally attains a real and lasting supremacy. It was geographical position which determined these relations of superiority. The small kingdoms in the west were shielded by the greater ones of Northumberland, Mercia and Wessex, as though by crescent-shaped forelands—which in their struggles with the Welsh kingdoms, with Strathclyde and Cumbria, with Piets and Scots, were continually in a state of martial activity. And so the smaller western kingdoms followed the three warlike ones; and round these Anglo-Saxon history revolves for two whole centuries, until in Wessex we find a combination of most of the conditions which are necessary to the existence of a great State.”—R. Gneist, *Hist. of the Eng. Constitution*, ch. 3.

A. D. 617.—Edwin becomes king of Northumbria.

A. D. 634.—Oswald becomes king of Northumbria.

A. D. 655.—Oswi becomes king of Northumbria.

A. D. 670.—Egfrith becomes king of Northumbria.

A. D. 688.—Ini becomes king of the West Saxons.

A. D. 716.—Ethelbald becomes king of Mercia.

A. D. 758.—Offa becomes king of Mercia.

A. D. 794.—Cenwulf becomes king of Mercia.

A. D. 800.—Accession of the West Saxon king Egberht.

A. D. 800-836.—The supremacy of Wessex.—The first king of all the English.—“And now I have come to the reign of Egberht, the great Bretwalda. He was an Ætheling of the blood of Cerdic, and he is said to have been the son of Ealhmund, and Ealhmund is said to have been an Under-king of Kent. For the old line of the Kings of Kent had come to an end and Kent was now sometimes under Wessex and sometimes under Mercia. . . . When Beorhtric died in 800, he [Egberht] was chosen King of the West-Saxons. He reigned until 836, and in that time he brought all the English Kingdoms, and the greater part of Britain, more or less under his power. The southern part of the island, all Kent, Sussex, and Essex, he joined on to his own Kingdom, and set his sons or other Æthelings to reign over them as his Under-kings. But Northumberland, Mercia, and East-Anglia were not brought so completely under his power as this. Their Kings submitted to Egberht and acknowledged him as their over-lord, but they went on reigning in their own Kingdoms, and assembling their own Wise Men, just as they did before. They became what in after times was called his ‘vassals,’ what in English was called being his ‘men.’ . . . Besides the English Kings, Egberht brought the Welsh, both in Wales and in Cornwall, more completely under his power. . . . So King Egberht was Lord from the Irish Sea to the German Ocean, and from the English Channel to the Firth of Forth. So it is not wonderful if, in his charters, he not only called himself King of the West-Saxons or King of the West-Saxons and Kentishmen, but sometimes ‘Rex Anglorum,’ or ‘King of the English.’ But amidst all this glory there were signs of great evils at hand. The Danes came several times.”—E. A. Freeman, *Old English Hist. for Children*, ch. 7.

A. D. 836.—Accession of the West Saxon king Ethelwulf.

A. D. 855-880.—Conquests and settlements of the Danes.—The heroic struggle of Alfred the Great.—The “Peace of Wedmore” and the “Danelaw.”—King Alfred’s character and reign.—“The Danish invasions of England . . . fall naturally into three periods, each of which finds its parallel in the course of the English Conquest of Britain. . . . We first find a period in which the object of the invaders seems to be simple plunder. They land, they harry the country, they fight, if need be, to secure their booty, but whether defeated or victorious, they equally return to their ships, and sail away with what they have gathered. This period includes the time from the first recorded invasion [A. D. 787] till the latter half of the ninth century. Next comes a time in which the object of the Northmen is clearly no longer mere plunder, but settlement. . . . In the reign of Æthelwulf the son of Egberht it is recorded that the heathen men wintered for the first time in the Isle of Sheppey [A. D. 855]. This marks the transition from the

first to the second period of their invasions. . . . It was not however till about eleven years from this time that the settlement actually began. Meanwhile the sceptre of the West-Saxons passed from one hand to another. . . . Four sons of Æthelwulf reigned in succession, and the reigns of the first three among them [Ethelbald, A. D. 858, Ethelberht, 860, Ethelred, 866] make up together only thirteen years. In the reign of the third of these princes, Æthelred I., the second period of the invasions fairly begins. Five years were spent by the Northmen in ravaging and conquering the tributary Kingdoms. Northumberland, still disputed between rival Kings, fell an easy prey [867-869], and one or two puppet princes did not scruple to receive a tributary crown at the hands of the heathen invaders. They next entered Mercia [868], they seized Nottingham, and the West-Saxon King hastening to the relief of his vassals, was unable to dislodge them from that stronghold. East Anglia was completely conquered [866-870] and its King Eadmund died a martyr. At last the full storm of invasion burst upon Wessex itself [871]. King Æthelred, the first of a long line of West-Saxon hero-Kings, supported by his greater brother Ælfred [Alfred the Great] met the invaders in battle after battle with varied success. He died and Ælfred succeeded, in the thick of the struggle. In this year [871], the last of Æthelred and the first of Ælfred, nine pitched battles, besides smaller engagements, were fought with the heathens on West-Saxon ground. At last peace was made; the Northmen retreated to London, within the Mercian frontier; Wessex was for the moment delivered, but the supremacy won by Egberht was lost. For a few years Wessex was subjected to nothing more than temporary incursions, but Northumberland and part of Mercia were systematically occupied by the Northmen, and the land was divided among them. . . . At last the Northmen, now settled in a large part of the island, made a second attempt to add Wessex itself to their possessions [878]. For a moment the land seemed conquered; Ælfred himself lay hid in the marshes of Somersetshire; men might well deem that the Empire of Egberht and the Kingdom of Cerdic itself, had vanished for ever. But the strong heart of the most renowned of Englishmen, the saint, the scholar, the hero, and the lawgiver, carried his people safely through this most terrible of dangers. Within the same year the Dragon of Wessex was again victorious [at the battle of Ethandun, or Edington], and the Northmen were driven to conclude a peace which Englishmen, fifty years sooner, would have deemed the lowest depth of degradation, but which might now be fairly looked upon as honourable and even as triumphant. By the terms of the Peace of Wedmore the Northmen were to evacuate Wessex and the part of Mercia south-west of Watling-Street; they, or at least their chiefs, were to submit to baptism, and they were to receive the whole land beyond Watling-Street as vassals of the West-Saxon King. . . . The exact boundary started from the Thames, along the Lea to its source, then right to Bedford and along the Ouse till it meets Watling-Street, then along Watling-Street to the Welsh border. See ‘Ælfred and Guthrum’s Peace,’ Thorpe’s ‘Laws and Institutes,’ i. 152. This frontier gives London to the English; but it seems that Ælfred did not obtain full possession of London till 886.” The territory thus conceded

to the Danes, which included all northeastern England from the Thames to the Tyne, was thenceforth known by the name of the Danelagh or Danelaw, signifying the country subject to the law of the Danes. The Peace of Wedmore ended the second period of the Danish invasions. The third period, which was not opened until a full century later, embraced the actual conquest of the whole of England by a Danish king and its temporary annexation to the dominions of the Danish crown.—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 2, with foot-note.—“Now that peace was restored, and the Danes driven out of his domains, it remained to be seen whether Alfred was as good a ruler as he was a soldier. . . . What did he see? The towns, even London itself, pillaged, ruined, or burnt down; the monasteries destroyed; the people wild and lawless; ignorance, roughness, insecurity everywhere. It is almost incredible with what a brave heart he set himself to repair all this; how his great and noble aims were still before him; how hard he strove, and how much he achieved. First of all he seems to have sought for helpers. Like most clever men, he was good at reading characters. He soon saw who would be true, brave, wise friends, and he collected these around him. Some of them he fetched from over the sea, from France and Germany; our friend Asser from Wales, or, as he calls his country, ‘Western Britain,’ while England, he calls ‘Saxony.’ He says he first saw Alfred ‘in a royal vill, which is called Dene’ in Sussex. ‘He received me with kindness, and asked me eagerly to devote myself to his service, and become his friend; to leave everything which I possessed on the left or western bank of the Severn, and promised that he would give more than an equivalent for it in his own dominions. I replied that I could not rashly and incautiously promise such things; for it seemed to be unjust that I should leave those sacred places in which I had been bred, educated, crowned, and ordained for the sake of any earthly honour and power, unless upon compulsion. Upon this he said, “If you cannot accede to this, at least let me have your service in part; spend six months of the year with me here, and the other six months in Britain.”’ And to this after a time Asser consented. What were the principal things he turned his mind to after providing for the defence of his kingdom, and collecting his friends and counsellors about him? Law—justice—religion—education. He collected and studied the old laws of his nation; what he thought good he kept, what he disapproved he left out. He added others, especially the ten commandments and some other parts of the law of Moses. Then he laid them all before his Witan, or wise men, and with their approval published them. . . . The state of justice in England was dreadful at this time. . . . Alfred’s way of curing this was by inquiring into all cases, as far as he possibly could, himself; and Asser says he did this ‘especially for the sake of the poor, to whose interest, day and night, he ever was wonderfully attentive; for in the whole kingdom the poor, besides him, had few or no protectors.’ . . . When he found that the judges had made mistakes through ignorance, he rebuked them, and told them they must either grow wiser or give up their posts; and soon the old earls and other judges, who had been unlearned from their cradles, began to study diligently. . . . For reviving and spreading religion among his people

he used the best means that he knew of; that is, he founded new monasteries and restored old ones, and did his utmost to get good bishops and clergymen. For his own part, he strove to practise in all ways what he taught to others. . . . Education was in a still worse condition than everything else. . . . All the schools had been broken up. Alfred says that when he began to reign there were very few clergymen south of the Humber who could even understand the Prayer-book. (That was still in Latin, as the Roman missionaries had brought it.) And south of the Thames he could not remember one. His first care was to get better-educated clergy and bishops. And next to get the laymen taught also. . . . He founded monasteries and schools, and restored the old ones which had been ruined. He had a school in his court for his own children and the children of his nobles. But at the very outset a most serious difficulty confronted Alfred. Where was he to get books? At this time, as far as we can judge, there can only have been one, or at most two books in the English language—the long poem of Cædmon about the creation of the world, &c., and the poem of Beowulf about warriors and fiery dragons. There were many English ballads and songs, but whether these were written down I do not know. There was no book of history, not even English history; no book of geography, no religious books, no philosophy. Bede, who had written so many books, had written them all in Latin. . . . So when they had a time of ‘stillness’ the king and his learned friends set to work and translated books into English; and Alfred, who was as modest and candid as he was wise, put into the preface of one of his translations that he hoped, if any one knew Latin better than he did, that he would not blame him, for he could but do according to his ability. . . . Beside all this, he had a great many other occupations. Asser, who often lived with him for months at a time, gives us an account of his busy life. Notwithstanding his infirmities and other hindrances, ‘he continued to carry on the government, and to exercise hunting in all its branches; to teach his workers in gold and artificers of all kinds, his falconers, hawkers, and dog-keepers; to build houses, majestic and good, beyond all the precedents of his ancestors, by his new mechanical inventions; to recite the Saxon books (Asser, being a Welshman, always calls the English, Saxon), and especially to learn by heart the Saxon poems, and to make others learn them; he never desisted from studying most diligently to the best of his ability; he attended the mass and other daily services of religion; he was frequent in psalm-singing and prayer; . . . he bestowed alms and largesses on both natives and foreigners of all countries; he was affable and pleasant to all, and curiously eager to investigate things unknown.’”—M. J. GUEST, *Lectures on the Hist. of Eng.*, lect. 9.—“It is no easy task for any one who has been studying his [Alfred’s] life and works to set reasonable bounds to their reverence, and enthusiasm, for the man. Lest the reader should think my estimate tainted with the proverbial weakness of biographers for their heroes, let them turn to the words in which the earliest, and the last of the English historians of that time, sum up the character of Alfred. Florence of Worcester, writing in the century after his death, speaks of him as ‘that famous, warlike, victorious king; the zealous protector of widows, scholars,

orphans and the poor; skilled in the Saxon poets; affable and liberal to all; endowed with prudence, fortitude, justice, and temperance; most patient under the infirmity which he daily suffered; a most stern inquisitor in executing justice; vigilant and devoted in the service of God.' Mr. Freeman, in his 'History of the Norman Conquest,' has laid down the portrait in bold and lasting colours, in a passage as truthful as it is eloquent, which those who are familiar with it will be glad to meet again, while those who do not know it will be grateful to me for substituting for any poor words of my own. 'Alfred, the unwilling author of these great changes, is the most perfect character in history. He is a singular instance of a prince who has become a hero of romance, who, as such, has had countless imaginary exploits attributed to him, but to whose character romance has done no more than justice, and who appears in exactly the same light in history and in fable. No other man on record has ever so thoroughly united all the virtues both of the ruler and of the private man. In no other man on record were so many virtues disfigured by so little alloy. A saint without superstition, a scholar without ostentation, a warrior all whose wars were fought in the defence of his country, a conqueror whose laurels were never stained by cruelty, a prince never cast down by adversity, never lifted up to insolence in the day of triumph — there is no other name in history to compare with his. Saint Lewis comes nearest to him in the union of a more than monastic piety with the highest civil, military, and domestic virtues. Both of them stand forth in honourable contrast to the abject superstition of some other royal saints, who were so selfishly engaged in the care of their own souls that they refused either to raise up heirs for their throne, or to strike a blow on behalf of their people. But even in Saint Lewis we see a disposition to forsake an immediate sphere of duty for the sake of distant and unprofitable, however pious and glorious, undertakings. The true duties of the King of the French clearly lay in France, and not in Egypt or Tunis. No such charge lies at the door of the great King of the West Saxons. With an inquiring spirit which took in the whole world, for purposes alike of scientific inquiry and of Christian benevolence, Alfred never forgot that his first duty was to his own people. He forestalled our own age in sending expeditions to explore the Northern Ocean, and in sending alms to the distant Churches of India; but he neither forsook his crown, like some of his predecessors, nor neglected his duties, like some of his successors. The virtue of Alfred, like the virtue of Washington, consisted in no marvellous displays of superhuman genius, but in the simple, straightforward discharge of the duty of the moment. But Washington, soldier, statesman, and patriot, like Alfred, has no claim to Alfred's further characters of saint and scholar. William the Silent, too, has nothing to set against Alfred's literary merits; and in his career, glorious as it is, there is an element of intrigue and chicanery utterly alien to the noble simplicity of both Alfred and Washington. The same union of zeal for religion and learning with the highest gifts of the warrior and the statesman is found, on a wider field of action, in Charles the Great. But even Charles cannot aspire to the pure glory of Alfred. Amidst all the splendour of conquest and legislation, we can-

not be blind to an alloy of personal ambition, of personal vice, to occasional unjust aggressions and occasional acts of cruelty. Among our own later princes, the great Edward alone can bear for a moment the comparison with his glorious ancestor. And, when tried by such a standard, even the great Edward fails. Even in him we do not see the same wonderful union of gifts and virtues which so seldom meet together; we cannot acquit Edward of occasional acts of violence, of occasional recklessness as to means; we cannot attribute to him the pure, simple, almost childlike disinterestedness which marks the character of Alfred.' Let Wordsworth, on behalf of the poets of England, complete the picture:

'Behold a pupil of the monkish gown,
The pious Alfred, king to justice dear!
Lord of the harp and liberating spear;
Mirror of princes! Indigent renown
Might range the starry ether for a crown
Equal to his deserts, who, like the year,
Pours forth his bounty, like the day doth cheer,
And awes like night, with mercy-tempered frown.
Ease from this noble miser of his time
No moment steals; pain narrows not his cares —
Though small his kingdom as a spark or gem,
Of Alfred boasts remote Jerusalem,
And Christian India, through her widespread
clime,

In sacred converse gifts with Alfred shares.'"

—Thos. Hughes, *Alfred the Great*, ch. 24.

ALSO IN: R. Pauli, *Life of Alfred the Great*. — Asser, *Life of Alfred*. — See, also, NORMANS, and EDUCATION, MEDIEVAL.

A. D. 901.—Accession of the West Saxon king Edward, called The Elder.

A. D. 925.—Accession of the West Saxon king Ethelstan.

A. D. 938.—The battle of Brunanburgh.—Alfred the Great, dying in 901, was succeeded by his son, Edward, and Edward, in turn, was followed, A. D. 925, by his son Athelstane, or Æthelstan. In the reign of Athelstane a great league was formed against him by the Northumbrian Danes with the Scots, with the Danes of Dublin and with the Britons of Strathclyde and Cumbria. Athelstane defeated the confederates in a mighty battle, celebrated in one of the finest of Old-English war-songs, and also in one of the Sagas of the Norse tongue, as the Battle of Brunanburgh or Brunanburh, but the site of which is unknown. "Five Kings and seven northern larks or earls fell in the strife. . . . Constantine the Scot fled to the north, mourning his fair-haired son, who perished in the slaughter. Anlaf [or Olaf, the leader of the Danes or Ostmen of Dublin], with a sad and scattered remnant of his forces, escaped to Ireland. . . . The victory was so decisive that, during the remainder of the reign of Athelstane, no enemy dared to rise up against him; his supremacy was acknowledged without contest, and his glory extended to distant realms."—F. Palgrave, *Hist. of the Anglo-Saxons*, ch. 10.—Mr. Skene is of opinion that the battle of Brunanburgh was fought at Aldborough, near York.—W. F. Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, v. 1, p. 357.

A. D. 940.—Accession of the West Saxon king Edmund.

A. D. 946.—Accession of the West Saxon king Edred.

A. D. 955.—Accession of the West Saxon king Edwig.

A. D. 958.—Accession of the West Saxon king Edgar.

A. D. 958.—Completed union of the realm.—Increase of kingly authority.—Approach towards feudalism.—Rise of the Witenagemot.—Decline of the Freeman.—“Before Alfred’s son Edward died, the whole of Mercia was incorporated with his immediate dominions. The way in which the thing was done was more remarkable than the thing itself. Like the Romans, he made the fortified towns the means of upholding his power. But unlike the Romans, he did not garrison them with colonists from amongst his own immediate dependents. He filled them, as Henry the Fowler did afterwards in Saxony, with free townsmen, whose hearts were at one with their fellow countrymen around. Before he died in 924, the Danish chiefs in the land beyond the Humber had acknowledged his overlordship, and even the Celts of Wales and Scotland had given in their submission in some form which they were not likely to interpret too strictly. His son and his two grandsons, Athelstan, Edmund, and Edred completed the work, and when after the short and troubled interval of Edwy’s rule in Wessex, Edgar united the undivided realm under his sway in 958, he had no internal enemies to suppress. He allowed the Celtic Scottish King who had succeeded to the inheritance of the Pictish race to possess the old Northumbrian land north of the Tweed, where they and their descendants learned the habits and speech of Englishmen. But he treated him and the other Celtic kings distinctly as his inferiors, though it was perhaps well for him that he did not attempt to impose upon them any very tangible tokens of his supremacy. The story of his being rowed by eight kings on the Dee is doubtless only a legend by which the peaceful king was glorified in the troubled times which followed. Such a struggle, so successfully conducted, could not fail to be accompanied by a vast increase of that kingly authority which had been on the growth from the time of its first establishment. The hereditary ealdormen, the representatives of the old kingly houses, had passed away. The old tribes, or—where their limitations had been obliterated by the tide of Danish conquest, as was the case in central and northern England—the new artificial divisions which had taken their place, were now known as shires, and the very name testified that they were regarded only as parts of a greater whole. The shire mote still continued the tradition of the old popular assemblies. At its head as presidents of its deliberations were the ealdorman and the bishop, each of them owing their appointment to the king, and it was summoned by the shire-reeve or sheriff, himself even more directly an officer of the king, whose business it was to see that all the royal dues were paid within the shire. In the more general concerns of the kingdom, the king consulted with his Witan, whose meetings were called the Witenagemot, a body, which, at least for all ordinary purposes, was composed not of any representatives of the shire-motes, but of his own dependents, the ealdormen, the bishops, and a certain number of thegns whose name, meaning ‘servants’, implied at least at first, that they either were or had at one time been in some way in the employment of the king. . . . The necessities of war . . . combined with the sluggishness of the mass of the population to

favour the growth of a military force, which would leave the tillers of the soil to their own peaceful occupations. As the conditions which make a standing army possible on a large scale did not yet exist, such a force must be afforded by a special class, and that class must be composed of those who either had too much land to till themselves, or, having no land at all, were released from the bonds which tied the cultivator to the soil, in other words, it must be composed of a landed aristocracy and its dependents. In working out this change, England was only aiming at the results which similar conditions were producing on the Continent. But just as the homogeneity of the population drew even the foreign element of the church into harmony with the established institutions, so it was with the military aristocracy. It grouped itself round the king, and it supplemented, instead of overthrowing, the old popular assemblies. Two classes of men, the eorls and the gesiths, had been marked out from their fellows at the time of the conquest. The thegn of Edgar’s day differed from both, but he had some of the distinguishing marks of either. He was not like the gesith, a mere personal follower of the king. He did not, like the eorl, owe his position to his birth. Yet his relation to the king was a close one, and he had a hold upon the land as firm as that of the older eorl. He may, perhaps, best be described as a gesith, who had acquired the position of an eorl without entirely throwing off his own characteristics. . . . There can be little doubt that the change began in the practice of granting special estates in the folkland, or common undivided land, to special persons. At first this land was doubtless held to be the property of the tribe. [This is now questioned by Vinogradoff and others. See *FOLCLAND*.] . . . When the king rose above the tribes, he granted it himself with the consent of his Witan. A large portion was granted to churches and monasteries. But a large portion went in private estates, or book land, as it was called, from the book or charter which conveyed them to the king’s own gesiths, or to members of his own family. The gesith thus ceased to be a mere member of the king’s military household. He became a landowner as well, with special duties to perform to the king. . . . He had special jurisdiction given him over his tenants and serfs, exempting him and them from the authority of the hundred mote, though they still remained, except in very exceptional cases, under the authority of the shire mote. . . . Even up to the Norman conquest this change was still going on. To the end, indeed, the old constitutional forms were not broken down. The hundred mote was not abandoned, where freemen enough remained to fill it. Even where all the land of a hundred had passed under the protection of a lord there was little outward change. . . . There was thus no actual breach of continuity in the nation. The thegnhood pushed its roots down, as it were, amongst the free classes. Nevertheless there was a danger of such a breach of continuity coming about. The freemen entered more and more largely into a condition of dependence, and there was a great risk lest such a condition of dependence should become a condition of servitude. Here and there, by some extraordinary stroke of luck, a freeman might rise to be a thegn. But the condition of the class to which he belonged was deteriorating every day. The downward progress

to serfdom was too easy to take, and by large masses of the population it was already taken. Below the increasing numbers of the serfs was to be found the lower class of slaves, who were actually the property of their masters. The Witenagemot was in reality a select body of thegns, if the bishops, who held their lands in much the same way, be regarded as thegns. In was rather an inchoate House of Lords, than an inchoate Parliament, after our modern ideas. It was natural that a body of men which united a great part of the wealth with almost all the influence in the kingdom should be possessed of high constitutional powers. The Witenagemot elected the king, though as yet they always chose him out of the royal family, which was held to have sprung from the god Woden. There were even cases in which they deposed unworthy kings."—S. R. Gardiner and J. B. Mullinger, *Introd. to the Study of Eng. Hist.*, pt. 1, ch. 2, sect. 16-21.

A. D. 975.—Accession of the West Saxon king Edward, called The Martyr.

A. D. 979.—Accession of the West Saxon king Ethelred, called The Unready.

A. D. 979-1016.—The Danish conquest.—"Then [A. D. 979] commenced one of the longest and most disastrous reigns of the Saxon kings, with the accession of Ethelred II., justly styled Ethelred the Unready. The Northmen now renewed their plundering and conquering expeditions against England; while England had a worthless waverer for her ruler, and many of her chief men turned traitors to their king and country. Always a laggart in open war, Ethelred tried in 1001 the cowardly and foolish policy of buying off the enemies whom he dared not encounter. The tax called Dane-gelt was then levied to provide 'a tribute for the Danish men on account of the great terror which they caused.' To pay money thus was in effect to hire the enemy to renew the war. In 1002 Ethelred tried the still more weak and wicked measure of ridding himself of his enemies by treacherous massacre. Great numbers of Danes were now living in England, intermixed with the Anglo-Saxon population. Ethelred resolved to relieve himself from all real or supposed danger of these Scandinavian settlers taking part with their invading kinsmen, by sending secret orders throughout his dominions for the putting to death of every Dane, man, woman, and child, on St. Brice's Day, Nov. 13. This atrocious order was executed only in Southern England, that is, in the West-Saxon territories; but large numbers of the Danish race were murdered there while dwelling in full security among their Saxon neighbours. . . . Among the victims was a royal Danish lady, named Gunhilde, who was sister of Sweyn, king of Denmark, and who had married and settled in England. . . . The news of the massacre of St. Brice soon spread over the Continent, exciting the deepest indignation against the English and their king. Sweyn collected in Denmark a larger fleet and army than the north had ever before sent forth, and solemnly vowed to conquer England or perish in the attempt. He landed on the south coast of Devon, obtained possession of Exeter by the treachery of its governor, and then marched through western and southern England, marking every shire with fire, famine and slaughter; but he was unable to take London, which was defended against the repeated attacks of the Danes with strong courage and patriotism, such

as seemed to have died out in the rest of Saxon England. In 1013, the wretched king Ethelred fled the realm and sought shelter in Normandy. Sweyn was acknowledged king in all the northern and western shires, but he died in 1014, while his vow of conquest was only partly accomplished. The English now sent for Ethelred back from Normandy, promising loyalty to him as their lawful king, 'provided he would rule over them more justly than he had done before.' Ethelred willingly promised amendment, and returned to reign amidst strife and misery for two years more. His implacable enemy, Sweyn, was indeed dead; but the Danish host which Sweyn had led thither was still in England, under the command of Sweyn's son, Canute [or Cnut], a prince equal in military prowess to his father, and far superior to him and to all other princes of the time in statesmanship and general ability. Ethelred died in 1016, while the war with Canute was yet raging. Ethelred's son, Edmund, surnamed Ironside, was chosen king by the great council then assembled in London, but great numbers of the Saxons made their submission to Canute. The remarkable personal valour of Edmund, strongly aided by the bravery of his faithful Londoners, maintained the war for nearly a year, when Canute agreed to a compromise, by which he and Edmund divided the land between them. But within a few months after this, the royal Ironside died by the hand of an assassin, and Canute obtained the whole realm of the English race. A Danish dynasty was now [A. D. 1016] established in England for three reigns."—Sir E. S. Creasy, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 5.

Also in: J. M. Lappenberg, *Eng. under the Anglo-Saxon Kings*, v. 2, pp. 151-233.—See, also, MALDEN, and ASSANDUN, BATTLES OF.

A. D. 1016.—Accession and death of King Edmund Ironside.

A. D. 1016-1042.—The Reign of the Danish kings.—"Cnut's rule was not as terrible as might have been feared. He was perfectly unscrupulous in striking down the treacherous and mischievous chieftains who had made a trade of Ethelred's weakness and the country's divisions. But he was wise and strong enough to rule, not by increasing but by allaying those divisions. Resting his power upon his Scandinavian kingdoms beyond the sea, upon his Danish countrymen in England, and his Danish huscarles, or specially trained soldiers in his service, he was able, without even the appearance of weakness, to do what in him lay to bind Dane and Englishman together as common instruments of his power. Fidelity counted more with him than birth. To bring England itself into unity was beyond his power. The device which he hit upon was operative only in hands as strong as his own. There were to be four great earls, deriving their name from the Danish word jarl, centralizing the forces of government in Wessex, in Mercia, in East Anglia, and in Northumberland. With Cnut the four were officials of the highest class. They were there because he placed them there. They would cease to be there if he so willed it. But it could hardly be that it would always be so. Some day or another, unless a great catastrophe swept away Cnut and his creation, the earldoms would pass into territorial sovereignties and the divisions of England would be made evident openly."—S. R. Gardiner and J. B. Mullinger, *Int. to the Study of Eng. Hist.*, ch. 2, sect.

25.—“He [Canute] ruled nominally at least, a larger European dominion than any English sovereign has ever done; and perhaps also a more homogeneous one. No potentate of the time came near him except the king of Germany, the emperor, with whom he was allied as an equal. The king of the Norwegians, the Danes, and a great part of the Swedes, was in a position to found a Scandinavian empire with Britain annexed. Canute's division of his dominions on his death-bed, showed that he saw this to be impossible; Norway, for a century and a half after his strong hand was removed, was broken up amongst an anarchical crew of piratic and blood-thirsty princes, nor could Denmark be regarded as likely to continue united with England. The English nation was too much divided and demoralised to retain hold on Scandinavia, even if the condition of the latter had allowed it. Hence Canute determined that during his life, as after his death, the nations should be governed on their own principles. . . . The four nations of the English, Northumbrians, East Angles, Mercians and West Saxons, might, each under their own national leader, obey a sovereign who was strong enough to enforce peace amongst them. The great earldoms of Canute's reign were perhaps a nearer approach to a feudal division of England than anything which followed the Norman Conquest. . . . And the extent to which this creation of the four earldoms affected the history of the next half-century cannot be exaggerated. The certain tendency of such an arrangement to become hereditary, and the certain tendency of the hereditary occupation of great fiefs ultimately to overwhelm the royal power, are well exemplified. . . . The Norman Conquest restored national unity at a tremendous temporary sacrifice, just as the Danish Conquest in other ways, and by a reverse process, had helped to create it.”—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 7, sect. 77.—Canute died in 1035. He was succeeded by his two sons, Harold Harefoot (1035-1040) and Harthacnute or Hardicanute (1040-1042), after which the Saxon line of kings was momentarily restored.—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 6.

A. D. 1035.—Accession of Harold, son of Cnut.

A. D. 1040.—Accession of Harthacnut, or Hardicanute.

A. D. 1042.—Accession of Edward the Confessor.

A. D. 1042-1066.—The last of the Saxon kings.—“The love which Canute had inspired by his wise and conciliatory rule was dissipated by the bad government of his sons, Harold and Harthacnut, who ruled in turn. After seven years of misgovernment, or rather anarchy, England, freed from the hated rule of Harthacnut by his death, returned to its old line of kings, and ‘all folk chose Edward [surnamed The Confessor, son of Ethelred the Unready] to king,’ as was his right by birth. Not that he was, according to our ideas, the direct heir, since Edward, the son of Edmund Ironside, still lived, an exile in Hungary. But the Saxons, by choosing Edward the Confessor, reasserted for the last time their right to elect that one of the hereditary line who was most available. With the reign of Edward the Confessor the Norman Conquest really began. We have seen the connection between England and Normandy begun by the

marriage of Ethelred the Unready to Emma the daughter of Richard the Fearless, and cemented by the refuge offered to the English exiles in the court of the Norman duke. Edward had long found a home there in Canute's time. . . . Brought up under Norman influence, Edward had contracted the ideas and sympathies of his adopted home. On his election to the English throne the French tongue became the language of the court, Norman favourites followed in his train, to be foisted into important offices of State and Church, and thus inaugurate that Normanizing policy which was to draw on the Norman Conquest. Had it not been for this, William would never have had any claim on England.” The Normanizing policy of king Edward roused the opposition of a strong English party, headed by the great West-Saxon Earl Godwine, who had been lifted from an obscure origin to vast power in England by the favor of Canute, and whose son Harold held the earldom of East Anglia. “Edward, raised to the throne chiefly through the influence of Godwine, shortly married his daughter, and at first ruled England leaving on the assistance, and almost overshadowed by the power of the great earl.” But Edward was Norman at heart and Godwine was thoroughly English; whence quarrels were not long in arising. They came to the crisis in 1051, by reason of a bloody tumult at Dover, provoked by insolent conduct on the part of a train of French visitors returning home from Edward's Court. Godwine was commanded to punish the townsmen of Dover and refused, whereupon the king obtained a sentence of outlawry, not only against the earl, but against his sons. “Godwine, obliged to bow before the united power of his enemies, was forced to fly the land. He went to Flanders with his son Swegen, while Harold and Leofwine went to Ireland, to be well received by Dermot king of Leinster. Many Englishmen seem to have followed him in his exile: for a year the foreign party was triumphant, and the first stage of the Norman Conquest complete. It was at this important crisis that William [Duke of Normandy], secure at home, visited his cousin Edward. . . . Friendly relations we may be sure had existed between the two cousins, and if, as is not improbable, William had begun to hope that he might some day succeed to the English throne, what more favourable opportunity for a visit could have been found? Edward had lost all hopes of ever having any children. . . . William came, and it would seem, gained all that he desired. For this most probably was the date of some promise on Edward's part that William should succeed him on his death. The whole question is beset with difficulties. The Norman chroniclers alone mention it, and give no dates. Edward had no right to will away his crown, the disposition of which lay with King and Witenagemot (or assembly of Wise Men, the grandes of the country), and his last act was to reverse the promise, if ever given, in favour of Harold, Godwine's son. But were it not for some such promise, it is hard to see how William could have subsequently made the Normans and the world believe in the sacredness of his claim. . . . William returned to Normandy; but next year Edward was forced to change his policy.” Godwine and his sons returned to England, with a fleet at their backs; London declared for them, and the king sub-

mitted himself to a reconciliation. "The party of Godwine once more ruled supreme, and no mention was made of the gift of the crown to William. Godwine, indeed, did not long survive his restoration, but dying the year after, 1053, left his son Harold Earl of the West-Saxons and the most important man in England." King Edward the Confessor lived yet thirteen years after this time, during which period Earl Harold grew continually in influence and conspicuous headship of the English party. In 1062 it was Harold's misfortune to be shipwrecked on the coast of France, and he was made captive. Duke William of Normandy intervened in his behalf and obtained his release; and "then, as the price of his assistance, extorted an oath from Harold, soon to be used against him. Harold, it is said, became his man, promised to marry William's daughter Adela, to place Dover at once in William's hands, and support his claim to the English throne on Edward's death. By a stratagem of William's the oath was unwittingly taken on holy relics, hidden by the duke under the table on which Harold laid hands to swear, whereby, according to the notions of those days, the oath was rendered more binding." But two years later, when Edward the Confessor died, the English Witenagemot chose Harold to be king, disregarding Edward's promise and Harold's oath to the Duke of Normandy.—A. H. Johnson, *The Normans in Europe*, ch. 10 and 12.

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 7-10.—J. R. Green, *The Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 10.

A. D. 1066.—Election and coronation of Harold.

A. D. 1066 (spring and summer).—Preparations of Duke William to enforce his claim to the English crown.—On receiving news of Edward's death and of Harold's acceptance of the crown, Duke William of Normandy lost no time in demanding from Harold the performance of the engagements to which he had pledged himself by his oath. Harold answered that the oath had no blinding effect, by reason of the compulsion under which it was given; that the crown of England was not his to bestow, and that, being the chosen king, he could not marry without consent of the Witenagemot. When the Duke had this reply he proceeded with vigor to secure from his own knights and barons the support he would need for the enforcing of his rights, as he deemed them, to the sovereignty of the English realm. A great parliament of the Norman barons was held at Lillebonne, for the consideration of the matter. "In this memorable meeting there was much diversity of opinion. The Duke could not command his vassals to cross the sea; their tenures did not compel them to such service. William could only request their aid to fight his battles in England: many refused to engage in this dangerous expedition, and great debates arose. . . . William, who could not restore order, withdrew into another apartment: and, calling the barons to him one by one, he argued and reasoned with each of these sturdy vassals separately, and apart from the others. He exhausted all the arts of persuasion;—their present courtesy, he engaged, should not be turned into a precedent, . . . and the fertile fields of England should be the recompense of their fidelity. Upon this prospect of remuneration, the barons assented. . . . William did not

confine himself to his own subjects. All the adventurers and adventurous spirits of the neighbouring states were invited to join his standard. . . . To all, such promises were made as should best incite them to the enterprise—lands,—liveries,—money,—according to their rank and degree; and the port of St. Pierre-sur-Dive was appointed as the place where all the forces should assemble. William had discovered four most valid reasons for the prosecution of his offensive warfare against a neighbouring people:—the bequest made by his cousin;—the perjury of Harold;—the expulsion of the Normans, at the instigation, as he alleged, of Godwin;—and, lastly, the massacre of the Danes by Ethelred on St. Brice's Day. The alleged perjury of Harold enabled William to obtain the sanction of the Papal See. Alexander, the Roman Pontiff, allowed, nay, even urged him to punish the crime, provided England, when conquered, should be held as the fief of St. Peter. . . . Hildebrand, Archdeacon of the Church of Rome, afterwards the celebrated Pope Gregory VII., greatly assisted by the support which he gave to the decree. As a visible token of protection, the Pope transmitted to William the consecrated banner, the Gonfalon of St. Peter, and a precious ring, in which a relic of the chief of the Apostles was enclosed."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, v. 3, pp. 300-303.—"William convinced, or seemed to convince, all men out of England and Scandinavia that his claim to the English crown was just and holy, and that it was a good work to help him to assert it in arms. . . . William himself doubtless thought his own claim the better; he deluded himself as he deluded others. But we are more concerned with William as a statesman; and if it be statesmanship to adapt means to ends, whatever the ends may be, if it be statesmanship to make men believe the worse cause is the better, then no man ever showed higher statesmanship than William showed in his great pleading before all Western Christendom. . . . Others had claimed crowns; none had taken such pains to convince all mankind that the claim was a good one. Such an appeal to public opinion marks on one side a great advance."—E. A. Freeman, *William the Conqueror*, ch. 6.

A. D. 1066 (September).—The invasion of Tostig and Harold Hardrada and their overthrow at Stamford Bridge.—"Harold [the English king], as one of his misfortunes, had to face two powerful armies, in distant parts of the kingdom, almost at the same time. Rumours concerning the intentions and preparations of the Duke of Normandy soon reached England. During the greater part of the summer, Harold, at the head of a large naval and military force, had been on the watch along the English coast. But months passed away and no enemy became visible. William, it was said, had been apprised of the measures which had been taken to meet him. . . . Many supposed that, on various grounds, the enterprise had been abandoned. Provisions also, for so great an army, became scarce. The men began to disperse; and Harold, disbanding the remainder, returned to London. But the news now came that Harold Hardrada, king of Norway, had landed in the north, and was ravaging the country in conjunction with Tostig, Harold's elder brother. This event came from one of those domestic feuds which did so much

at this juncture to weaken the power of the English. Tostig had exercised his authority in Northumbria [as earl] in the most arbitrary manner, and had perpetrated atrocious crimes in furtherance of his objects. The result was an amount of disaffection which seems to have put it out of the power of his friends to sustain him. He had married a daughter of Baldwin, count of Flanders, and so became brother-in-law to the duke of Normandy. His brother Harold, as he affirmed, had not done a brother's part towards him, and he was more disposed, in consequence, to side with the Norman than with the Saxon in the approaching struggle. The army with which he now appeared consisted mostly of Norwegians and Flemings, and their avowed object was to divide not less than half the kingdom between them. . . . [The young Mercian earls Edwin and Morcar] summoned their forces . . . to repel the invasion under Tostig. Before Harold could reach the north, they hazarded an engagement at a place named Fulford, on the Ouse, not far from Bishopstoke. Their measures, however, were not wisely taken. They were defeated with great loss. The invaders seem to have regarded this victory as deciding the fate of that part of the kingdom. They obtained hostages at York, and then moved to Stamford Bridge, where they began the work of dividing the northern parts of England between them. But in the midst of these proceedings clouds of dust were seen in the distance. The first thought was, that the multitude which seemed to be approaching must be friends. But the illusion was soon at an end. The dust raised was by the march of an army of West Saxons under the command of Harold."—R. Vaughan, *Revolutions of Eng. Hist.*, bk. 3, ch. 1.—"Of the details of that awful day [Sept. 25, 1066] we have no authentic record. We have indeed a glorious description [in the *Heimskringla* of Snorro Sturleson], conceived in the highest spirit of the warlike poetry of the North; but it is a description which, when critically examined, proves to be hardly more worthy of belief than a battle-piece in the *Iliad*. . . . At least we know that the long struggle of that day was crowned by complete victory on the side of England. The leaders of the invading host lay each man ready for all that England had to give him, his seven feet of English ground. There Harold of Norway, the last of the ancient Sea-Kings, yielded up that fiery soul which had braved death in so many forms and in so many lands. . . . There Tostig, the son of Godwine, an exile and a traitor, ended in crime and sorrow a life which had begun with promises not less bright than that of his royal brother. . . . The whole strength of the Northern army was broken; a few only escaped by flight, and found means to reach the ships at Riccall."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 14, sect. 4.

A. D. 1066 (October).—The Norman invasion and battle of Senlac or Hastings.—The battle of Stamford-bridge was fought on Monday, Sept. 25, A. D. 1066. Three days later, on the Thursday, Sept. 28, William of Normandy landed his more formidable army of invasion at Pevensey, on the extreme southeastern coast. The news of William's landing reached Harold, at York, on the following Sunday, it is thought, and his victorious but worn and wasted army was led instantly back, by forced marches, over the route it had

traversed no longer than the week before. Waiting at London a few days for fresh musters to join him, the English king set out from that city Oct. 12, and arrived on the following day at a point seven miles from the camp which his antagonist had entrenched at Hastings. Meantime the Normans had been cruelly ravaging the coast country, by way of provoking attack. Harold felt himself driven by the devastation they committed to face the issue of battle without waiting for a stronger rally. "Advancing near enough to the coast to check William's ravages, he intrenched himself on the hill of Senlac, a low spur of the Sussex Downs, near Hastings, in a position which covered London, and forced the Norman army to concentrate. With a host subsisting by pillage, to concentrate is to starve, and no alternative was left to William but a decisive victory or ruin. Along the higher ground that leads from Hastings the Duke led his men in the dim dawn of an October morning to the mound of Telham. It was from this point that the Normans saw the host of the English gathered thickly behind a rough trench and a stockade on the height of Senlac. Marshy ground covered their right. . . . A general charge of the Norman foot opened the battle; in front rode the minstrel Taillefer, tossing his sword in the air and catching it again while he chanted the song of Roland. He was the first of the host who struck a blow, and he was the first to fall. The charge broke vainly on the stout stockade behind which the English warriors plied axe and javelin with fierce cries of 'Out, Out,' and the repulse of the Norman footmen was followed by the repulse of the Norman horse. Again and again the Duke rallied and led them to the fatal stockade. . . . His Breton troops, entangled in the marshy ground on his left, broke in disorder, and a cry arose, as the panic spread through the army, that the Duke was slain. 'I live,' shouted William as he tore off his helmet, 'and by God's help will conquer yet.' Maddened by repulse, the Duke spurred right at the standard; unhorsed, his terrible mace struck down Gyrth, the King's brother, and stretched Leofwine, a second of Godwine's sons, beside him; again dismounted, a blow from his hand hurled to the ground an unmannerly rider who would not lend him his steed. Amid the roar and tumult of the battle he turned the flight he had arrested into the means of victory. Broken as the stockade was by his desperate onset, the shield-wall of the warriors behind it still held the Normans at bay, when William by a feint of flight drew a part of the English force from their post of vantage. Turning on his disorderly pursuers, the Duke cut them to pieces, broke through the abandoned line, and was master of the central plateau, while French and Bretons made good their ascent on either flank. At three the hill seemed won, at six the fight still raged around the standard, where Harold's hus-carls stood stubbornly at bay on the spot marked afterward by the high altar of Battle Abbey. An order from the Duke at last brought his archers to the front, and their arrow-flight told heavily on the dense masses crowded around the King. As the sun went down, a shaft pierced Harold's right eye; he fell between the royal ensigns, and the battle closed with a desperate *mêlée* over his corpse."—J. R. Green, *A Short History of the English People*, ch. 2, sect. 4.

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 15, sect. 4.—E. S. Creasy, *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World*, ch. 8.—Wace, *Roman de Rou*; trans. by Sir A. Malet.

A. D. 1066-1071.—The Finishing of the Norman Conquest.—"It must be well understood that this great victory [of Senlac] did not make Duke William King nor put him in possession of the whole land. He still held only part of Sussex, and the people of the rest of the kingdom showed as yet no mind to submit to him. If England had had a leader left like Harold or Gyrth, William might have had to fight as many battles as Cnut had, and that with much less chance of winning in the end. For a large part of England fought willingly on Cnut's side, while William had no friends in England at all, except a few Norman settlers. William did not call himself King till he was regularly crowned more than two months later, and even then he had real possession only of about a third of the kingdom. It was more than three years before he had full possession of all. Still the great fight on Senlac none the less settled the fate of England. For after that fight William never met with any general resistance. . . . During the year 1067 William made no further conquests; all western and northern England remained unsubdued; but, except in Kent and Herefordshire, there was no fighting in any part of the land which had really submitted. The next two years were the time in which all England was really conquered. The former part of 1068 gave him the West. The latter part of that year gave him central and northern England as far as Yorkshire, the extreme north and northwest being still unsubdued. The attempt to win Durham in the beginning of 1069 led to two revolts at York. Later in the year all the north and west was again in arms, and the Danish fleet [of King Swegen, in league with the English patriots] came. But the revolts were put down one by one, and the great winter campaign of 1069-1070 conquered the still unsubdued parts, ending with the taking of Chester. Early in 1070 the whole land was for the first time in William's possession; there was no more fighting, and he was able to give his mind to the more peaceful part of his schemes, what we may call the conquest of the native Church by the appointment of foreign bishops. But in the summer of 1070 began the revolt of the Fenland, and the defence of Ely, which lasted till the autumn of 1071. After that William was full King everywhere without dispute. There was no more national resistance; there was no revolt of any large part of the country. . . . The conquest of the land, as far as fighting goes, was now finished."—E. A. Freeman, *Short Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 8, sect. 9; ch. 10, sect. 16.

A. D. 1067-1087.—The spoils of the Conquest.—"The Norman army . . . remained concentrated around London [in the winter of 1067], and upon the southern and eastern coasts nearest Gaul. The partition of the wealth of the invaded territory now almost solely occupied them. Commissioners went over the whole extent of country in which the army had left garrisons; they took an exact inventory of property of every kind, public and private, carefully registering every particular. . . . A close inquiry was made into the names of all the English partisans of Harold,

who had either died in battle, or survived the defeat, or by involuntary delays had been prevented from joining the royal standard. All the property of these three classes of men, lands, revenues, furniture, houses, were confiscated; the children of the first class were declared forever disinherited; the second class, were, in like manner, wholly dispossessed of their estates and property of every kind, and, says one of the Norman writers, were only too grateful for being allowed to retain their lives. Lastly, those who had not taken up arms were also despoiled of all they possessed, for having had the intention of taking up arms; but, by special grace, they were allowed to entertain the hope that after many long years of obedience and devotion to the foreign power, not they, indeed, but their sons, might perhaps obtain from their new masters some portion of their paternal heritage. Such was the law of the conquest, according to the unsuspected testimony of a man nearly contemporary with and of the race of the conquerors [Richard Lenoir or Noirot, bishop of Ely in the 12th century]. The immense product of this universal spoliation became the pay of those adventurers of every nation who had enrolled under the banner of the duke of Normandy. . . . Some received their pay in money, others had stipulated that they should have a Saxon wife, and William, says the Norman chronicle, gave them in marriage noble dames, great heiresses, whose husbands had fallen in the battle. One, only, among the knights who had accompanied the conqueror, claimed neither lands, gold, nor wife, and would accept none of the spoils of the conquered. His name was Guilbert Fitz-Richard: he said that he had accompanied his lord to England because such was his duty, but that stolen goods had no attraction for him."—A. Thierry, *Hist. of the Conq. of Eng. by the Normans*, bk. 4.—"Though many confiscations took place, in order to gratify the Norman army, yet the mass of property was left in the hands of its former possessors. Offices of high trust were bestowed upon Englishmen, even upon those whose family renown might have raised the most aspiring thoughts. But, partly through the insolence and injustice of William's Norman vassals, partly through the suspiciousness natural to a man conscious of having overturned the national government, his yoke soon became more heavy. The English were oppressed; they rebelled, were subdued, and oppressed again. . . . An extensive spoliation of property accompanied these revolutions. It appears by the great national survey of Domesday Book, completed near the close of the Conqueror's reign, that the tenants in capite of the crown were generally foreigners. . . . But inferior freeholders were much less disturbed in their estates than the higher. . . . The valuable labours of Sir Henry Ellis, in presenting us with a complete analysis of Domesday Book, afford an opportunity, by his list of mesne tenants at the time of the survey, to form some approximation to the relative numbers of English and foreigners holding manors under the immediate vassals of the crown. . . . Though I will not now affirm or deny that they were a majority, they [the English] form a large proportion of nearly 8,000 mesne tenants, who are summed up by the diligence of Sir Henry Ellis. . . . This might induce us to suspect that, great as the spoliation must appear in modern times,

and almost completely as the nation was excluded from civil power in the commonwealth, there is some exaggeration in the language of those writers who represent them as universally reduced to a state of penury and servitude. And this suspicion may be in some degree just. Yet those writers, and especially the most English in feeling of them all, M. Thierry, are warranted by the language of contemporary authorities."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 8, pt. 2.—"By right of conquest William claimed nothing. He had come to take his crown, and he had unluckily met with some opposition in taking it. The crown-lands of King Edward passed of course to his successor. As for the lands of other men, in William's theory all was forfeited to the crown. The lawful heir had been driven to seek his kingdom in arms; no Englishman had helped him; many Englishmen had fought against him. All then were directly or indirectly traitors. The King might lawfully deal with the lands of all as his own. . . . After the general redemption of lands, gradually carried out as William's power advanced, no general blow was dealt at Englishmen as such. . . . Though the land had never seen so great a confiscation, or one so largely for the behoof of foreigners, yet there was nothing new in the thing itself. . . . Confiscation of land was the every-day punishment for various public and private crimes. . . . Once granting the original wrong of his coming at all and bringing a host of strangers with him, there is singularly little to blame in the acts of the Conqueror."—E. A. Freeman, *William the Conqueror*, pp. 102-104, 126.—"After each effort [of revolt] the royal hand was laid on more heavily: more and more land changed owners, and with the change of owners the title changed. The complicated and unintelligible irregularities of the Anglo-Saxon tenures were exchanged for the simple and uniform feudal theory. . . . It was not the change from allodial to feudal so much as from confusion to order. The actual amount of dispossession was no doubt greatest in the higher ranks."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 9, sect. 95.

A. D. 1069-1071.—The Camp of Refuge in the Fens.—"In the northern part of Cambridgeshire there is a vast extent of low and marshy land, intersected in every direction by rivers. All the waters from the centre of England which do not flow into the Thames or the Trent, empty themselves into these marshes, which in the latter end of autumn overflow, cover the land, and are charged with fogs and vapours. A portion of this damp and swampy country was then, as now, called the Isle of Ely; another the Isle of Thorney, a third the Isle of Croyland. This district, almost a moving bog, impracticable for cavalry and for soldiers heavily armed, had more than once served as a refuge for the Saxons in the time of the Danish conquest; towards the close of the year 1069 it became the rendezvous of several bands of patriots from various quarters, assembling against the Normans. Former chieftains, now dispossessed of their lands, successively repaired hither with their clients, some by land, others by water, by the mouths of the rivers. They here constructed entrenchments of earth and wood, and established an extensive armed station, which took the name of the Camp of Refuge. The foreigners at first hesitated to attack them amidst their rushes and willows, and thus gave them time to transmit messages in every direction,

at home and abroad, to the friends of old England. Become powerful, they undertook a partisan war by land and by sea, or, as the conquerors called it, robbery and piracy."—A. Thierry, *Hist. of the Conq. of Eng. by the Normans*, bk. 4.—"Against the new tyranny the free men of the Danelagh and of Northumbria rose. If Edward the descendant of Cerdic had been little to them, William the descendant of Rollo was still less. . . . So they rose, and fought; too late, it may be, and without unity or purpose; and they were worsted by an enemy who had both unity and purpose; whom superstition, greed, and feudal discipline kept together, at least in England, in one compact body of unscrupulous and terrible confederates. And theirs was a land worth fighting for—a good land and large: from Humber mouth inland to the Trent and merry Sherwood, across to Chester and the Dee, round by Leicester and the five burghs of the Danes; eastward again to Huntingdon and Cambridge (then a poor village on the site of an old Roman town); and then northward again into the wide fens, the land of the Girvii, where the great central plateau of England slides into the sea, to form, from the rain and river washings of eight shires, lowlands of a fertility inexhaustible, because ever-growing to this day. Into those fens, as into a natural fortress, the Anglo-Danish noblemen crowded down instinctively from the inland to make their last stand against the French. . . . Most gallant of them all, and their leader in the fatal struggle against William, was Hereward the Wake, Lord of Bourne and ancestor of that family of Wake, the arms of whom appear on the cover of this book."—C. Kingsley, *Hereward the Wake, Prelude*.—The defence of the Camp of Refuge was maintained until October, 1071, when the stronghold is said to have been betrayed by the monks of Ely, who grew tired of the disturbance of their peace. But Hereward did not submit. He made his escape and various accounts are given of his subsequent career and his fate.—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 20, sect. 1.

ALSO IN: C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, first series, c. 8.

A. D. 1085-1086.—The Domesday Survey and Domesday Book.—"The distinctive characteristic of the Norman kings [of England] was their exceeding greed, and the administrative system was so directed as to insure the exaction of the highest possible imposts. From this bent originated the great registration that William [the Conqueror] caused to be taken of all lands, whether holden in fee or at rent; as well as the census of the entire population. The respective registers were preserved in the Cathedral of Winchester, and by the Norman were designated 'le grand rôle,' 'le rôle royal,' 'le rôle de Winchester'; but by the Saxons were termed 'the Book of the Last Judgment,' 'Doomesdage Boc,' 'Doomsday Book.'"—E. Fischel, *The English Constitution*, ch. 1.—For a different statement see the following: "The recently attempted invasion from Denmark seems to have impressed the king with the desirability of an accurate knowledge of his resources, military and fiscal, both of which were based upon the land. The survey was completed in the remarkably short space of a single year [1085-1086]. In each shire the commissioners made their inquiries by the oaths of the sheriffs, the barons and their Norman retainers, the parish priests, the reeves

and six ceorls of each township. The result of their labours was a minute description of all the lands of the kingdom, with the exception of the four northern counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland and Durham, and part of what is now Lancashire. It enumerates the tenants-in-chief, under tenants, freeholders, villeins, and serfs, describes the nature and obligations of the tenures, the value in the time of King Eadward, at the conquest, and at the date of the survey, and, which gives the key to the whole inquiry, informs the king whether any advance in the valuation could be made. . . . The returns were transmitted to Winchester, digested, and recorded in two volumes which have descended to posterity under the name of Domesday Book. The name itself is probably derived from Domus Dei, the appellation of a chapel or vault of the cathedral at Winchester in which the survey was at first deposited."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *English Const. Hist.*, ch. 2.—"Of the motives which induced the Conqueror and his council to undertake the Survey we have very little reliable information, and much that has been written on the subject savours more of a deduction from the result than of a knowledge of the immediate facts. We have the statement from the Charulary of St. Mary's, Worcester, of the appointment of the Commissioners by the king himself to make the Survey. We have also the heading of the 'Inquisitio Eliensis' which purports to give, and probably does truly give, the items of the articles of inquiry, which sets forth as follows: I. What is the manor called? II. Who held it in the time of King Edward? III. Who now holds it? IV. How many hides? V. What teams are there in demesne? VI. What teams of the men? VII. What villans? VIII. What cottagers? IX. What bondmen? X. What freemen and what sokemen? XI. What woods? XII. What meadow? XIII. What pastures? XIV. What mills? XV. What fisheries? XVI. What is added or taken away? XVII. What the whole was worth together, and what now? XVIII. How much each freeman or sokeman had or has? All this to be estimated three times, viz. in the time of King Edward, and when King William gave it, and how it is now, and if more can be had for it than has been had. This document is, I think, the best evidence we have of the form of the inquiry, and it tallies strictly with the form of the various returns as we now have them. . . . All external evidence failing, we are driven back to the Record itself for evidence of the Conqueror's intention in framing it, and anyone who carefully studies it will be driven to the inevitable conclusion that it was framed and designed in the spirit of perfect equity. Long before the Conquest, in the period between the death of Alfred and that of Edward the Confessor, the kingdom had been rapidly declining into a state of disorganisation and decay. The defence of the kingdom and the administration of justice and keeping of the peace could not be maintained by the king's revenues. The tax of Danegeld, instituted by Ethelred at first to buy peace of the Danes, and afterwards to maintain the defence of the kingdom, had more and more come to be levied unequally and unfairly. The Church had obtained enormous remissions of its liability, and its possessions were constantly increasing. Powerful subjects had obtained further remission, and the tax had come to be irregularly

collected and was burdensome upon the smaller holders and their poor tenants, while the nobility and the Church escaped with a small share in the burden. In short the tax had come to be collected upon an old and uncorrected assessment. It had probably dwindled in amount, and at last had been ultimately remitted by Edward the Confessor. Anarchy and confusion appears to have reigned throughout the realm. The Conqueror was threatened with foreign invasion, and pressed on all sides by complaints of unfair taxation on the part of his subjects. Estates had been divided and subdivided, and the incidence of the tax was unequal and unjust. He had to face the difficulties before him and to count the resources of his kingdom for its defence, and the means of doing so were not at hand. In this situation his masterly and order-loving Norman mind instituted this great inquiry, but ordered it to be taken (as I maintain the study of the Book will show) in the most public and open manner, and with the utmost impartiality, with the view of levying the taxes of the kingdom equally and fairly upon all. The articles of his inquiry show that he was prepared to study the resources of his kingdom and consider the liability of his subjects from every possible point of view."—Stuart Moore, *On the Study of Domesday Book* (*Domesday Studies*, v. 1).—"Domesday Book is a vast mine of materials for the social and economical history of our country, a mine almost inexhaustible, and to a great extent as yet unworked. Among national documents it is unique. There is nothing that approaches it in interest and value except the Landnámabók, which records the names of the original settlers in Iceland and the designations they bestowed upon the places where they settled, and tells us how the island was taken up and apportioned among them. Such a document for England, describing the way in which our forefathers divided the territory they conquered, and how 'they called the lands after their own names,' would indeed be priceless. But the Domesday Book does, indirectly, supply materials for the history of the English as well as of the Norman Conquest, for it records not only how the lands of England were divided among the Norman host which conquered at Senlac, but it gives us also the names of the Saxon and Danish holders who possessed the lands before the great battle which changed all the future history of England, and enables us to trace the extent of the transfer of the land from Englishmen to Normans; it shows how far the earlier owners were reduced to tenants, and by its enumeration of the classes of population—freemen, sokemen, villans, cottiers, and slaves—it indicates the nature and extent of the earlier conquests. Thus we learn that in the West of England slaves were numerous, while in the East they were almost unknown, and hence we gather that in the districts first subdued the British population was exterminated or driven off, while in the West it was reduced to servitude."—I. Taylor, *Domesday Survivals* (*Domesday Studies*, v. 1).

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conquest*, ch. 21-22 and app. A in v. 5.—W. de Gray Birch, *Domesday Book*.—F. W. Maitland, *Domesday Book* (*Dict. Pol. Econ.*).

A. D. 1087-1135.—The sons of the Conqueror and their reigns.—William the Conqueror, when he died, left Normandy and Maine to his elder son Robert, the English crown to

his stronger son, William, called Rufus, or the Red, and only a legacy of £5,000 to his third son, Henry, called Beauclerc, or The Scholar. The Conqueror's half-brother, Odo, soon began to persuade the Norman barons in England to displace William Rufus and plant Robert on the English throne. "The claim of Robert to succeed his father in England, was supported by the respected rights of primogeniture. But the Anglo-Saxon crown had always been elective. . . . Primogeniture . . . gave at that time no right to the crown of England, independent of the election of its parliamentary assembly. Having secured this title, the power of Rufus rested on the foundation most congenial with the feelings and institutions of the nation, and from their partiality received a popular support, which was soon experienced to be impregnable. The danger compelled the king to court his people by promises to diminish their grievances: which drew 30,000 knights spontaneously to his banners, happy to have got a sovereign distinct from hated Normandy. The invasion of Robert, thus resisted by the English people, effected nothing but some temporary devastations. . . . The state of Normandy, under Robert's administration, for some time furnished an ample field for his ambitious uncle's activity. It continued to exhibit a negligent government in its most vicious form. . . . Odo's politics only facilitated the reannexation of Normandy to England. But this event was not completed in William's reign. When he retorted the attempt of Robert, by an invasion of Normandy, the great barons of both countries found themselves endangered by the conflict, and combined their interest to persuade their respective sovereigns to a fraternal pacification. The most important article of their reconciliation provided, that if either should die without issue, the survivor should inherit his dominions. Hostilities were then abandoned; mutual courtesies ensued; and Robert visited England as his brother's guest. The mind of William the Red King, was cast in no common mould. It had all the greatness and the defects of the chivalric character, in its strong but rudest state. Impetuous, daring, original, magnanimous, and munificent; it was also harsh, tyrannical, and selfish; conceited of its own powers, loose in its moral principles, and disdaining consequences. . . . While Lanfranc lived, William had a counsellor whom he respected, and whose good opinion he was careful to preserve. . . . The death of Lanfranc removed the only man whose wisdom and influence could have meliorated the king's ardent, but undisciplined temper. It was his misfortune, on this event, to choose for his favourite minister, an able, but an unprincipled man. . . . The minister advised the king, on the death of every prelate, to seize all his temporal possessions. . . . The great revenues obtained from this violent innovation, tempted both the king and his minister to increase its productiveness, by deferring the nomination of every new prelate for an indefinite period. Thus he kept many bishoprics, and among them the see of Canterbury, vacant for some years; till a severe illness alarming his conscience, he suddenly appointed Anselm to the dignity. . . . His disagreement with Anselm soon began. The prelate injudiciously began the battle by asking the king to restore, not only the possessions of his see, which were enjoyed

by Lanfranc — a fair request — but also the lands which had before that time belonged to it; a demand that, after so many years alteration of property, could not be complied with without great disturbance of other persons. Anselm also exacted of the king that in all things which concerned the church, his counsels should be taken in preference to every other. . . . Though Anselm, as a literary man, was an honour and a benefit to his age, yet his monastic and studious habits prevented him from having that social wisdom, that knowledge of human nature, that discreet use of his own virtuous firmness, and that mild management of turbulent power, which might have enabled him to have exerted much of the influence of Lanfranc over the mind of his sovereign. . . . Anselm, seeing the churches and abbeys oppressed in their property, by the royal orders, resolved to visit Rome, and to concert with the pope the measures most adapted to overawe the king. . . . William threatened, that if he did go to Rome, he would seize all the possessions of the archbishopric. Anselm declared, that he would rather travel naked and on foot, than desist from his resolution; and he went to Dover with his pilgrim's staff and wallet. He was searched before his departure, that he might carry away no money, and was at last allowed to sail. But the king immediately executed his threat, and sequestered all his lands and property. This was about three years before the end of the reign. . . . Anselm continued in Italy till William's death. The possession of Normandy was a leading object of William's ambition, and he gradually attained a preponderance in it. His first invasion compelled Robert to make some cessions; these were increased on his next attack; and when Robert determined to join the Crusaders, he mortgaged the whole of Normandy to William for three years, for 10,000 marks. He obtained the usual success of a powerful invasion in Wales. The natives were overpowered on the plains, but annoyed the invaders in their mountains. He marched an army against Malcolm, king of Scotland, to punish his incursions. Robert advised the Scottish king to conciliate William; Malcolm yielded to his counsel and accompanied Robert to the English court, but on his return, was treacherously attacked by Mowbray, the earl of Northumbria, and killed. William regretted the perfidious cruelty of the action. . . . The government of William appears to have been beneficial, both to England and Normandy. To the church it was oppressive. . . . He had scarcely reigned twelve years, when he fell by a violent death." He was hunting with a few attendants in the New Forest. "It happened that, his friends dispersing in pursuit of game, he was left alone, as some authorities intimate, with Walter Tyrrel, a noble knight, whom he had brought out of France, and admitted to his table, and to whom he was much attached. As the sun was about to set, a stag passed before the king, who discharged an arrow at it. . . . At the same moment, another stag crossing, Walter Tyrrel discharged an arrow at it. At this precise juncture, a shaft struck the king, and buried itself in his breast. He fell, without a word, upon the arrow, and expired on the spot. . . . It seems to be a questionable point, whether Walter Tyrrel actually shot the king. That opinion was certainly the most prevalent at the time, both here and in

France. . . . None of the authorities intimate a belief of a purposed assassination; and, therefore, it would be unjust now to impute it to any one. . . . Henry was hunting in a different part of the New Forest when Rufus fell. . . . He left the body to the casual charity of the passing rustic, and rode precipitately to Winchester, to seize the royal treasure. . . . He obtained the treasure, and proceeding hastily to London, was on the following Sunday, the third day after William's death, elected king, and crowned. . . . He began his reign by removing the unpopular agents of his unfortunate brother. He recalled Anselm, and conciliated the clergy. He gratified the nation, by abolishing the oppressive exactions of the previous reign. He assured many benefits to the barons, and by a charter, signed on the day of his coronation, restored to the people their Anglo-Saxon laws and privileges, as amended by his father; a measure which ended the pecuniary oppressions of his brother, and which favoured the growing liberties of the nation. The Conqueror had noticed Henry's expanding intellect very early; had given him the best education which the age could supply. . . . He became the most learned monarch of his day, and acquired and deserved the surname of Beauclerc, or fine scholar. No wars, no cares of state, could afterwards deprive him of his love of literature. The nation soon felt the impulse and the benefit of their sovereign's intellectual taste. He acceded at the age of 32, and gratified the nation by marrying and crowning Matilda, daughter of the sister of Edgar Etheling by Malcolm the king of Scotland, who had been waylaid and killed."—S. Turner, *Hist. of England during the Middle Ages*, v. 1, ch. 5-6.—The Norman lords, hating the "English ways" of Henry, were soon in rebellion, undertaking to put Robert of Normandy (who had returned from the Crusade) in his place. The quarrel went on till the battle of Tenchebray, 1106, in which Robert was defeated and taken prisoner. He was imprisoned for life. The duchy and the kingdom were again united. The war in Normandy led to a war with Louis king of France, who had espoused Robert's cause. It was ended by the battle of Brémule, 1119, where the French suffered a bad defeat. In Henry's reign all south Wales was conquered; but the north Welsh princes held out. Another expedition against them was preparing, when, in 1135, Henry fell ill at the Castle of Lions in Normandy, and died.—E. A. Freeman, *The reign of William Rufus and accession of Henry I.*

ALSO IN: Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and Eng.*, v. 4.

A. D. 1135-1154.—The miserable reign of Stephen.—Civil war, anarchy and wretchedness in England.—The transition to hereditary monarchy.—After the death of William the Conqueror, the English throne was occupied in succession by two of his sons, William II., or William Rufus (1087-1100), and Henry I., or Henry Beauclerc (1100-1135). The latter outlived his one legitimate son, and bequeathed the crown at his death to his daughter, Matilda, widow of the Emperor Henry V. of Germany and now wife of Geoffrey, Count of Anjou. This latter marriage had been very unpopular, both in England and Normandy, and a strong party refused to recognize the Empress Matilda, as she was commonly called. This party maintained

the superior claims of the family of Adela, daughter of William the Conqueror, who had married the Earl of Blois. Naturally their choice would have fallen upon Theobald of Blois, the eldest of Adela's sons; but his more enterprising younger brother Stephen supplanted him. Hastening to England, and winning the favour of the citizens of London, Stephen secured the royal treasure and persuaded a council of peers to elect him king. A most grievous civil war ensued, which lasted for nineteen terrible years, during which long period there was anarchy and great wretchedness in England. "The land was filled with castles, and the castles with armed banditti, who seem to have carried on their extortions under colour of the military commands bestowed by Stephen on every petty castellau. Often the very belfries of churches were fortified. On the poor lay the burden of building these strongholds; the rich suffered in their donjons. Many were starved to death, and these were the happiest. Others were flung into cellars filled with reptiles, or hung up by the thumbs till they told where their treasures were concealed, or crippled in frames which did not suffer them to move, or held just resting on the ground by sharp iron collars round the neck. The Earl of Essex used to send out spies who begged from door to door, and then reported in what houses wealth was still left; the alms-givers were presently seized and imprisoned. The towns that could no longer pay the blackmail demanded from them were burned. . . . Sometimes the peasants, maddened by misery, crowded to the roads that led from a field of battle, and smote down the fugitives without any distinction of sides. The bishops cursed vainly, when the very churches were burned and monks robbed. 'To till the ground was to plough the sea; the earth bare no corn, for the land was all laid waste by such deeds, and men said openly that Christ slept, and his saints. Such things, and more than we can say, suffered we nineteen winters for our sins' (A. S. Chronicle). . . . Many soldiers, sickened with the unnatural war, put on the white cross and sailed for a nobler battle-field in the East." As Matilda's son Henry—afterwards Henry II.—grew to manhood, the feeling in his favor gained strength and his party made head against the weak and incompetent Stephen. Finally, in 1153, peace was brought about under an agreement "that Stephen should wear the crown till his death, and Henry receive the homage of the lords and towns of the realm as heir apparent." Stephen died the next year and Henry came to the throne with little further dispute.—C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. during the Early and Middle Ages*, ch. 28.—"Stephen, as a king, was an admitted failure. I cannot, however, but view with suspicion the causes assigned to his failure by often unfriendly chroniclers. That their criticisms had some foundation it would not be possible to deny. But in the first place, had he enjoyed better fortune, we should have heard less of his incapacity, and in the second, these writers, not enjoying the same stand-point as ourselves, were, I think, somewhat inclined to mistake effects for causes. . . . His weakness throughout his reign . . . was due to two causes, each supplementing the other. These were—(1) the essentially unsatisfactory character of his position, as resting, virtually, on a compact that he should be king so long only as he gave satis-

faction to those who had placed him on the throne; (2) the existence of a rival claim, hanging over him from the first, like the sword of Damocles, and affording a lever by which the malcontents could compel him to adhere to the original understanding, or even to submit to further demands. . . . The position of his opponents throughout his reign would seem to have rested on two assumptions. The first, that a breach, on his part, of the 'contract' justified ipso facto revolt on theirs; the second, that their allegiance to the king was a purely feudal relation, and, as such, could be thrown off at any moment by performing the famous diffidatio. This essential feature of continental feudalism had been rigidly excluded by the Conqueror. He had taken advantage, as is well known, of his position as an English king, to extort an allegiance from his Norman followers more absolute than he could have claimed as their feudal lord. It was to Stephen's peculiar position that was due the introduction for a time of this pernicious principle into England. . . . Passing now to the other point, the existence of a rival claim, we approach a subject of great interest, the theory of the succession to the English Crown at what may be termed the crisis of transition from the principle of election (within the royal house) to that of hereditary right according to feudal rules. For the right view on this subject, we turn, as ever, to Dr. Stubbs, who, with his usual sound judgment, writes thus of the Norman period:—"The crown then continued to be elective. . . . But whilst the elective principle was maintained in its fulness where it was necessary or possible to maintain it, it is quite certain that the right of inheritance, and inheritance as primogeniture, was recognized as co-ordinate. . . . The measures taken by Henry I. for securing the crown to his own children, whilst they prove the acceptance of the hereditary principle, prove also the importance of strengthening it by the recognition of the elective theory." Mr. Freeman, though writing with a strong bias in favour of the elective theory, is fully justified in his main argument, namely, that Stephen 'was no usurper in the sense in which the word is vulgarly used.' He urges, apparently with perfect truth, that Stephen's offence, in the eyes of his contemporaries, lay in his breaking his solemn oath, and not in his supplanting a rightful heir. And he aptly suggests that the wretchedness of his reign may have hastened the growth of that new belief in the divine right of the heir to the throne, which first appears under Henry II., and in the pages of William of Newburgh. So far as Stephen is concerned the case is clear enough. But we have also to consider the Empress. On what did she base her claim? I think that, as implied in Dr. Stubbs' words, she based it on a double, not a single, ground. She claimed the kingdom as King Henry's daughter ('regis Henrici filia'), but she claimed it further because the succession had been assured to her by oath ('sibi juratum') as such. It is important to observe that the oath in question can in no way be regarded in the light of an election. . . . The Empress and her partisans must have largely, to say the least, based their claim on her right to the throne as her father's heir, and . . . she and they appealed to the oath as the admission and recognition of that right, rather than as partaking in any way

whatever of the character of a free election. . . . The sex of the Empress was the drawback to her claim. Had her brother lived, there can be little question that he would, as a matter of course, have succeeded his father at his death. Or again, had Henry II. been old enough to succeed his grandfather, he would, we may be sure, have done so. . . . Broadly speaking, to sum up the evidence here collected, it tends to the belief that the obsolescence of the right of election to the English crown presents considerable analogy to that of canonical election in the case of English bishoprics. In both cases a free election degenerated into a mere assent to a choice already made. We see the process of change already in full operation when Henry I. endeavours to extort beforehand from the magnates their assent to his daughter's succession, and when they subsequently complain of this attempt to dictate to them on the subject. We catch sight of it again when his daughter bases her claim to the crown, not on any free election, but on her rights as her father's heir, confirmed by the above assent. We see it, lastly, when Stephen, though owing his crown to election, claims to rule by Divine right ('Dei gratia'), and attempts to reduce that election to nothing more than a national 'assent' to his succession. Obviously, the whole question turned on whether the election was to be held first, or was to be a mere ratification of a choice already made. . . . In comparing Stephen with his successor the difference between their circumstances has been insufficiently allowed for. At Stephen's accession, thirty years of legal and financial oppression had rendered unpopular the power of the Crown, and had led to an impatience of official restraint which opened the path to a feudal reaction: at the accession of Henry, on the contrary, the evils of an enfeebled administration and of feudalism run mad had made all men eager for the advent of a strong king, and had prepared them to welcome the introduction of his centralizing administrative reforms. He anticipated the position of the house of Tudor at the close of the Wars of the Roses, and combined with it the advantages which Charles II. derived from the Puritan tyranny. Again, Stephen was hampered from the first by his weak position as a king on sufferance, whereas Henry came to his work unhampered by compact or concession. Lastly, Stephen was confronted throughout by a rival claimant, who formed a splendid rallying-point for all the discontent in his realm: but Henry reigned for as long as Stephen without a rival to trouble him; and when he found at length a rival in his own son, a claim far weaker than that which had threatened his predecessor seemed likely for a time to break his power as effectually as the followers of the Empress had broken that of Stephen. He may only, indeed, have owed his escape to that efficient administration which years of strength and safety had given him the time to construct. It in no way follows from these considerations that Henry was not superior to Stephen; but it does, surely, suggest itself that Stephen's disadvantages were great, and that had he enjoyed better fortune, we might have heard less of his defects."—J. H. Round, *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: Mrs. J. R. Green, *Henry the Second*, ch. 1.—See, also, STANDARD, BATTLE OF THE (A. D. 1137).

A. D. 1154-1189.—Henry II., the first of the Angevin kings (Plantagenets) and his empire.

—Henry II., who came to the English throne on Stephen's death, was already, by the death of his father, Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, the head of the great house of Anjou, in France. From his father he inherited Anjou, Touraine and Maine; through his mother, Matilda, daughter of Henry I., he received the dukedom of Normandy as well as the kingdom of England; by marriage with Eleanor, of Aquitaine, or Guienne, he added to his empire the princely domain which included Gascony, Poitou, Saintonge, Perigord, Limousin, Angoumois, with claims of suzerainty over Auvergne and Toulouse. "Henry found himself at twenty-one ruler of dominions such as no king before him had ever dreamed of uniting. He was master of both sides of the English Channel, and by his alliance with his uncle, the Count of Flanders, he had command of the French coast from the Scheldt to the Pyrenees, while his claims on Toulouse would carry him to the shores of the Mediterranean. His subjects told with pride how 'his empire reached from the Arctic Ocean to the Pyrenees'; there was no monarch save the Emperor himself who ruled over such vast domains. . . . His aim [a few years later] seems to have been to rival in some sort the Empire of the West, and to reign as an over-king, with sub-kings of his various provinces, and England as one of them, around him. He was connected with all the great ruling houses. . . . England was forced out of her old isolation; her interest in the world without was suddenly awakened. English scholars thronged the foreign universities; English chroniclers questioned travellers, scholars, ambassadors, as to what was passing abroad. The influence of English learning and English statecraft made itself felt all over Europe. Never, perhaps, in all the history of England was there a time when Englishmen played so great a part abroad." The king who gathered this wide, incongruous empire under his sceptre, by mere circumstances of birth and marriage, proved strangely equal, in many respects, to its greatness. "He was a foreign king who never spoke the English tongue, who lived and moved for the most part in a foreign camp, surrounded with a motley host of Brabançons and hirelings. . . . It was under the rule of a foreigner such as this, however, that the races of conquerors and conquered in England first learnt to feel that they were one. It was by his power that England, Scotland and Ireland were brought to some vague acknowledgement of a common suzerain lord, and the foundations laid of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. It was he who abolished feudalism as a system of government, and left it little more than a system of land tenure. It was he who defined the relations established between Church and State, and decreed that in England churchman as well as baron was to be held under the Common Law. . . . His reforms established the judicial system whose main outlines have been preserved to our own day. It was through his 'Constitutions' and his 'Assizes' that it came to pass that over all the world the English-speaking races are governed by English and not by Roman law. It was by his genius for government that the servants of the royal household became transformed into Ministers of State. It was he who gave England a foreign policy which

decided our continental relations for seven hundred years. The impress which the personality of Henry II. left upon his time meets us wherever we turn."—Mrs. J. R. Green, *Henry the Second*, ch. 1-2.—Henry II. and his two sons, Richard I. (Cœur de Lion), and John, are distinguished, sometimes, as the Angevin kings, or kings of the House of Anjou, and sometimes as the Plantagenets, the latter name being derived from a boyish habit ascribed to Henry's father, Count Geoffrey, of "adorn[ing] his cap with a sprig of 'plantagenista,' the broom which in early summer makes the open country of Anjou and Maine a blaze of living gold." Richard retained and ruled the great realm of his father; but John lost most of his foreign inheritance, including Normandy, and became the unwilling benefactor of England by stripping her kings of alien interests and alien powers and bending their necks to Magna Charta.—K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*.

ALSO IN: W. Stubbs, *The Early Plantagenets*.—See, also, AQUITAINE (GUIENNE): A. D. 1137-1152; IRELAND: A. D. 1169-1175.

A. D. 1162-1170.—Conflict of King and Church.—The Constitutions of Clarendon.—Murder of Archbishop Becket.—"Archbishop Theobald was at first the King's chief favourite and adviser, but his health and his influence declining, Becket [the Archdeacon of Canterbury] was found apt for business as well as amusement, and gradually became intrusted with the exercise of all the powers of the crown. . . . The exact time of his appointment as Chancellor has not been ascertained, the records of the transfer of the Great Seal not beginning till a subsequent reign, and old biographers being always quite careless about dates. But he certainly had this dignity soon after Henry's accession. . . . Becket continued Chancellor till the year 1162, without any abatement in his favour with the King, or in the power which he possessed, or in the energy he displayed, or in the splendour of his career. . . . In April, 1161, Archbishop Theobald died. Henry declared that Becket should succeed,—no doubt counting upon his co-operation in carrying on the policy hitherto pursued in checking the encroachments of the clergy and of the see of Rome. . . . The same opinion of Becket's probable conduct was generally entertained, and a cry was raised that 'the Church was in danger.' The English bishops sent a representation to Henry against the appointment, and the electors long refused to obey his mandate, saying that 'it was indecent that a man who was rather a soldier than a priest, and who had devoted himself to hunting and falconry instead of the study of the Holy Scriptures, should be placed in the chair of St. Augustine.' . . . The universal expectation was, that Becket would now attempt the part so successfully played by Cardinal Wolsey in a succeeding age; that, Chancellor and Archbishop, he would continue the minister and personal friend of the King; that he would study to support and extend all the prerogatives of the Crown, which he himself was to exercise; and that in the palaces of which he was now master he would live with increased magnificence and luxury. . . . Never was there so wonderful a transformation. Whether from a predetermined purpose, or from a sudden change of inclination, he immediately became in every respect an altered man. Instead

of the stately and fastidious courtier, was seen the humble and squalid penitent. Next his skin he wore hair-cloth, populous with vermin; he lived upon roots, and his drink was water, rendered nauseous by an infusion of fennel. By way of further penance and mortification, he frequently inflicted stripes on his naked back. . . . He sent the Great Seal to Henry, in Normandy, with this short message, 'I desire that you will provide yourself with another Chancellor, as I find myself hardly sufficient for the duties of one office, and much less of two.' The fond patron, who had been so eager for his elevation, was now grievously disappointed and alarmed. . . . He at once saw that he had been deceived in his choice. . . . The grand struggle which the Church was then making was, that all churchmen should be entirely exempted from the jurisdiction of the secular courts, whatever crime they might have committed. . . . Henry, thinking that he had a favourable opportunity for bringing the dispute to a crisis, summoned an assembly of all the prelates at Westminster, and himself put to them this plain question: 'Whether they were willing to submit to the ancient laws and customs of the kingdom?' Their reply, framed by Becket, was: 'We are willing, saving our own order.' . . . The King, seeing what was comprehended in the reservation, retired with evident marks of displeasure, deprived Becket of the government of Eye and Berkhamstead, and all the appointments which he held at the pleasure of the Crown, and uttered threats as to seizing the temporalities of all the bishops, since they would not acknowledge their allegiance to him as the head of the state. The legate of Pope Alexander, dreading a breach with so powerful a prince at so unseasonable a juncture, advised Becket to submit for the moment; and he with his brethren, retracting the saving clause, absolutely promised 'to observe the laws and customs of the kingdom.' To avoid all future dispute, Henry resolved to follow up his victory by having these laws and customs, as far as the Church was concerned, reduced into a code, to be sanctioned by the legislature, and to be specifically acknowledged by all the bishops. This was the origin of the famous 'Constitutions of Clarendon.' Becket left the kingdom (1164). Several years later he made peace with Henry and returned to Canterbury; but soon he again displeased the King, who cried in a rage, 'Who will rid me of this turbulent priest?' Four knights who were present immediately went to Canterbury, where they slew the Archbishop in the cathedral (December 29, 1170). "The government tried to justify or palliate the murder. The Archbishop of York likened Thomas à Becket to Pharaoh, who died by the Divine vengeance, as a punishment for his hardness of heart; and a proclamation was issued, forbidding any one to speak of Thomas of Canterbury as a martyr: but the feelings of men were too strong to be checked by authority; pieces of linen which had been dipped in his blood were preserved as relics; from the time of his death it was believed that miracles were worked at his tomb; thither flocked hundreds of thousands, in spite of the most violent threats of punishment; at the end of two years he was canonised at Rome; and, till the breaking out of the Reformation, St. Thomas of Canterbury, for pilgrimages and prayers, was the most distin-

guished Saint in England."—Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, ch. 3.—"What did Henry II. propose to do with a clerk who was accused of a crime? . . . Without doing much violence to the text, it is possible to put two different interpretations upon that famous clause in the Constitutions of Clarendon which deals with criminous clerks. . . . According to what seems to be the commonest opinion, we might comment upon this clause in some such words as these:—Offences of which a clerk may be accused are of two kinds. They are temporal or they are ecclesiastical. Under the former head fall murder, robbery, larceny, rape, and the like; under the latter, incontinence, heresy, disobedience to superiors, breach of rules relating to the conduct of divine service, and so forth. If charged with an offence of the temporal kind, the clerk must stand his trial in the king's court; his trial, his sentence, will be like that of a layman. For an ecclesiastical offence, on the other hand, he will be tried in the court Christian. The king reserves to his court the right to decide what offences are temporal, what ecclesiastical; also he asserts the right to send delegates to supervise the proceedings of the spiritual tribunals. . . . Let us attempt a rival commentary. The author of this clause is not thinking of two different classes of offences. The purely ecclesiastical offences are not in debate. No one doubts that for these a man will be tried in and punished by the spiritual court. He is thinking of the grave crimes, of murder and the like. Now every such crime is a breach of temporal law, and it is also a breach of canon law. The clerk who commits murder breaks the king's peace, but he also infringes the divine law, and—no canonist will doubt this—ought to be degraded. Very well. A clerk is accused of such a crime. He is summoned before the king's court, and he is to answer there—let us mark this word responder—*for* what he ought to answer for there. What ought he to answer for there? The breach of the king's peace and the felony. When he has answered, . . . then, without any trial, he is to be sent to the ecclesiastical court. In that court he will have to answer as an ordained clerk accused of homicide, and in that court there will be a trial (*res ibi tractabitur*). If the spiritual court convicts him it will degrade him, and thenceforth the church must no longer protect him. He will be brought back into the king's court, . . . and having been brought back, no longer a clerk but a mere layman, he will be sentenced (probably without any further trial) to the layman's punishment, death or mutilation. The scheme is this: accusation and plea in the temporal court; trial, conviction, degradation, in the ecclesiastical court; sentence in the temporal court to the layman's punishment. This I believe to be the meaning of the clause."—F. W. Maitland, *Henry II. and the Criminous Clerks* (*English Historical Review*, April, 1892), pp. 224-226.—The Assize of Clarendon, sometimes confused with the Constitutions of Clarendon, was an important decree approved two years later. It laid down the principles on which the administration of justice was to be carried out, in twenty-two articles drawn up for the use of the judges.—Mrs. J. R. Green, *Henry the Second*, ch. 5-6.—"It may not be without instruction to remember that the Constitutions of Clarendon, which Becket spent his life in

opposing, and of which his death procured the suspension, are now incorporated in the English law, and are regarded, without a dissentient voice, as among the wisest and most necessary of English institutions; that the especial point for which he surrendered his life was not the independence of the clergy from the encroachments of the Crown, but the personal and now forgotten question of the superiority of the see of Canterbury to the see of York."—A. P. Stanley, *Historical Memorials of Canterbury*, p. 124.

ALSO IN: W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 12, sect. 139-141.—The same, *Select Charters*, pt. 4.—J. C. Robertson, *Becket*.—J. A. Giles, *Life and Letters of Thomas à Becket*.—R. H. Froude, *Hist. of the Contest between Archbishop Thomas à Becket and Henry II. (Remains, pt. 2, v. 2)*.—J. A. Froude, *Life and Times of Thomas Becket*.—C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of England during the Early and Middle Ages*, v. 1, ch. 29.—See, also, BENEFIT OF CLERGY, and JURY, TRIAL BY.

A. D. 1189.—Accession of King Richard I. (called Cœur de Lion).

A. D. 1189-1199.—Reign of Richard Cœur de Lion.—His Crusade and campaigns in France.—"The Third Crusade [see CRUSADES: A. D. 1188-1192], undertaken for the deliverance of Palestine from the disasters brought upon the Crusaders' Kingdom by Saladin, was the first to be popular in England. . . . Richard joined the Crusade in the very first year of his reign, and every portion of his subsequent career was concerned with its consequences. Neither in the time of William Rufus nor of Stephen had the First or Second Crusades found England sufficiently settled for such expeditions. . . . But the patronage of the Crusades was a hereditary distinction in the Angevin family now reigning in England: they had founded the kingdom of Palestine; Henry II. himself had often prepared to set out; and Richard was confidently expected by the great body of his subjects to redeem the family pledge. . . . Wholly inferior in statesmanlike qualities to his father as he was, the generosity, munificence, and easy confidence of his character made him an almost perfect representative of the chivalry of that age. He was scarcely at all in England, but his fine exploits both by land and sea have made him deservedly a favourite. The depreciation of him which is to be found in certain modern books must in all fairness be considered a little mawkish. A King who leaves behind him such an example of apparently reckless, but really prudent valour, of patience under jealous ill-treatment, and perseverance in the face of extreme difficulties, shining out as the head of the manhood of his day, far above the common race of kings and emperors,—such a man leaves a heritage of example as well as glory, and incites posterity to noble deeds. His great moral fault was his conduct to Henry, and for this he was sufficiently punished; but his parents must each bear their share of the blame. . . . The interest of English affairs during Richard's absence languishes under the excitement which attends his almost continuous campaigns. . . . Both on the Crusade and in France Richard was fighting the battle of the House which the English had very deliberately placed upon its throne; and if the war was kept off its shores, if the troubles of Stephen's reign were not allowed to recur, the country had no right to complain of a taxation or a royal ransom

which times of peace enabled it, after all, to bear tolerably well. . . . The great maritime position of the Plantagenets made these sovereigns take to the sea."—M. Burrows, *Commentaries on the Hist. of England*, bk. 1, ch. 18.—Richard "was a bad king; his great exploits, his military skill, his splendour and extravagance, his poetical tastes, his adventurous spirit, do not serve to cloak his entire want of sympathy, or even consideration for his people. He was no Englishman. . . . His ambition was that of a mere warrior."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, sect. 150 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 2, ch. 7-8.

A. D. 1199.—Accession of King John.

A. D. 1205.—The loss of Normandy and its effects.—In 1202 Philip Augustus, king of France, summoned John of England, as Duke of Normandy (therefore the feudal vassal of the French crown) to appear for trial on certain grave charges before the august court of the Peers of France. John refused to obey the summons; his French fiefs were declared forfeited, and the armies of the French king took possession of them (see FRANCE: A. D. 1180-1224). This proved to be a lasting separation of Normandy from England,—except as it was recovered momentarily long afterwards in the conquests of Henry V. "The Norman barons had had no choice but between John and Philip. For the first time since the Conquest there was no competitor, son, brother, or more distant kinsman, for their allegiance. John could neither rule nor defend them. Bishops and barons alike welcomed or speedily accepted their new lord. The families that had estates on both sides of the Channel divided into two branches, each of which made terms for itself; or having balanced their interests in the two kingdoms, threw in their lot with one or other, and renounced what they could not save. Almost immediately Normandy settles down into a quiet province of France. . . . For England the result of the separation was more important still. Even within the reign of John it became clear that the release of the barons from their connexion with the continent was all that was wanted to make them Englishmen. With the last vestiges of the Norman inheritances vanished the last idea of making England a feudal kingdom. The Great Charter was won by men who were maintaining, not the cause of a class, as had been the case in every civil war since 1070, but the cause of a nation. From the year 1203 the king stood before the English people face to face."—W. Stubbs, *Constitutional Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 12, sect. 152.—See FRANCE: A. D. 1180-1224.

A. D. 1205-1213.—King John's quarrel with the Pope and the Church.—On the death, in 1205, of Archbishop Hubert, of Canterbury, who had long been chief minister of the crown, a complicated quarrel over the appointment to the vacant see arose between the monks of the cathedral, the suffragan bishops of the province, King John, and the powerful Pope Innocent III. Pope Innocent put forward as his candidate the afterwards famous Stephen Langton, secured his election in a somewhat irregular way (A. D. 1207), and consecrated him with his own hands. King John, bent on filling the primacy with a creature of his own, resisted the papal action with more fury than discretion, and proceeded to open war with the whole Church. "The

monks of Canterbury were driven from their monastery, and when, in the following year, an interdict which the Pope had intrusted to the Bishops of London, Ely and Worcester, was published, his hostility to the Church became so extreme that almost all the bishops fled; the Bishops of Winchester, Durham, and Norwich, two of whom belonged to the ministerial body, being the only prelates left in England. The interdict was of the severest form; all services of the Church, with the exception of baptism and extreme unction, being forbidden, while the burial of the dead was allowed only in unconsecrated ground; its effect was however weakened by the conduct of some of the monastic orders, who claimed exemption from its operation, and continued their services. The king's anger knew no bounds. The clergy were put beyond the protection of the law; orders were issued to drive them from their benefices, and lawless acts committed at their expense met with no punishment. . . . Though acting thus violently, John showed the weakness of his character by continued communication with the Pope, and occasional fiftful acts of favour to the Church; so much so, that, in the following year, Langton prepared to come over to England, and, upon the continued obstinacy of the king, Innocent, feeling sure of his final victory, did not shrink from issuing his threatened excommunication. John had hoped to be able to exclude the knowledge of this step from the island . . . ; but the rumour of it soon got abroad, and its effect was great. . . . In a state of nervous excitement, and mistrusting his nobles, the king himself perpetually moved to and fro in his kingdom, seldom staying more than a few days in one place. None the less did he continue his old line of policy. . . . In 1211 a league of excommunicated leaders was formed, including all the princes of the North of Europe; Ferrand of Flanders, the Duke of Brabant, John, and Otho [John's Guelphic Saxon nephew, who was one of two contestants for the imperial crown in Germany], were all members of it, and it was chiefly organized by the activity of Reynald of Dammartin, Count of Boulogne. The chief enemy of these confederates was Philip of France; and John thought he saw in this league the means of revenge against his old enemy. To complete the line of demarcation between the two parties, Innocent, who was greatly moved by the description of the disorders and persecutions in England, declared John's crown forfeited, and intrusted the carrying out of the sentence to Philip. In 1213 armies were collected on both sides. Philip was already on the Channel, and John had assembled a large army on Barhamdown, not far from Canterbury. But, at the last moment, when the French king was on the eve of embarking his forces for the invasion of England, John submitted himself abjectly to Pandulf, the legate of the Pope. He not only surrendered to all that he had contended against, but went further, to the most shameful extreme. "On the 15th of May, at Dover, he formally resigned the crowns of England and Ireland into the hands of Pandulf, and received them again as the Pope's feudatory."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.* (3d ed.), v. 1, pp. 130-134.

Also in: C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. during the Early and Middle Ages*, v. 2, ch. 2.—E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Doc's of the Middle Ages*, bk. 4, no. 5.—See, also, BOUVINES, BATTLE OF.

A. D. 1206-1230.—Attempts of John and Henry III. to recover Anjou and Maine. See ANJOU: A. D. 1206-1442.

A. D. 1215.—Magna Carta.—"It is to the victory of Bouvines that England owes her Great Charter [see BOUVINES]. . . . John sailed for Poitou with the dream of a great victory which should lay Philip [of France] and the barons alike at his feet. He returned from his defeat to find the nobles no longer banded together in secret conspiracies, but openly united in a definite claim of liberty and law. The author of this great change was the new Archbishop [Langton] whom Innocent had set on the throne of Canterbury. . . . In a private meeting of the barons at St. Paul's, he produced the Charter of Henry I., and the enthusiasm with which it was welcomed showed the sagacity with which the Primate had chosen his ground for the coming struggle. All hope, however, hung on the fortunes of the French campaign; it was the victory at Bouvines that broke the spell of terror, and within a few days of the king's landing the barons again met at St. Edmundsbury. . . . At Christmas they presented themselves in arms before the king and preferred their claim. The few months that followed showed John that he stood alone in the land. . . . At Easter the barons again gathered in arms at Brackley and renewed their claim. 'Why do they not ask for my kingdom?' cried John in a burst of passion; but the whole country rose as one man at his refusal. London threw open her gates to the army of the barons, now organized under Robert Fitz-Walter, 'the marshal of the army of God and the holy Church.' The example of the capital was at once followed by Exeter and Lincoln; promises of aid came from Scotland and Wales; the northern nobles marched hastily to join their comrades in London. With seven horsemen in his train John found himself face to face with a nation in arms. . . . Nursing wrath in his heart the tyrant bowed to necessity, and summoned the barons to a conference at Runnymede. An island in the Thames between Staines and Windsor had been chosen as the place of conference: the king encamped on one bank, while the barons covered the marshy flat, still known by the name of Runnymede, on the other. Their delegates met in the island between them. . . . The Great Charter was discussed, agreed to, and signed in a single day [June 15, A. D. 1215]. One copy of it still remains in the British Museum, injured by age and fire, but with the royal seal still hanging from the brown, shriveled parchment."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the English People*, ch. 3, sect. 2-3.—"As this was the first effort towards a legal government, so is it beyond comparison the most important event in our history, except that Revolution without which its benefits would have been rapidly annihilated. The constitution of England has indeed no single date from which its duration is to be reckoned. The institutions of positive law, the far more important changes which time has wrought in the order of society, during six hundred years subsequent to the Great Charter, have undoubtedly lessened its direct application to our present circumstances. But it is still the key-stone of English liberty. All that has since been obtained is little more than as confirmation or commentary. . . . The essential clauses of Magna Charta are those which protect the personal liberty and property of all

freemen, by giving security from arbitrary imprisonment and arbitrary spoliation. 'No freeman (says the 29th chapter of Henry III.'s charter, which, as the existing law, I quote in preference to that of John, the variations not being very material) shall be taken or imprisoned, or be disseised of his freehold, or liberties, or free customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or any otherwise destroyed; nor will we pass upon him, nor send upon, but by lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. We will sell to no man, we will not deny or delay to any man, justice or right.' It is obvious that these words, interpreted by any honest court of law, convey an ample security for the two main rights of civil society."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 8, pt. 2.—"The Great Charter, although drawn up in the form of a royal grant, was really a treaty between the king and his subjects. . . . It is the collective people who really form the other high contracting party in the great capitulation,—the three estates of the realm, not, it is true, arranged in order according to their profession or rank, but not the less certainly combined in one national purpose, and securing by one bond the interests and rights of each other, severally and all together. . . . The barons maintain and secure the right of the whole people as against themselves as well as against their master. Clause by clause the rights of the commons are provided for as well as the rights of the nobles. . . . The knight is protected against the compulsory exaction of his services, and the horse and cart of the freeman against the irregular requisition even of the sheriff. . . . The Great Charter is the first great public act of the nation, after it has realised its own identity. . . . The whole of the constitutional history of England is little more than a commentary on Magna Carta."—W. Stubbs, *Constitutional Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 12, sect. 155.—The following is the text of Magna Carta: "John, by the Grace of God, King of England, Lord of Ireland, Duke of Normandy, Aquitaine, and Count of Anjou, to his Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Earls, Barons, Justiciaries, Foresters, Sheriffs, Governors, Officers, and to all Bailiffs, and his faithful subjects, greeting. Know ye, that we, in the presence of God, and for the salvation of our soul, and the souls of all our ancestors and heirs, and unto the honour of God and the advancement of Holy Church, and amendment of our Realm, by advice of our venerable Fathers, Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church; Henry, Archbishop of Dublin; William, of London; Peter, of Winchester; Jocelin, of Bath and Glastonbury; Hugh, of Lincoln; Walter, of Worcester; William, of Coventry; Benedict, of Rochester—Bishops; of Master Pandulph, Sub-Deacon and Familiar of our Lord the Pope; Brother Aymeric, Master of the Knights-Templars in England; and of the noble Persons, William Marescall, Earl of Pembroke; William, Earl of Salisbury; William, Earl of Warren; William, Earl of Arundel; Alan de Galloway, Constable of Scotland; Warin FitzGerald, Peter FitzHerbert, and Hubert de Burgh, Seneschal of Poitou; Hugh de Neville, Matthew FitzHerbert, Thomas Basset, Alan Basset, Philip of Albiney, Robert de Roppell, John Mareschal, John FitzHugh, and others, our liegemen, have, in the first place, granted to God, and by this our present Charter confirmed, for us and our heirs

forever:—1. That the Church of England shall be free, and have her whole rights, and her liberties inviolable; and we will have them so observed, that it may appear thence that the freedom of elections, which is reckoned chief and indispensable to the English Church, and which we granted and confirmed by our Charter, and obtained the confirmation of the same from our Lord the Pope Innocent III., before the discord between us and our barons, was granted of mere free will; which Charter we shall observe, and we do will it to be faithfully observed by our heirs for ever. 2. We also have granted to all the freemen of our kingdom, for us and for our heirs for ever, all the underwritten liberties, to be had and holden by them and their heirs, of us and our heirs for ever: If any of our earls, or barons, or others, who hold of us in chief by military service, shall die, and at the time of his death his heir shall be of full age, and owe a relief, he shall have his inheritance by the ancient relief—that is to say, the heir or heirs of an earl, for a whole earldom, by a hundred pounds; the heir or heirs of a baron, for a whole barony, by a hundred pounds; the heir or heirs of a knight, for a whole knight's fee, by a hundred shillings at most; and whoever oweth less shall give less, according to the ancient custom of fees. 3. But if the heir of any such shall be under age, and shall be in ward, when he comes of age he shall have his inheritance without relief and without fine. 4. The keeper of the land of such an heir being under age, shall take of the land of the heir none but reasonable issues, reasonable customs, and reasonable services, and that without destruction and waste of his men and his goods; and if we commit the custody of any such lands to the sheriff, or any other who is answerable to us for the issues of the land, and he shall make destruction and waste of the lands which he hath in custody, we will take of him amends, and the land shall be committed to two lawful and discreet men of that fee, who shall answer for the issues to us, or to him to whom we shall assign them; and if we sell or give to any one the custody of any such lands, and he therein make destruction or waste, he shall lose the same custody, which shall be committed to two lawful and discreet men of that fee, who shall in like manner answer to us as aforesaid. 5. But the keeper, so long as he shall have the custody of the land, shall keep up the houses, parks, warrens, ponds, mills, and other things pertaining to the land, out of the issues of the same land; and shall deliver to the heir, when he comes of full age, his whole land, stocked with ploughs and carriages, according as the time of wainage shall require, and the issues of the land can reasonably bear. 6. Heirs shall be married without disparagement, and so that before matrimony shall be contracted, those who are near in blood to the heir shall have notice. 7. A widow, after the death of her husband, shall forthwith and without difficulty have her marriage and inheritance; nor shall she give anything for her dower, or her marriage, or her inheritance, which her husband and she held at the day of his death; and she may remain in the mansion house of her husband forty days after his death, within which time her dower shall be assigned. 8. No widow shall be distrained to marry herself, so long as she has a mind to live without a husband; but yet she shall give security that she will not marry without our assent,

if she hold of us; or without the consent of the lord of whom she holds, if she hold of another. 9. Neither we nor our bailiffs shall seize any land or rent for any debt so long as the chattels of the debtor are sufficient to pay the debt; nor shall the sureties of the debtor be distrained so long as the principal debtor has sufficient to pay the debt; and if the principal debtor shall fail in the payment of the debt, not having wherewithal to pay it, then the sureties shall answer the debt; and if they will they shall have the lands and rents of the debtor, until they shall be satisfied for the debt which they paid for him, unless the principal debtor can show himself acquitted thereof against the said sureties. 10. If any one have borrowed anything of the Jews, more or less, and die before the debt be satisfied, there shall be no interest paid for that debt, so long as the heir is under age, of whomsoever he may hold; and if the debt falls into our hands, we will only take the chattel mentioned in the deed. 11. And if any one shall die indebted to the Jews, his wife shall have her dower and pay nothing of that debt; and if the deceased left children under age, they shall have necessaries provided for them, according to the tenement of the deceased; and out of the residue the debt shall be paid, saving, however, the service due to the lords, and in like manner shall it be done touching debts due to others than the Jews. 12. No scutage or aid shall be imposed in our kingdom, unless by the general council of our kingdom; except for ransoming our person, making our eldest son a knight, and once for marrying our eldest daughter; and for these there shall be paid no more than a reasonable aid. In like manner it shall be concerning the aids of the City of London. 13. And the City of London shall have all its ancient liberties and free customs, as well by land as by water; furthermore, we will and grant that all other cities and boroughs, and towns and ports, shall have all their liberties and free customs. 14. And for holding the general council of the kingdom concerning the assessment of aids, except in the three cases aforesaid, and for the assessing of scutages, we shall cause to be summoned the archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and greater barons of the realm, singly by our letters. And furthermore, we shall cause to be summoned generally, by our sheriffs and bailiffs, all others who hold of us in chief, for a certain day, that is to say, forty days before their meeting at least, and to a certain place; and in all letters of such summons we will declare the cause of such summons. And summons being thus made, the business shall proceed on the day appointed, according to the advice of such as shall be present, although all that were summoned come not. 15. We will not for the future grant to any one that he may take aid of his own free tenants, unless to ransom his body, and to make his eldest son a knight, and once to marry his eldest daughter; and for this there shall be only paid a reasonable aid. 16. No man shall be distrained to perform more service for a knight's fee, or other free tenement, than is due from thence. 17. Common pleas shall not follow our court, but shall be holden in some place certain. 18. Trials upon the Writs of Novel Disseisin, and of Mort d'ancestor, and of Darrein Presentment, shall not be taken but in their proper counties, and after this manner: We, or if we should be out of the realm, our chief justiciary, will send two justiciaries

through every county four times a year, who, with four knights of each county, chosen by the county, shall hold the said assizes in the county on the day, and at the place appointed. 19. And if any matters cannot be determined on the day appointed for holding the assizes in each county, so many of the knights and freeholders as have been at the assizes aforesaid shall stay to decide them as is necessary, according as there is more or less business. 20. A freeman shall not be amerced for a small offence, but only according to the degree of the offence; and for a great crime according to the heinousness of it, saving to him his contentment; and after the same manner a merchant, saving to him his merchandise. And a villein shall be amerced after the same manner, saving to him his wainage, if he falls under our mercy; and none of the aforesaid amerciaments shall be assessed but by the oath of honest men in the neighbourhood. 21. Earls and barons shall not be amerced but by their peers, and after the degree of the offence. 22. No ecclesiastical person shall be amerced for his lay tenement, but according to the proportion of the others aforesaid, and not according to the value of his ecclesiastical benefice. 23. Neither a town nor any tenant shall be distrained to make bridges or embankments, unless that anciently and of right they are bound to do it. 24. No sheriff, constable, coroner, or other our bailiffs, shall hold "Pleas of the Crown." 25. All counties, hundreds, wapentakes, and trethings, shall stand at the old rents, without any increase, except in our demesne manors. 26. If any one holding of us a lay fee die, and the sheriff, or our bailiffs, show our letters patent of summons for debt which the dead man did owe to us, it shall be lawful for the sheriff or our bailiff to attach and register the chattels of the dead, found upon his lay fee, to the amount of the debt, by the view of lawful men, so as nothing be removed until our whole clear debt be paid; and the rest shall be left to the executors to fulfil the testament of the dead; and if there be nothing due from him to us, all the chattels shall go to the use of the dead, saving to his wife and children their reasonable shares. 27. If any freeman shall die intestate, his chattels shall be distributed by the hands of his nearest relations and friends, by view of the Church, saving to every one his debts which the deceased owed to him. 28. No constable or bailiff of ours shall take corn or other chattels of any man unless he presently give him money for it, or hath respite of payment by the good-will of the seller. 29. No constable shall distrain any knight to give money for castle-guard, if he himself will do it in his person, or by another able man, in case he cannot do it through any reasonable cause. And if we have carried or sent him into the army, he shall be free from such guard for the time he shall be in the army by our command. 30. No sheriff or bailiff of ours, or any other, shall take horses or carts of any freeman for carriage, without the assent of the said freeman. 31. Neither shall we nor our bailiffs take any man's timber for our castles or other uses, unless by the consent of the owner of the timber. 32. We will retain the lands of those convicted of felony only one year and a day, and then they shall be delivered to the lord of the fee. 33. All kydells (weirs) for the time to come shall be put down in the rivers of Thames and Medway, and throughout all England, except upon the sea-

coast. 34. The writ which is called *præcipe*, for the future, shall not be made out to any one, of any tenement, whereby a freeman may lose his court. 35. There shall be one measure of wine and one of ale through our whole realm; and one measure of corn, that is to say, the London quarter; and one breadth of dyed cloth, and russets, and haberjeets, that is to say, two ells within the lists; and it shall be of weights as it is of measures. 36. Nothing from henceforth shall be given or taken for a writ of inquisition of life or limb, but it shall be granted freely, and not denied. 37. If any do hold of us by fee-farm, or by socage, or by burgage, and he hold also lands of any other by knight's service, we will not have the custody of the heir or land, which is holden of another man's fee by reason of that fee-farm, socage, or burgage; neither will we have the custody of the fee-farm, or socage, or burgage, unless knight's service was due to us out of the same fee-farm. We will not have the custody of an heir, nor of any land which he holds of another by knight's service, by reason of any petty serjeanty by which he holds of us, by the service of paying a knife, an arrow, or the like. 38. No bailiff from henceforth shall put any man to his law upon his own bare saying, without credible witnesses to prove it. 39. No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned, or disseised, or outlawed, or banished, or any ways destroyed, nor will we pass upon him, nor will we send upon him, unless by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. 40. We will sell to no man, we will not deny to any man, either justice or right. 41. All merchants shall have safe and secure conduct, to go out of, and to come into England, and to stay there and to pass as well by land as by water, for buying and selling by the ancient and allowed customs, without any unjust tolls; except in time of war, or when they are of any nation at war with us. And if there be found any such in our land, in the beginning of the war, they shall be attached, without damage to their bodies or goods, until it be known unto us, or our chief justiciary, how our merchants be treated in the nation at war with us; and if ours be safe there, the others shall be safe in our dominions. 42. It shall be lawful, for the time to come, for any one to go out of our kingdom, and return safely and securely by land or by water, saving his allegiance to us; unless in time of war, by some short space, for the common benefit of the realm, except prisoners and outlaws, according to the law of the land, and people in war with us, and merchants who shall be treated as is above mentioned. 43. If any man hold of any escheat, as of the honour of Wallingford, Nottingham, Boulogne, Lancaster, or of other escheats which be in our hands, and are baronies, and die, his heir shall give no other relief, and perform no other service to us than he would to the baron, if it were in the baron's hand; and we will hold it after the same manner as the baron held it. 44. Those men who dwell without the forest from henceforth shall not come before our justiciaries of the forest, upon common summons, but such as are impleaded, or are sureties for any that are attached for something concerning the forest. 45. We will not make any justices, constables, sheriffs, or bailiffs, but of such as know the law of the realm and mean duly to observe it. 46. All barons who have founded abbeys, which they

hold by charter from the kings of England, or by ancient tenure, shall have the keeping of them, when vacant, as they ought to have. 47. All forests that have been made forests in our time shall forthwith be disforested; and the same shall be done with the water-banks that have been fenced in by us in our time. 48. All evil customs concerning forests, warrens, foresters, and warreners, sheriffs and their officers, water-banks and their keepers, shall forthwith be inquired into in each county, by twelve sworn knights of the same county, chosen by creditable persons of the same county; and within forty days after the said inquest be utterly abolished, so as never to be restored: so as we are first acquainted therewith, or our justiciary, if we should not be in England. 49. We will immediately give up all hostages and charters delivered unto us by our English subjects, as securities for their keeping the peace, and yielding us faithful service. 50. We will entirely remove from their bailiwicks the relations of Gerard de Atheyes, so that for the future they shall have no bailiwick in England; we will also remove Engelard de Cygony, Andrew, Peter, and Gyon, from the Chancery; Gyon de Cygony, Geoffrey de Martyn, and his brothers; Philip Mark, and his brothers, and his nephew, Geoffrey, and their whole retinue. 51. As soon as peace is restored, we will send out of the kingdom all foreign knights, cross-bowmen, and stipendiaries, who are come with horses and arms to the molestation of our people. 52. If any one has been dispossessed or deprived by us, without the lawful judgment of his peers, of his lands, castles, liberties, or right, we will forthwith restore them to him; and if any dispute arise upon this head, let the matter be decided by the five-and-twenty barons hereafter mentioned, for the preservation of the peace. And for all those things of which any person has, without the lawful judgment of his peers, been dispossessed or deprived, either by our father King Henry, or our brother King Richard, and which we have in our hands, or are possessed by others, and we are bound to warrant and make good, we shall have a respite till the term usually allowed the crusaders; excepting those things about which there is a plea depending, or whereof an inquest hath been made, by our order before we undertook the crusade; but as soon as we return from our expedition, or if perchance we tarry at home and do not make our expedition, we will immediately cause full justice to be administered therein. 53. The same respite we shall have, and in the same manner, about administering justice, disafforesting or letting continue the forests, which Henry our father, and our brother Richard, have afforested; and the same concerning the wardship of the lands which are in another's fee, but the wardship of which we have hitherto had, by reason of a fee held of us by knight's service; and for the abbeys founded in any other fee than our own, in which the lord of the fee says he has a right; and when we return from our expedition, or if we tarry at home, and do not make our expedition, we will immediately do full justice to all the complainants in this behalf. 54. No man shall be taken or imprisoned upon the appeal of a woman, for the death of any other than her husband. 55. All unjust and illegal fines made by us, and all amerancements imposed unjustly and contrary to the law of the land, shall be entirely given up, or else be left to the decision of the five-and-twenty

barons hereafter mentioned for the preservation of the peace, or of the major part of them, together with the aforesaid Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, if he can be present, and others whom he shall think fit to invite; and if he cannot be present, the business shall notwithstanding go on without him; but so that if one or more of the aforesaid five-and-twenty barons be plaintiffs in the same cause, they shall be set aside as to what concerns this particular affair, and others be chosen in their room, out of the said five-and-twenty, and sworn by the rest to decide the matter. 56. If we have disseised or dispossessed the Welsh of any lands, liberties, or other things, without the legal judgment of their peers, either in England or in Wales, they shall be immediately restored to them; and if any dispute arise upon this head, the matter shall be determined in the Marches by the judgment of their peers; for tenements in England according to the law of England, for tenements in Wales according to the law of Wales, for tenements of the Marches according to the law of the Marches: the same shall the Welsh do to us and our subjects. 57. As for all those things of which a Welshman hath, without the lawful judgment of his peers, been disseised or deprived of by King Henry our father, or our brother King Richard, and which we either have in our hands or others are possessed of, and we are obliged to warrant it, we shall have a respite till the time generally allowed the crusaders; excepting those things about which a suit is depending, or whereof an inquest has been made by our order, before we undertook the crusade: but when we return, or if we stay at home without performing our expedition, we will immediately do them full justice, according to the laws of the Welsh and of the parts before mentioned. 58. We will without delay dismiss the son of Llewellyn, and all the Welsh hostages, and release them from the engagements they have entered into with us for the preservation of the peace. 59. We will treat with Alexander, King of Scots, concerning the restoring his sisters and hostages, and his right and liberties, in the same form and manner as we shall do to the rest of our barons of England; unless by the charters which we have from his father, William, late King of Scots, it ought to be otherwise; and this shall be left to the determination of his peers in our court. 60. All the aforesaid customs and liberties, which we have granted to be holden in our kingdom, as much as it belongs to us, all people of our kingdom, as well clergy as laity, shall observe, as far as they are concerned, towards their dependents. 61. And whereas, for the honour of God and the amendment of our kingdom, and for the better quieting the discord that has arisen between us and our barons, we have granted all these things aforesaid; willing to render them firm and lasting, we do give and grant our subjects the underwritten security, namely that the barons may choose five-and-twenty barons of the kingdom, whom they think convenient; who shall take care, with all their might, to hold and observe, and cause to be observed, the peace and liberties we have granted them, and by this our present Charter confirmed in this manner; that is to say, that if we, our justiciary, our bailiffs, or any of our officers, shall in any circumstance have failed in the performance of them towards any person, or shall have broken through any of

these articles of peace and security, and the offence be notified to four barons chosen out of the five-and-twenty before mentioned, the said four barons shall repair to us, or our justiciary, if we are out of the realm, and, laying open the grievance, shall petition to have it redressed without delay: and if it be not redressed by us, or if we should chance to be out of the realm, if it should not be redressed by our justiciary within forty days, reckoning from the time it has been notified to us, or to our justiciary (if we should be out of the realm), the four barons aforesaid shall lay the cause before the rest of the five-and-twenty barons; and the said five-and-twenty barons, together with the community of the whole kingdom, shall distrain and distress us in all the ways in which they shall be able, by seizing our castles, lands, possessions, and in any other manner they can, till the grievance is redressed, according to their pleasure; saving harmless our own person, and the persons of our Queen and children; and when it is redressed, they shall behave to us as before. And any person whatsoever in the kingdom may swear that he will obey the orders of the five-and-twenty barons aforesaid in the execution of the premises, and will distress us, jointly with them, to the utmost of his power; and we give public and free liberty to any one that shall please to swear to this, and never will hinder any person from taking the same oath. 62. As for all those of our subjects who will not, of their own accord, swear to join the five-and-twenty barons in distraining and distressing us, we will issue orders to make them take the same oath as aforesaid. And if any one of the five-and-twenty barons dies, or goes out of the kingdom, or is hindered any other way from carrying the things aforesaid into execution, the rest of the said five-and-twenty barons may choose another in his room, at their discretion, who shall be sworn in like manner as the rest. In all things that are committed to the execution of these five-and-twenty barons, if, when they are all assembled together, they should happen to disagree about any matter, and some of them, when summoned, will not or cannot come, whatever is agreed upon, or enjoined, by the major part of those that are present shall be reputed as firm and valid as if all the five-and-twenty had given their consent; and the aforesaid five-and-twenty shall swear that all the premises they shall faithfully observe, and cause with all their power to be observed. And we will procure nothing from any one, by ourselves nor by another, whereby any of these concessions and liberties may be revoked or lessened; and if any such thing shall have been obtained, let it be null and void; neither will we ever make use of it either by ourselves or any other. And all the ill-will, indignations, and rancours that have arisen between us and our subjects, of the clergy and laity, from the first breaking out of the dissensions between us, we do fully remit and forgive: moreover, all trespasses occasioned by the said dissensions, from Easter in the sixteenth year of our reign till the restoration of peace and tranquillity, we hereby entirely remit to all, both clergy and laity, and as far as in us lies do fully forgive. We have, moreover, caused to be made for them the letters patent testimonial of Stephen, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Henry, Lord Archbishop of Dublin, and the bishops aforesaid, as also of Master Pandulph, for the security and

concessions aforesaid. 63. Wherefore we will and firmly enjoin, that the Church of England be free, and that all men in our kingdom have and hold all the aforesaid liberties, rights, and concessions, truly and peaceably, freely and quietly, fully and wholly to themselves and their heirs, of us and our heirs, in all things and places, for ever, as is aforesaid. It is also sworn, as well on our part as on the part of the barons, that all the things aforesaid shall be observed in good faith, and without evil subtilty. Given under our hand, in the presence of the witnesses above named, and many others, in the meadow called Runingmede, between Windsor and Staines, the 15th day of June, in the 17th year of our reign."—W. Stubbs, *Select Charters*, pt. 5.—*Old South Leaflets*, General Series, no. 5.

ALSO IN: E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Docs of the Middle Ages*, bk. 1, no. 7.—C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of Eng. during the Early and Middle Ages*, v. 2, ch. 3.

A. D. 1216-1274.—Character and reign of Henry III.—The Barons' War.—Simon de Montfort and the evolution of the English Parliament.—King John died October 17, 1216. "His legitimate successor was a child of nine years of age. For the first time since the Conquest the personal government was in the hands of a minor. In that stormy time the great Earl of Pembroke undertook the government, as Protector. . . . At the Council of Bristol, with general approbation and even with that of the papal legate, Magna Charta was confirmed, though with the omission of certain articles. . . . After some degree of tranquillity had been restored, a second confirmation of the Great Charter took place in the autumn of 1217, with the omission of the clauses referring to the estates, but with the grant of a new *charta de foresta*, introducing a vigorous administration of the forest laws. In 9 Henry III. Magna Charta was again confirmed, and this is the form in which it afterwards took its place among the statutes of the realm. Two years later, Henry III. personally assumes the reins of government at the Parliament of Oxford (1227), and begins his rule without confirming the two charters. At first the tutorial government still continues, which had meanwhile, even after the death of the great Earl of Pembroke (1219), remained in a fairly orderly condition. The first epoch of sixteen years of this reign must therefore be regarded purely as a government by the nobility under the name of Henry III. The regency had succeeded in removing the dominant influence of the Roman Curia by the recall of the papal legate, Pandulf, to Rome (1221), and in getting rid of the dangerous foreign mercenary soldiery (1224). . . . With the disgraceful dismissal of the chief justiciary, Hubert de Burgh, there begins a second epoch of a personal rule of Henry III. (1232-1252), which for twenty continuous years, presents the picture of a confused and undecided struggle between the king and his foreign favourites and personal adherents on the one side, and the great barons, and with them soon the prelates, on the other. . . . In 21 Henry III. the King finds himself, in consequence of pressing money embarrassments, again compelled to make a solemn confirmation of the charter, in which once more the clauses relating to the estates are omitted. Shortly afterwards, as had happened just one hundred years previously in France, the name 'parliamentum' occurs for the first time (Chron. Dunst., 1244;

Matth. Paris, 1246), and curiously enough, Henry III. himself, in a writ addressed to the Sheriff of Northampton, designates with this term the assembly which originated the Magna Charta. . . . The name 'parliament,' now occurs more frequently, but does not supplant the more definite terms concilium, colloquium, etc. In the meanwhile the relations with the Continent became complicated, in consequence of the family connections of the mother and wife of the King, and the greed of the papal envoys. . . . From the year 1244 onwards, neither a chief justice nor a chancellor, nor even a treasurer, is appointed, but the administration of the country is conducted at the Court by the clerks of the offices."—R. Gneist, *Hist. of the English Const.*, v. 1, pp. 313-321.—"Nothing is so hard to realise as chaos; and nothing nearer to chaos can be conceived than the government of Henry III. Henry was, like all the Plantagenets, clever; like very few of them, he was devout; and if the power of conceiving a great policy would constitute a great King, he would certainly have been one. . . . He aimed at making the Crown virtually independent of the barons. . . . His connexion with Louis IX., whose brother-in-law he became, was certainly a misfortune to him. In France the royal power had during the last fifty years been steadily on the advance; in England it had as steadily receded; and Henry was ever hearing from the other side of the Channel maxims of government and ideas of royal authority which were utterly inapplicable to the actual state of his own kingdom. This, like a premature Stuart, Henry was incapable of perceiving; a King he was, and a King he would be, in his own sense of the word. It is evident that with such a task before him, he needed for the most shadowy chance of success, an iron strength of will, singular self-control, great forethought and care in collecting and husbanding his resources, a rare talent for administration, the sagacity to choose and the self-reliance to trust his counsellors. And not one of these various qualities did Henry possess. . . . Henry had imbibed from the events and the tutors of his early childhood two maxims of state, and two alone; to trust Rome, and to distrust the barons of England. . . . He filled the places of trust and power about himself with aliens, to whom the maintenance of Papal influence was like an instinct of self-preservation. Thus were definitely formed the two great parties out of whose antagonism the War of the Barons arose, under whose influence the relations between the crown and people of England were remodelled, and out of whose enduring conflict rose, indirectly, the political principles which contributed so largely to bring about the Reformation of the English Church. The few years which followed the fall of Hubert de Burgh were the heyday of Papal triumph. And no triumph could have been worse used. . . . Thus was the whole country lying a prey to the ecclesiastical aliens maintained by the Pope, and to the lay aliens maintained by the King, . . . when Simon de Montfort became . . . inseparably intermixed with the course of our history. . . . In the year 1258 opened the first act of the great drama which has made the name of Simon de Montfort immortal. . . . The Barons of England, at Leicester's suggestion, had leagued for the defence of their rights. They appeared armed at the Great Council. . . . They required as the condition of their assistance that the general

reformation of the realm should be entrusted to a Commission of twenty-four members, half to be chosen by the crown, and half by themselves. For the election of this body, primarily, and for a more explicit statement of grievances, the Great Council was to meet again at Oxford on the 11th of June, 1258. When the Barons came, they appeared at the head of their retainers. The invasion of the Welsh was the plea; but the real danger was nearer home. They seized on the Cinque Ports; the unrenewed truce with France was the excuse; they remembered too vividly King John and his foreign mercenaries. They then presented their petition. This was directed to the redress of various abuses. . . . To each and every clause the King gave his inevitable assent. One more remarkable encroachment was made upon the royal prerogative; the election in Parliament of a chief justiciar. . . . The chief justiciar was the first officer of the Crown. He was not a mere chief justice, after the fashion of the present day, but the representative of the Crown in its high character of the fountain of justice. . . . But the point upon which the barons laid the greatest stress, from the beginning to the end of their struggle, was the question of the employment of aliens. That the strongest castles and the fairest lands of England should be in the hands of foreigners, was an insult to the national spirit which no free people could fail to resent. . . . England for the English, the great war cry of the barons, went home to the heart of the humblest. . . . The great question of the constitution of Parliament was not heard at Oxford; it emerged into importance when the struggle grew fiercer, and the barons found it necessary to gather allies round them. . . . One other measure completed the programme of the barons; namely, the appointment, already referred to, of a committee of twenty-four. . . . It amounted to placing the crown under the control of a temporary Council of Regency [see OXFORD, PROVISIONS OF]. . . . Part of the barons' work was simple enough. The justiciar was named, and the committee of twenty-four. To expel the foreigners was less easy. Simon de Montfort, himself an alien by birth, resigned the two castles which he held, and called upon the rest to follow. They simply refused. . . . But the barons were in arms, and prepared to use them. The aliens, with their few English supporters, fled to Winchester, where the castle was in the hands of the foreign bishop Aymer. They were besieged, brought to terms, and exiled. The barons were now masters of the situation. . . . Among the prerogatives of the crown which passed to the Oxford Commission not the least valuable, for the hold which it gave on the general government of the country, was the right to nominate the sheriffs. In 1261 the King, who had procured a Papal bull to abrogate the Provisions of Oxford, and an army of mercenaries to give the bull effect, proceeded to expel the sheriffs who had been placed in office by the barons. The reply of the barons was most memorable; it was a direct appeal to the order below their own. They summoned three knights elected from each county in England to meet them at St. Albans to discuss the state of the realm. It was clear that the day of the House of Commons could not be far distant, when at such a crisis an appeal to the knights of the shire could be made, and evidently made with success. For a moment,

in this great move, the whole strength of the barons was united; but differences soon returned, and against divided counsels the crown steadily prevailed. In June, 1262, we find peace restored. The more moderate of the barons had acquiesced in the terms offered by Henry; Montfort, who refused them, was abroad in voluntary exile. . . . Suddenly, in July, the Earl of Gloucester died, and the sole leadership of the barons passed into the hands of Montfort. With this critical event opens the last act in the career of the great Earl. In October he returns privately to England. The whole winter is passed in the patient reorganising of the party, and the preparation for a decisive struggle. Montfort, fervent, eloquent, and devoted, swayed with despotic influence the hearts of the younger nobles (and few in those days lived to be grey), and taught them to feel that the Provisions of Oxford were to them what the Great Charter had been to their fathers. They were drawn together with an unanimity unknown before. . . . They demanded the restoration of the Great Provisions. The King refused, and in May, 1263, the barons appealed to arms. . . . Henry, with a reluctant hand, subscribed once more to the Provisions of Oxford, with a saving clause, however, that they should be revised in the coming Parliament. On the 9th of September, accordingly, Parliament was assembled. . . . The King and the barons agreed to submit their differences to the arbitration of Louis of France. . . . Louis IX. had done more than any one king of France to enlarge the royal prerogative; and Louis was the brother-in-law of Henry. His award, given at Amiens on the 23d of January, 1264, was, as we should have expected, absolutely in favour of the King. The whole Provisions of Oxford were, in his view, an invasion of the royal power. . . . The barons were astounded. . . . They at once said that the question of the employment of aliens was never meant to be included. . . . The appeal was made once again to the sword. Success for a moment inclined to the royal side, but it was only for a moment; and on the memorable field of Lewes the genius of Leicester prevailed. . . . With the two kings of England and of the Romans prisoners in his hands, Montfort dictated the terms of the so-called Mise of Lewes. . . . Subject to the approval of Parliament, all differences were to be submitted once more to French arbitration. . . . On the 23d of June the Parliament met. It was no longer a Great Council, after the fashion of previous assemblies; it included four knights, elected by each English county. This Parliament gave such sanction as it was able to the exceptional authority of Montfort, and ordered that until the proposed arbitration could be carried out, the King's council should consist of nine persons, to be named by the Bishop of Chichester, and the Earls of Gloucester and Leicester. The effect was to give Simon for the time despotic power. . . . It was at length agreed that all questions whatever, the employment of aliens alone excepted, should be referred to the Bishop of London, the justiciar Hugh le Despenser, Charles of Anjou, and the Abbot of Bec. If on any point they could not agree, the Archbishop of Rouen was to act as referee. . . . It was . . . not simply the expedient of a revolutionary chief in difficulties, but the expression of a settled and matured policy, when, in December 1264, [Montfort] issued in the King's name the ever-memorable writs which summoned the first complete Par-

liament which ever met in England. The earls, barons, and bishops received their summons as of course; and with them the deans of cathedral churches, an unprecedented number of abbots and priors, two knights from every shire, and two citizens or burgesses from every city or borough in England. Of their proceedings we know but little; but they appear to have appointed Simon de Montfort to the office of Justiciar of England, and to have thus made him in rank, what he had before been in power, the first subject in the realm. . . . Montfort . . . had now gone so far, he had exercised such extraordinary powers, he had done so many things which could never really be pardoned, that perhaps his only chance of safety lay in the possession of some such office as this. It is certain, moreover, that something which passed in this Parliament, or almost exactly at the time of its meeting, did cause deep offence to a considerable section of the barons. . . . Difficulties were visibly gathering thicker around him, and he was evidently conscious that disaffection was spreading fast. . . . Negotiations went forward, not very smoothly, for the release of Prince Edward. They were terminated in May by his escape. It was the signal for a royalist rising. Edward took the command of the Welsh border; before the middle of June he had made the border his own. On the 29th Gloucester opened its gates to him. He had many secret friends. He pushed fearlessly eastward, and surprised the garrison of Kenilworth, commanded by Simon, the Earl's second son. The Earl himself lay at Evesham, awaiting the troops which his son was to bring up from Kenilworth. . . . On the fatal field of Evesham, fighting side by side to the last, fell the Earl himself, his eldest son Henry, Despensers the late Justiciar, Lord Basset of Drayton, one of his firmest friends, and a host of minor name. With them, to all appearance, fell the cause for which they had fought."—*Simon de Montfort* (*Quarterly Rev.*, Jan., 1866).—See PARLIAMENT, THE ENGLISH: EARLY STAGES OF ITS EVOLUTION. — "Important as this assembly [the Parliament of 1264] is in the history of the constitution, it was not primarily and essentially a constitutional assembly. It was not a general convention of the tenants in chief or of the three estates, but a parliamentary assembly of the supporters of the existing government."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 14, sect. 177 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: The same, *The Early Plantagenets*. —G. W. Prothero, *Life of Simon de Montfort*, ch. 11-12. —H. Blaauw, *The Barons' War*. —C. H. Pearson, *England, Early and Middle Ages*, v. 2.

A. D. 1271.—Crusade of Prince Edward. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1270-1271.

A. D. 1272.—Accession of King Edward I.
A. D. 1275-1295.—Development of Parliamentary representation under Edward I.— "Happily, Earl Simon [de Montfort] found a successor, and more than a successor, in the king's [Henry III.'s] son. . . . Edward I. stood on the vantage ground of the throne. . . . He could do that easily and without effort which Simon could only do laboriously, and with the certainty of rousing opposition. Especially was this the case with the encouragement given by the two men to the growing aspirations after parliamentary representation. Earl Simon's assemblies were instruments of warfare. Edward's assemblies were invitations to peace. . . . Barons and prelates, knights and townsmen, came to-

gether only to support a king who took the initiative so wisely, and who, knowing what was best for all, sought the good of his kingdom without thought of his own ease. Yet even so, Edward was too prudent at once to gather together such a body as that which Earl Simon had planned. He summoned, indeed, all the constituent parts of Simon's parliament, but he seldom summoned them to meet in one place or at one time. Sometimes the barons and prelates met apart from the townsmen or the knights, sometimes one or the other class met entirely alone. . . . In this way, during the first twenty years of Edward's reign, the nation rapidly grew in that consciousness of national unity which would one day transfer the function of regulation from the crown to the representatives of the people."—S. R. Gardiner and J. B. Mullinger, *Int. to the Study of Eng. Hist.*, ch. 4, sect. 17.— "In 1264 Simon de Montfort had called up from both shires and boroughs representatives to aid him in the new work of government. That part of Earl Simon's work had not been lasting. The task was left for Edward I. to be advanced by gradual safe steps, but to be thoroughly completed, as a part of a definite and orderly arrangement, according to which the English parliament was to be the perfect representation of the Three Estates of the Realm, assembled for purposes of taxation, legislation and united political action. . . . Edward's first parliament, in 1275, enabled him to pass a great statute of legal reform, called the Statute of Westminster the First, and to exact the new custom on wool; another assembly, the same year, granted him a fifteenth. . . . There is no evidence that the commons of either town or county were represented. . . . In 1282, when the expenses of the Welsh war were becoming heavy, Edward again tried the plan of obtaining money from the towns and counties by separate negotiation; but as that did not provide him with funds sufficient for his purpose, he called together, early in 1283, two great assemblies, one at York and another at Northampton, in which four knights from each shire and four members from each city and borough were ordered to attend; the cathedral and conventual clergy also of the two provinces were represented at the same places by their elected proctors. At these assemblies there was no attendance of the barons; they were with the king in Wales; but the commons made a grant of one-thirtieth on the understanding that the lords should do the same. Another assembly was held at Shrewsbury the same year, 1283, to witness the trial of David of Wales; to this the bishops and clergy were not called, but twenty towns and all the counties were ordered to send representatives. Another step was taken in 1290: knights of the shire were again summoned; but still much remained to be done before a perfect parliament was constituted. Counsel was wanted for legislation, consent was wanted for taxation. The lords were summoned in May, and did their work in June and July, granting a feudal aid and passing the statute 'Quia Emptores,' but the knights only came to vote or to promise a tax, after a law had been passed; and the towns were again taxed by special commissions. In 1294, . . . under the alarm of war with France, an alarm which led Edward into several breaches of constitutional law, he went still further, assembling the clergy by their representatives in August,

and the shires by their representative knights in October. The next year, 1295, witnessed the first summons of a perfect and model parliament; the clergy represented by their bishops, deans, archdeacons, and elected proctors; the barons summoned severally in person by the king's special writ, and the commons summoned by writs addressed to the sheriffs, directing them to send up two elected knights from each shire, two elected citizens from each city, and two elected burghers from each borough. The writ by which the prelates were called to this parliament contained a famous sentence taken from the Roman law, 'That which touches all should be approved by all,' a maxim which might serve as a motto for Edward's constitutional scheme, however slowly it grew upon him, now permanently and consistently completed."—W. Stubbs, *The Early Plantagenets*, ch. 10.—"Comparing the history of the following ages with that of the past, we can scarcely doubt that Edward had a definite idea of government before his eyes, or that that idea was successful because it approved itself to the genius and grew out of the habits of the people. Edward saw, in fact, what the nation was capable of, and adapted his constitutional reforms to that capacity. But although we may not refuse him the credit of design, it may still be questioned whether the design was altogether voluntary, whether it was not forced upon him by circumstances and developed by a series of careful experiments. . . . The design, as interpreted by the result, was the creation of a national parliament, composed of the three estates. . . . This design was perfected in 1295. It was not the result of compulsion, but the consummation of a growing policy. . . . But the close union of 1295 was followed by the compulsion of 1297: out of the organic completeness of the constitution sprang the power of resistance, and out of the resistance the victory of the principles, which Edward might guide, but which he failed to coerce."—W. Stubbs, *Constitutional Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 15, sect. 244 and ch. 14, sect. 180-182.—The same, *Select Charters*, pt. 7.—"The 13th century was above all things the age of the lawyer and the legislator. The revived study of Roman law had been one of the greatest results of the intellectual renaissance of the twelfth century. The enormous growth of the universities in the early part of the thirteenth century was in no small measure due to the zeal, ardour and success of their legal faculties. From Bologna there flowed all over Europe a great impulse towards the systematic and scientific study of the Civil Law of Rome. . . . The northern lawyers were inspired by their emulation of the civilians and canonists to look at the rude chaos of feudal custom with more critical eyes. They sought to give it more system and method, to elicit its leading principles, and to co-ordinate its clashing rules into a harmonious body of doctrine worthy to be put side by side with the more pretentious edifices of the Civil and Canon Law. In this spirit Henry de Bracton wrote the first systematic exposition of English law in the reign of Henry III. The judges and lawyers of the reign of Edward sought to put the principles of Bracton into practice. Edward himself strove with no small success to carry on the same great work by new legislation. . . . His well-known title of the 'English Justinian' is not so absurd as it appears at first

sight. He did not merely resemble Justinian in being a great legislator. Like the famous codifier of the Roman law, Edward stood at the end of a long period of legal development, and sought to arrange and systematise what had gone before him. Some of his great laws are almost in form attempts at the systematic codification of various branches of feudal custom. . . . Edward was greedy for power, and a constant object of his legislation was the exaltation of the royal prerogative. But he nearly always took a broad and comprehensive view of his authority, and thoroughly grasped the truth that the best interests of king and kingdom were identical. He wished to rule the state, but was willing to take his subjects into partnership with him, if they in return recognised his royal rights. . . . The same principles which influenced Edward as a law-giver stand out clearly in his relations to every class of his subjects. . . . It was the greatest work of Edward's life to make a permanent and ordinary part of the machinery of English government, what in his father's time had been but the temporary expedient of a needy taxgatherer or the last despairing effort of a revolutionary partisan. Edward I. is—so much as one man can be—the creator of the historical English constitution. It is true that the materials were ready to his hand. But before he came to the throne the parts of the constitution, though already roughly worked out, were ill-defined and ill-understood. Before his death the national council was no longer regarded as complete unless it contained a systematic representation of the three estates. All over Europe the thirteenth century saw the establishment of a system of estates. The various classes of the community, which had a separate social status and a common political interest, became organised communities, and sent their representatives to swell the council of the nation. By Edward's time there had already grown up in England some rough anticipation of the three estates of later history. . . . It was with no intention of diminishing his power, but rather with the object of enlarging it, that Edward called the nation into some sort of partnership with him. The special clue to this aspect of his policy is his constant financial embarrassment. He found that he could get larger and more cheerful subsidies if he laid his financial condition before the representatives of his people. . . . The really important thing was that Edward, like Montfort, brought shire and borough representatives together in a single estate, and so taught the country gentry, the lesser landowners, who, in a time when direct participation in politics was impossible for a lower class, were the real constituencies of the shire members, to look upon their interests as more in common with the traders of lower social status than with the greater landlords with whom in most continental countries the lesser gentry were forced to associate their lot. The result strengthened the union of classes, prevented the growth of the abnormally numerous privileged nobility of most foreign countries, and broadened and deepened the main current of the national life."—T. F. Tout, *Edward the First*, ch. 7-8.—"There was nothing in England which answered to the 'third estate' in France—a class, that is to say, both isolated and close, composed exclusively of townspeople, enjoying no commerce with the rural population (except such as consisted in the

reception of fugitives), and at once detesting and dreading the nobility by whom it was surrounded. In England the contrary was the case. The townsfolk and the other classes in each county were thrown together upon numberless occasions; a long period of common activity created a cordial understanding between the burghers on the one hand and their neighbours the knights and landowners on the other, and finally prepared the way for the fusion of the two classes."—E. Boutmy, *The English Constitution*, ch. 3.

A. D. 1279.—The Statute of Mortmain.—"For many years past, the great danger to the balance of power appeared to come from the regular clergy, who, favoured by the success of the mendicant orders, were adding house to house and field to field. Never dying out like families, and rarely losing by forfeitures, the monasteries might well high calculate the time, when all the soil of England should be their own. . . . Accordingly, one of the first acts of the barons under Henry III. had been to enact, that no fees should be aliened to religious persons or corporations. Edward re-enacted and strengthened this by various provisions in the famous Statute of Mortmain. The fee illegally aliened was now to be forfeited to the chief lord under the King; and if, by collusion or neglect, the lord omitted to claim his right, the crown might enter upon it. Never was statute more unpopular with the class at whom it was aimed, more ceaselessly eluded, or more effectual."—C. H. Pearson, *Hist. of England during the Early and Middle Ages*, v. 2, ch. 9.

A. D. 1282-1284.—Subjugation of Wales. See WALES: A. D. 1282-1284.

A. D. 1290-1305.—Conquest of Scotland by Edward I. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1290-1305.

A. D. 1297.—The Confirmatio Chartarum of Edward I.—"It was long before the King would surrender the right of taking talliages without a parliamentary grant. In order to carry on his extensive wars he was in constant need of large sums of money, which he raised by arbitrary exactions from all classes of his subjects, lay and clerical." The disputes and the resistance to which these exactions gave rise grew violent in 1297, and Edward was at length persuaded to assent to what was called the "Confirmatio Chartarum"—confirmation of the Great Charter and the Charter of Forests. "The Confirmatio Chartarum, which, although a statute, is drawn up in the form of a charter, was passed on the 10th of October, 1297, in a Parliament at which knights of the shire attended as representatives of the Commons, as well as the lay and clerical baronage. . . . The Confirmatio Chartarum was not merely a re-issue of Magna Charta and the Charter of the Forest, . . . but the enactment of a series of new provisions. . . . By the 5th section of this statute the King expressly renounced as precedents the aids, tasks, and prises before taken. . . . The exclusive right of Parliament to impose taxation, though often infringed by the illegal exercise of prerogative, became from this time an axiom of the Constitution."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *English Constitutional History*, ch. 7.

14th Century.—The founding of manufactures and trade. See FLANDERS: A. D. 1335-1387, and TRADE, MEDÆVAL.

A. D. 1306-1393.—Resistance to the Pope.—"For one hundred and fifty years succeeding

the Conquest, the right of nominating the archbishops, bishops, and mitred abbots had been claimed and exercised by the king. This right had been specially confirmed by the Constitutions of Clarendon, which also provided that the revenues of vacant sees should belong to the Crown. But John admitted all the Papal claims, surrendering even his kingdom to the Pope, and receiving it back as a fief of the Holy See. By the Great Charter the Church recovered its liberties; the right of free election being specially conceded to the cathedral chapters and the religious houses. Every election was, however, subject to the approval of the Pope, who also claimed a right of veto on institutions to the smaller church benefices. . . . Under Henry III. the power thus vested in the Pope and foreign superiors of the monastic orders was greatly abused, and soon degenerated into a mere channel for draining money into the Roman exchequer. Edward I. firmly withstood the exactions of the Pope, and reasserted the independence of both Church and Crown. . . . In the reign of the great Edward began a series of statutes passed to check the aggressions of the Pope and restore the independence of the national church. The first of the series was passed in 1306-7. . . . This statute was confirmed under Edward III. in the 4th, and again in the 5th year of his reign; and in the 25th of his reign [A. D. 1351], roused 'by the grievous complaints of all the commons of his realm,' the King and Parliament passed the famous Statute of Provisors, aimed directly at the Pope, and emphatically forbidding his nominations to English benefices. . . . Three years afterwards it was found necessary to pass a statute forbidding citations to the court of Rome—[the prelude to the Statute of Præmunire, described below]. . . . In 1389, there was an expectation that the Pope was about to attempt to enforce his claims, by excommunicating those who rejected them. . . . The Parliament at once passed a highly penal statute. . . . Matters were shortly afterwards brought to a crisis by Boniface IX., who after declaring the statutes enacted by the English Parliament null and void, granted to an Italian cardinal a prebendal stall at Wells, to which the king had already presented. Cross suits were at once instituted by the two claimants in the Papal and English courts. A decision was given by the latter, in favour of the king's nominee, and the bishops, having agreed to support the Crown, were forthwith excommunicated by the Pope. The Commons were now roused to the highest pitch of indignation,"—and the final great Statute of Præmunire was passed, A. D. 1393. "The firm and resolute attitude assumed by the country caused Boniface to yield; 'and for the moment,' observes Mr. Froude, 'and indeed for ever under this especial form, the wave of papal encroachment was rolled back.'"—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist.*, ch. 11.—"The great Statute of Provisors, passed in 1351, was a very solemn expression of the National determination not to give way to the pope's usurpation of patronage. . . . All persons procuring or accepting papal promotions were to be arrested. . . . In 1352 the purchasers of Provisions were declared outlaws; in 1365 another act repeated the prohibitions and penalties; and in 1390 the parliament of Richard II. released and confirmed the statute. By this act, forfeiture and banishment were

decreed against future transgressors." The Statute of *Præmunire* as enacted finally in 1393, provided that "all persons procuring in the court of Rome or elsewhere such translations, processes, sentences of excommunication, bulls, instruments or other things which touch the king, his crown, regality or realm, should suffer the penalties of *præmunire*"—which included imprisonment and forfeiture of goods. "The name *præmunire* which marks this form of legislation is taken from the opening word of the writ by which the sheriff is charged to summon the delinquent."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 19, sect. 715-716.

A. D. 1307.—Accession of King Edward II.

A. D. 1310-1311.—The Ordainers.—"At the parliament which met in March 1310 [reign of Edward II.] a new scheme of reform was promulgated, which was framed on the model of that of 1258 and the Provisions of Oxford. It was determined that the task of regulating the affairs of the realm and of the king's household should be committed to an elected body of twenty-one members, or Ordainers, the chief of whom was Archbishop Winchelsey. . . . The Ordainers were empowered to remain in office until Michaelmas 1311, and to make ordinances for the good of the realm, agreeable to the tenour of the king's coronation oath. The whole administration of the kingdom thus passed into their hands. . . . The Ordainers immediately on their appointment issued six articles directing the observance of the charters, the careful collection of the customs, and the arrest of the foreign merchants; but the great body of the ordinances was reserved for the parliament which met in August 1311. The famous document or statute known as the Ordinances of 1311 contained forty-one clauses, all aimed at existing abuses."—W. Stubbs, *The Early Plantagenets*, ch. 12.

A. D. 1314-1328.—Bannockburn and the recovery of Scottish independence. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1314; 1314-1328.

A. D. 1327.—Accession of King Edward III.

A. D. 1328.—The Peace of Northampton with Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1328.

A. D. 1328-1360.—The pretensions and wars of Edward III. in France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1328-1339; and 1337-1360.

A. D. 1332-1370.—The wars of Edward III. with Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1332-1333, and 1333-1370.

A. D. 1333-1380.—The effects of the war in France.—"A period of great wars is generally favourable to the growth of a nobility. Men who equipped large bodies of troops for the Scotch or French wars, or who had served with distinction in them, naturally had a claim for reward at the hands of their sovereign. . . . The 13th century had broken up estates all over England and multiplied families of the upper class; the 14th century was consolidating properties again, and establishing a broad division between a few powerful nobles and the mass of the community. But if the gentry, as an order, lost a little in relative importance by the formation of a class of great nobles, more distinct than had existed before, the middle classes of England, its merchants and yeomen, gained very much in importance by the war. Under the firm rule of the 'King of the Sea,' as his subjects lovingly called Edward III., our commerce expanded. Englishmen rose to an equality with the mer-

chants of the Hanse Towns, the Genoese, or the Lombards, and England for a time overflowed with treasure. The first period of war, ending with the capture of Calais, secured our coasts; the second, terminated by the peace of Brétigny, brought the plunder of half France into the English markets; and even when Edward's reign had closed on defeat and bankruptcy, and our own shores were ravaged by hostile fleets, it was still possible for private adventurers to retaliate invasion upon the enemy. . . . The romance of foreign conquest, of fortunes lightly gained and lightly lost, influenced English enterprise for many years to come. . . . The change to the lower orders during the reign arose rather from the frequent pestilences, which reduced the number of working men and made labour valuable, than from any immediate participation in the war. In fact, English serfs, as a rule, did not serve in Edward's armies. They could not be men-at-arms or archers for want of training and equipment; and for the work of light-armed troops and foragers, the Irish and Welsh seem to have been preferred. The opportunity of the serfs came with the Black Death, while districts were depopulated, and everywhere there was a want of hands to till the fields and get in the crops. The immediate effect was unfortunate. . . . The indifference of late years, when men were careless if their villans stayed on the property or emigrated, was succeeded by a sharp inquisition after fugitive serfs, and constant legislation to bring them back to their masters. . . . The leading idea of the legislator was that the labourer, whose work had doubled or trebled in value, was to receive the same wages as in years past; and it was enacted that he might be paid in kind, and, at last, that in all cases of contumacy he should be imprisoned without the option of a fine. . . . The French war contributed in many ways to heighten the feeling of English nationality. Our trade, our language and our Church received a new and powerful influence. In the early years of Edward III.'s reign, Italian merchants were the great financiers of England, farming the taxes and advancing loans to the Crown. Gradually the instinct of race, the influence of the Pope, and geographical position, contributed, with the mistakes of Edward's policy, to make France the head, as it were, of a confederation of Latin nations. Genoese ships served in the French fleet, Genoese bowmen fought at Crécy, and English privateers retorted on Genoese commerce throughout the course of the reign. In 1376 the Commons petitioned that all Lombards might be expelled the kingdom, bringing amongst other charges against them that they were French spies. The Florentines do not seem to have been equally odious, but the failure of the great firm of the Bardi in 1345, chiefly through its English engagements, obliged Edward to seek assistance elsewhere; and he transferred the privilege of lending to the crown to the merchants of the rising Hanse Towns."—C. H. Pearson, *Eng. Hist. in the Fourteenth Century*, ch. 9.—"We may trace the destructive nature of the war with France in the notices of adjoining parishes thrown into one for want of sufficient inhabitants, 'of people impoverished by frequent taxation of our lord the king,' until they had fled, of churches allowed to fall into ruin because there were none to worship within their walls, and of religious houses extinguished

because the monks and nuns had died, and none had been found to supply their places. . . . To the poverty of the country and the consequent inability of the nation to maintain the costly wars of Edward III., are attributed the enactments of sumptuary laws, which were passed because men who spent much on their table and dress were unable 'to help their liege lord' in the battle field."—W. Denton, *Eng. in the 15th Century*, int., pt. 2.

A. D. 1348-1349.—The Black Death and its effects.—"The plague of 1349 . . . produced in every country some marked social changes. . . . In England the effects of the plague are historically prominent chiefly among the lower classes of society. The population was diminished to an extent to which it is impossible now even to approximate, but which bewildered and appalled the writers of the time; whole districts were thrown out of cultivation, whole parishes depopulated, the number of labourers was so much diminished that on the one hand the survivors demanded an extravagant rate of wages, and even combined to enforce it, whilst on the other hand the landowners had to resort to every antiquated claim of service to get their estates cultivated at all; the whole system of farming was changed in consequence, the great landlords and the monastic corporations ceased to manage their estates by farming stewards, and after a short interval, during which the lands with the stock on them were let to the cultivator on short leases, the modern system of letting was introduced, and the permanent distinction between the farmer and the labourer established."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 16, sect. 259.—"On the first of August 1348 the disease appeared in the seaport towns of Dorsetshire, and travelled slowly westwards and northwards, through Devonshire and Somersetshire to Bristol. In order, if possible, to arrest its progress, all intercourse with the citizens of Bristol was prohibited by the authorities of the county of Gloucester. These precautions were however taken in vain; the Plague continued to Oxford, and, travelling slowly in the same measured way, reached London by the first of November. It appeared in Norwich on the first of January, and thence spread northwards. . . . The mortality was enormous. Perhaps from one-third to one-half the population fell victims to the disease. Adam of Monmouth says that only a tenth of the population survived. Similar amplifications are found in all the chroniclers. We are told that 60,000 persons perished in Norwich between January and July 1349. No doubt Norwich was at that time the second city in the kingdom, but the number is impossible. . . . It is stated that in England the weight of the calamity fell on the poor, and that the higher classes were less severely affected. But Edward's daughter Joan fell a victim to it and three archbishops of Canterbury perished in the same year. . . . All contemporary writers inform us that the immediate consequence of the Plague was a dearth of labour, and excessive enhancement of wages, and thereupon a serious loss to the landowners. To meet this scarcity the king issued a proclamation directed to the sheriffs of the several counties, which forbade the payment of higher than the customary wages, under the penalties of amercement. But the king's mandate was every where disobeyed. . . . Many of the labourers were thrown into prison; many to avoid punish-

ment fled to the forests, but were occasionally captured and fined; and all were constrained to disavow under oath that they would take higher than customary wages for the future."—J. E. T. Rogers, *Hist. of Agriculture and Prices in Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 15. See BLACK DEATH.

ALSO IN: F. A. Gasquet, *The Great Pestilence*.—W. Longman, *Edward III.*, v. 1, ch. 16.—A. Jessop, *The Coming of the Friars*, &c., ch. 4-5.

A. D. 1350-1400.—Chaucer and his relations to English language and literature.—"At the time when the conflict between church and state was most violent, and when Wyclif was beginning to draw upon himself the eyes of patriots, there was considerable talk at the English court about a young man named Geoffrey Chaucer, who belonged to the king's household, and who both by his personality and his connections enjoyed the favor of the royal family. . . . On many occasions, even thus early, he had appeared as a miracle of learning to those about him—he read Latin as easily as French; he spoke a more select English than others; and it was known that he had composed, or, as the expression then was, 'made,' many beautiful English verses. The young poet belonged to a well-to-do middle-class family who had many far-reaching connections, and even some influence with the court. . . . Even as a boy he may have heard his father, John Chaucer, the vintner of Thames Street, London, telling of the marvelous voyage he had made to Antwerp and Cologne in the brilliant suite of Edward III. in 1338. When a youth of sixteen or seventeen, Geoffrey served as a page or squire to Elizabeth, duchess of Ulster, first wife of Lionel, duke of Clarence, and daughter-in-law of the king. He bore arms when about nineteen years of age, and went to France in 1359, in the army commanded by Edward III. . . . This epoch formed a sort of 'Indian summer' to the age of chivalry, and its spirit found expression in great deeds of war as well as in the festivals and manners of the court. The ideal which men strove to realize did not quite correspond to the spirit of the former age. On the whole, people had become more worldly and practical, and were generally anxious to protect the real interests of life from the unwarranted interference of romantic aspirations. The spirit of chivalry no longer formed a fundamental element, but only an ornament of life—an ornament, indeed, which was made much of, and which was looked upon with a sentiment partaking of enthusiasm. . . . In the midst of this outside world of motley pomp and throbbing life Geoffrey could observe the doings of high and low in various situations. He was early initiated into court intrigues, and even into many political secrets, and found opportunities of studying the human type in numerous individuals and according to the varieties developed by rank in life, education, age, and sex. . . . Nothing has been preserved from his early writings. . . . The fact is very remarkable that from the first, or at least from a very early period, Chaucer wrote in the English language—however natural this may seem to succeeding ages in 'The Father of English Poetry.' The court of Edward III. favored the language as well as the literature of France; a considerable number of French poets and 'menestrels' were in the service and pay of the English king. Queen Philippa, in particular, showing herself in this a

true daughter of her native Hainault, formed the centre of a society cultivating the French language and poetry. She had in her personal service Jean Froissart, one of the most eminent representatives of that language and poetry; like herself he belonged to one of the most northern districts of the French-speaking territory; he had made himself a great name, as a prolific and clever writer of erotic and allegoric trifles, before he sketched out in his famous chronicle the motley-colored, vivid picture of that eventful age. We also see in this period young Englishmen of rank and education trying their flight on the French Parnassus. . . . To these Anglo-French poets there belonged also a Kentishman of noble family, named John Gower. Though some ten years the senior of Chaucer, he had probably met him about this time. They were certainly afterwards very intimately acquainted. Gower . . . had received a very careful education, and loved to devote the time he could spare from the management of his estates to study and poetry. His learning was in many respects greater than Chaucer's. He had studied the Latin poets so diligently that he could easily express himself in their language, and he was equally good at writing French verses, which were able to pass muster, at least in England. . . . But Chaucer did not let himself be led astray by examples such as these. It is possible that he would have found writing in French no easy task, even if he had attempted it. At any rate his bourgeois origin, and the seriousness of his vocation as poet, threw a determining weight into the scale and secured his fidelity to the English language with a commendable consistency."—B. Ten Brink, *Hist. of English Literature*, bk. 4, ch. 4 (v. 2, pt. 1).—"English was not taught in the schools, but French only, until after the accession of Richard II., or possibly the latter years of Edward III., and Latin was always studied through the French. Up to this period, then, as there were no standards of literary authority, and probably no written collections of established forms, or other grammatical essays, the language had no fixedness or uniformity, and hardly deserved to be called a written speech. . . . From this Babylonian confusion of speech, the influence and example of Chaucer did more to rescue his native tongue than any other single cause; and if we compare his dialect with that of any writer of an earlier date, we shall find that in compass, flexibility, expressiveness, grace, and all the higher qualities of poetical diction, he gave it at once the utmost perfection which the materials at his hand would permit of. The English writers of the fourteenth century had an advantage which was altogether peculiar to their age and country. At all previous periods, the two languages had co-existed, in a great degree independently of each other, with little tendency to intermix; but in the earlier part of that century, they began to coalesce, and this process was going on with a rapidity that threatened a predominance of the French, if not a total extinction of the Saxon element. . . . When the national spirit was aroused, and impelled to the creation of a national literature, the poet or prose writer, in selecting his diction, had almost two whole vocabularies before him. That the syntax should be English, national feeling demanded; but French was so familiar and habitual to all who were able to read, that probably the scholar-

ship of the day would scarcely have been able to determine, with respect to a large proportion of the words in common use, from which of the two great wells of speech they had proceeded. Happily, a great arbiter arose at the critical moment of severance of the two peoples and dialects, to preside over the division of the common property, and to determine what share of the contributions of France should be permanently annexed to the linguistic inheritance of Englishmen. Chaucer did not introduce into the English language words which it had rejected as aliens before, but out of those which had been already received, he invested the better portion with the rights of citizenship, and stamped them with the mint-mark of English coinage. In this way, he formed a vocabulary, which, with few exceptions, the taste and opinion of succeeding generations has approved; and a literary diction was thus established, which, in all the qualities required for the poetic art, had at that time no superior in the languages of modern Europe. The soundness of Chaucer's judgment, the nicety of his philological appreciation, and the delicacy of his sense of adaptation to the actual wants of the English people, are sufficiently proved by the fact that, of the Romance words found in his writings, not much above one hundred have been suffered to become obsolete, while a much larger number of Anglo-Saxon words employed by him have passed altogether out of use. . . . In the three centuries which elapsed between the Conquest and the noon-tide of Chaucer's life, a large proportion of the Anglo-Saxon dialect of religion, of moral and intellectual discourse, and of taste, had become utterly obsolete, and unknown. The place of the lost words had been partly supplied by the importation of Continental terms; but the new words came without the organic power of composition and derivation which belonged to those they had supplanted. Consequently, they were incapable of those modifications of form and extensions of meaning which the Anglo-Saxon roots could so easily assume, and which fitted them for the expression of the new shades of thought and of sentiment born of every hour in a mind and an age like those of Chaucer."—G. P. Marsh, *Origin and Hist. of the Eng. Lang.*, lect. 9.

ALSO IN: T. R. Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*.
—A. W. Ward, *Chaucer*.—W. Godwin, *Life of Geoffrey Chaucer*.

A. D. 1360-1414.—The Lollards.—"The Lollards were the earliest 'Protestants' of England. They were the followers of John Wyclif, but before his time the nickname of Lollard had been known on the continent. A little brotherhood of pious people had sprung up in Holland, about the year 1300, who lived in a half-monastic fashion and devoted themselves to helping the poor in the burial of their dead; and, from the low chants they sang at the funerals—*lollen* being the old word for such singing—they were called Lollards. The priests and friars hated them and accused them of heresy, and a Walter Lollard, probably one of them, was burnt in 1322 at Cologne as a heretic, and gradually the name became a nickname for such people. So when Wyclif's 'simple priests' were preaching the new doctrines, the name already familiar in Holland and Germany, was given to them, and gradually became the name for that whole movement of religious reformation which grew up from the seed Wyclif

sowed."—B. Herford, *Story of Religion in Eng.*, ch. 16.—"A turning point arrived in the history of the reforming party at the accession of the house of Lancaster. King Henry the Fourth was not only a devoted son of the Church, but he owed his success in no slight measure to the assistance of the Churchmen, and above all to that of Archbishop Arundel. It was felt that the new dynasty and the hierarchy stood or fell together. A mixture of religious and political motives led to the passing of the well-known statute 'De hæretico comburendo' in 1401 and thenceforward Lollardy was a capital offence."—R. L. Poole, *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform*, ch. 8.—"The abortive insurrection of the Lollards at the commencement of Henry V.'s reign, under the leadership of Sir John Oldcastle, had the effect of adding to the penal laws already in existence against the sect." This gave to Lollardy a political character and made the Lollards enemies against the State, as is evident from the king's proclamation in which it was asserted "that the insurgents intended to 'destroy him, his brothers and several of the spiritual and temporal lords, to confiscate the possessions of the Church, to secularize the religious orders, to divide the realm into confederate districts, and to appoint Sir John Oldcastle president of the commonwealth.'"—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist.* (4th ed.), ch. 11.—"The early life of Wycliffe is obscure. . . . He emerges into distinct notice in 1360, ten years subsequent to the passing of the first Statute of Provisors, having then acquired a great Oxford reputation as a lecturer in divinity. . . . He was a man of most simple life; austere in appearance, with bare feet and russet mantle. As a soldier of Christ, he saw in his Great Master and his Apostles the patterns whom he was bound to imitate. By the contagion of example he gathered about him other men who thought as he did; and gradually, under his captaincy, these 'poor priests' as they were called—vowed to poverty because Christ was poor—vowed to accept no benefice . . . spread out over the country as an army of missionaries, to preach the faith which they found in the Bible—to preach, not of relics and of indulgences, but of repentance and of the grace of God. They carried with them copies of the Bible which Wycliffe had translated, . . . and they refused to recognize the authority of the bishops, or their right to silence them. If this had been all, and perhaps if Edward III. had been succeeded by a prince less miserably incapable than his grandson Richard, Wycliffe might have made good his ground; the movement of the parliament against the pope might have united in a common stream with the spiritual move against the church at home, and the Reformation have been antedated by a century. He was summoned to answer for himself before the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1377. He appeared in court supported by the presence of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, the eldest of Edward's surviving sons, and the authorities were unable to strike him behind so powerful a shield. But the 'poor priests' had other doctrines. . . . His [Wycliffe's] theory of property, and his study of the character of Christ, had led him to the near confines of Anabaptism." The rebellion of Wat Tyler, which occurred in 1381, cast odium upon all such opinions. "So long as Wycliffe lived, his own lofty character was a guarantee for the conduct of his immediate dis-

ciples; and although his favour had far declined, a party in the state remained attached to him, with sufficient influence to prevent the adoption of extreme measures against the 'poor priests.' . . . They were left unmolested for the next twenty years. . . . On the settlement of the country under Henry IV. they fell under the general ban which struck down all parties who had shared in the late disturbances."—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 6.—"Wycliffe's translation of the Bible itself created a new era, and gave birth to what may be said never to have existed till then—a popular theology. . . . It is difficult in our day to imagine the impression such a book must have produced in an age which had scarcely anything in the way of popular literature, and which had been accustomed to regard the Scriptures as the special property of the learned. It was welcomed with an enthusiasm which could not be restrained, and read with avidity both by priests and laymen. . . . The homely wisdom, blended with eternal truth, which has long since enriched our vernacular speech with a multitude of proverbs, could not thenceforth be restrained in its circulation by mere pious awe or time-honoured prejudice. Divinity was discussed in ale-houses. Popular preachers made war upon old prejudices, and did much to shock that sense of reverence which belonged to an earlier generation. A new school had arisen with a theology of its own, warning the people against the delusive preaching of the friars, and asserting loudly its own claims to be true and evangelical, on the ground that it possessed the gospel in the English tongue. Appealing to such an authority in their favour, the eloquence of the new teachers made a marvellous impression. Their followers increased with extraordinary rapidity. By the estimate of an opponent they soon numbered half the population, and you could hardly see two persons in the street but one of them was a Wycliffite. . . . They were supported by the powerful influence of John of Gaunt, who shielded not only Wycliffe himself, but even the most violent of the fanatics. And, certainly, whatever might have been Wycliffe's own view, doctrines were promulgated by his reputed followers that were distinctly subversive of authority. John Ball fomented the insurrection of Wat Tyler, by preaching the natural equality of men. . . . But the popularity of Lollardy was short-lived. The extravagance to which it led soon alienated the sympathies of the people, and the sect fell off in numbers almost as rapidly as it had risen."—J. Gairdner, *Studies in Eng. Hist.*, 1-2.—"Wyclif . . . was not without numerous followers, and the Lollardism which sprang out of his teaching was a living force in England for some time to come. But it was weak through its connection with subversive social doctrines. He himself stood aloof from such doctrines, but he could not prevent his followers from mingling in the social fray. It was perhaps their merit that they did so. The established constitutional order was but another name for oppression and wrong to the lower classes. But as yet the lower classes were not sufficiently advanced in moral and political training to make it safe to entrust them with the task of righting their own wrongs as they would have attempted to right them if they had gained the mastery. It had nevertheless become impossible to leave the peasants to be once more goaded by suffering into rebellion. The attempt, if it had been made, to

enforce absolute labour-rents was tacitly abandoned, and gradually during the next century the mass of the villeins passed into the position of freemen. For the moment, nobles and prelates, landowners and clergy, banded themselves together to form one great party of resistance. The church came to be but an outwork of the baronage."—S. R. Gardiner and J. B. Mullinger, *Introd. to the Study of Eng. Hist.*, pt. 1, ch. 5, sect. 14-15.

ALSO IN: L. Sergeant, *John Wyclif*.—G. Lechler, *John Wyclif and his English Precursors*.—See, also, BOHEMIA; A. D. 1405-1415, and BEGUINES.

A. D. 1377.—Accession of King Richard II.

A. D. 1377-1399.—The character and reign of Richard II.—"Richard II. was a far superior man to many of the weaker kings of England; but being self-willed and unwarlike, he was unfitted for the work which the times required. Yet, on a closer inspection than the traditional view of the reign has generally encouraged, we cannot but observe that the finer qualities which came out in certain crises of his reign appear to have frequently influenced his conduct: we know that he was not an immoral man, that he was an excellent husband to an excellent wife, and that he had devoted friends, willing to lay down their lives for him when there was nothing whatever left for them to gain. . . . Richard, who had been brought up in the purple quite as much as Edward II., was kept under restraint by his uncles, and not being judiciously guided in the arts of government, fell, like his prototype, into the hands of favourites. His brilliant behaviour in the insurrection of 1381 indicated much more than mere possession of the Plantagenet courage and presence of mind. He showed a real sympathy with the villeins who had undeniable grievances. . . . His instincts were undoubtedly for freedom and forgiveness, and there is no proof, nor even probability, that he intended to use the villeins against his enemies. His early and happy marriage with Anne of Bohemia ought, one might think, to have saved him from the vice of favoritism; but he was at least more fortunate than Edward II. in not being cast under the spell of a Gaveston. When we consider the effect of such a galling government as that of his uncle Gloucester, and his cousin Derby, afterwards Henry IV., who seems to have been pushing Gloucester on from the first, we can hardly be surprised that he should require some friend to lean upon. The reign is, in short, from one, and perhaps the truest, point of view, a long duel between the son of the Black Prince and the son of John of Gaunt. One or other of them must inevitably perish. A handsome and cultivated youth, who showed himself at fifteen every inch a king, who was married at sixteen, and led his own army to Scotland at eighteen, required a different treatment from that which he received. He was a man, and should have been dealt with as such. His lavish and reprehensible grants to his favourites were made the excuse for Gloucester's violent interference in 1386, but there is good ground for believing that the movement was encouraged by the anti-Wicliffite party, which had taken alarm at the sympathy with the Reformers shown at this time by Richard and Anne."—M. Burrows, *Commentaries on the History of England*, bk. 2, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: J. R. Green, *Hist. of the English People*, bk. 4, ch. 4 (v. 1).—C. H. Pearson, *English Hist. in the 14th Cent'y*, ch. 10-12.

A. D. 1381.—Wat Tyler's Rebellion.—"In June 1381 there broke out in England the formidable insurrection known as Wat Tyler's Rebellion. The movement seems to have begun among the bondmen of Essex and of Kent; but it spread at once to the counties of Sussex, Hertford, Cambridge, Suffolk and Norfolk. The peasantry, armed with bludgeons and rusty swords, first occupied the roads by which pilgrims went to Canterbury, and made every one swear that he would be true to king Richard and not accept a king named John. This, of course, was aimed at the government of John of Gaunt [Duke of Lancaster], . . . to whom the people attributed every grievance they had to complain of. The principal, or at least the immediate cause of offence arose out of a poll-tax which had been voted in the preceding year."—J. Gairdner, *Houses of Lancaster and York*, ch. 2.—The leaders of the insurgents were Wat the Tyler, who had been a soldier, John Ball, a priest and preacher of democratic and socialistic doctrines, and one known as Jack Straw. They made their way to London. "It ought to have been easy to keep them out of the city, as the only approach to it was by London Bridge, and the mayor and chief citizens proposed to defend it. But the Londoners generally, and even three of the aldermen, were well inclined to the rebels, and declared that they would not let the gates be shut against their friends and neighbours, and would kill the mayor himself if he attempted to do it. So on the evening of Wednesday, June 13, the insurgents began to stream in across the bridge, and next morning marched their whole body across the river, and proceeded at once to the Savoy, the splendid palace of the Duke of Lancaster. Proclamation was made that any one found stealing the smallest article would be beheaded; and the place was then wrecked and burned with all the formalities of a solemn act of justice. Gold and silver plate was shattered with battle-axes and thrown into the Thames; rings and smaller jewels were brayed in mortars; silk and embroidered dresses were trampled under feet and torn up. Then the Temple was burned with all its muniments. The poet Gower was among the lawyers who had to save their lives by flight, and he passed several nights in the woods of Essex, covered with grass and leaves and living on acorns. Then the great house of the Hospitallers at Clerkenwell was destroyed, taking seven days to burn." The young king (Richard II.) and his court and council had taken refuge in the Tower. The insurgents now threatened to storm their stronghold if the king did not come out and speak to them. The king consented and appointed a rendezvous at Mile End. He kept the appointment and met his turbulent subjects with so much courage and tact and so many promises, that he persuaded a great number to disperse to their homes. But while this pacific interview took place, Wat Tyler, John Ball, and some 400 of their followers burst into the Tower, determined to find the archbishop of Canterbury and the Lord Treasurer, Sir Robert de Hales, who were the most obnoxious ministers. "So great was the general consternation that the soldiers dared not raise a hand while these ruffians searched the different rooms, not sparing even the king's bedroom, running spears into the beds, asked the king's mother to kiss them, and played insolent jokes

on the chief officers. Unhappily they were not long in finding the archbishop, who had said mass in the chapel, and was kneeling at the altar in expectation of their approach." The Lord Treasurer was also found, and both he and the archbishop were summarily beheaded by the mob. "Murder now became the order of the day, and foreigners were among the chief victims; thirteen Flemings were dragged out of one church and beheaded, seventeen out of another, and altogether it is said 400 perished. Many private enmities were revenged by the London rabble on this day." On the next day, June 15, the king, with an armed escort, went to the camp of the insurgents, at Smithfield, and opened negotiations with Tyler, offering successively three forms of a new charter of popular rights and liberties, all of which were rejected. Finally, Tyler was invited to a personal conference, and there, in the midst of the king's party, on some provocation or pretended provocation in his words or bearing, the popular leader was struck from his horse and killed. King Richard immediately rode out before the ranks of the rebels, while they were still dazed by the suddenness and audacity of the treacherous blow, crying "I will be your leader; follow me." The thoughtless mob followed and soon found itself surrounded by bodies of troops whose courage had revived. The king now commanded the trembling peasants "to fall on their knees, cut the strings of their bows, and leave the city and its neighbourhood, under pain of death, before nightfall. This command was instantly obeyed." Meantime and afterwards there were many lesser risings in various parts of the country, all of which were suppressed, with such rigorous prosecutions in the courts that 1,500 persons are said to have suffered judicially.—C. H. Pearson, *Eng. Hist. in the Fourteenth Century*, ch. 10.—The Wat Tyler insurrection proved disastrous in its effect on the work of Church reform which Wyclif was then pursuing. "Not only was the power of the Lancastrian party, on which Wyclif had relied, for the moment annihilated, but the quarrel between the Baronage and Church, on which his action had hitherto been grounded, was hushed in the presence of a common danger. Much of the odium of the outbreak, too, fell on the Reformer. . . . John Ball, who had figured in the front rank of the revolt, was claimed as one of his adherents. . . . Whatever belief such charges might gain, it is certain that from this moment all plans for the reorganization of the Church were confounded in the general odium which attached to the projects of the socialist peasant leaders."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the Eng. People*, ch. 5, sect. 3.—"When Parliament assembled it proved itself as hostile as the crown to the conceding any of the demands of the people; both were faithful to all the records of history in similar cases; they would have belied all experience if, being victorious, they had consented to the least concession to the vanquished. The upper classes repudiated the recognition of the rights of the poor to a degree, which in our time would be considered sheer insanity. The king had annulled, by proclamation to the sheriffs, the charters of manumission which he had granted to the insurgents, and this revocation was warmly approved by both Lords and Commons, who, not satisfied with saying that such

enfranchisement could not be made without their consent, added, that they would never give that consent, even to save themselves from perishing altogether in one day. There was, it is true, a vague rumour about the propriety and wisdom of abolishing villanage; but the notion was scouted, and the owners of serfs showed that they neither doubted the right by which they held their fellow-creatures in a state of slavery, nor would hesitate to increase the severity of the laws affecting them. They now passed a law by which 'all riots and rumours, and other such things were turned into high treason'; this law was most vaguely expressed, and would probably involve those who made it in inextricable difficulties. It was self-apparent, that this Parliament acted under the impulses of panic, and of revenge for recent injuries. . . . It might be said that the citizens of the municipalities wrote their charters of enfranchisement with the very blood of their lords and bishops; yet, during the worst days of oppression, the serfs of the cities had never suffered the cruel excesses of tyranny endured by the country people till the middle of the fifteenth century. And, nevertheless, the long struggles of the townships, despite the bloodshed and cruelties of the citizens, are ever considered and narrated as glorious revolutions, whilst the brief efforts of the peasants for vengeance, which were drowned in their own blood, have remained as a stigma flung in the face of the country populations whenever they utter a word claiming some amelioration in their condition. Whence the injustice? The bourgeoisie was victorious and successful. The rural populations were vanquished and trampled upon. The bourgeoisie, therefore, has had its poets, historians, and flatterers, whilst the poor peasant, rude, untutored, and ignorant, never had a lyre nor a voice to bewail his lamentable sorrows and sufferings."—Prof. De Vericour, *Wat Tyler* (*Royal Hist. Soc., Transactions*, n. s., v. 2).

ALSO IN: G. Lechler, *John Wyclif*, ch. 9, sect. 3.—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of England*, v. 2, ch. 1.

A. D. 1383.—The Bishop of Norwich's Crusade in Flanders. See FLANDERS: A. D. 1383.

A. D. 1388.—The Merciless or Wonderful Parliament. See PARLIAMENT, THE WONDERFUL.

A. D. 1399.—Accession of King Henry IV.

A. D. 1399-1471.—House of Lancaster.—This name is given in English history to the family which became royal in the person of Henry of Bolingbroke, Duke of Lancaster, who deposed his cousin, Richard II., or forced him to abdicate the throne, and who was crowned king (Henry IV.), Oct. 11, 1399, with what seemed to be the consent of the nation. He not only claimed to be the next in succession to Richard, but he put forward a claim of descent through his mother, more direct than Richard's had been, from Henry III. "In point of fact Henry was not the next in succession. His father, John of Gaunt [or John of Ghent, in which city he was born], was the fourth son of Edward III., and there were descendants of that king's third son, Lionel Duke of Clarence, living. . . . At one time Richard himself had designated as his successor the nobleman who really stood next to him in the line of descent. This was Roger Mortimer, Earl of March, the same who was killed by the rebels in

Ireland. This Roger had left a son Edmund to inherit his title, but Edmund was a mere child, and the inconvenience of another minority could not have been endured."—J. Gairdner, *Houses of Lancaster and York*, ch. 2.—As for Henry's pretensions through his mother, they were founded upon what Mr. Gairdner calls an "idle story," that "the eldest son of Henry III. was not king Edward, but his brother Edmund Crouchback, Earl of Lancaster, who was commonly reputed the second son; and that this Edmund had been purposely set aside on account of his personal deformity. The plain fact of the matter was that Edmund Crouchback was six years younger than his brother Edward I.; and that his surname Crouchback had not the smallest reference to personal deformity, but only implied that he wore the cross upon his back as a crusader." Mr. Wylie (*Hist. of Eng. under Henry IV.*, v. 1, ch. 1) represents that this latter claim was put forward under the advice of the leading jurists of the time, to give the appearance of a legitimate succession; whereas Henry took his real title from the will and assent of the nation. Henry IV. was succeeded by his vigorous son, Henry V. and he in turn by a feeble son, Henry VI., during whose reign England was torn by intrigues and factions, ending in the lamentable civil wars known as the "Wars of the Roses," the deposition of Henry VI. and the acquisition of the throne by the "House of York," in the persons of Edward IV. and Richard III. It was a branch of the House of Lancaster that reappeared, after the death of Richard III. in the royal family better known as the Tudors.

A. D. 1400-1436.—Relations with Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1400-1436.

A. D. 1402-1413.—Owen Glendower's Rebellion in Wales. See WALES: A. D. 1402-1413.

A. D. 1403.—Hotspur's Rebellion.—The earl of Northumberland and his son, Henry Percy, called "Hotspur," had performed great services for Henry IV., in establishing and maintaining him upon the throne. "At the outset of his reign their opposition would have been fatal to him; their adhesion ensured his victory. He had rewarded them with territory and high offices of trust, and they had by faithful services ever since increased their claims to gratitude and consideration. . . . Both father and son were high-spirited, passionate, suspicious men, who entertained an exalted sense of their own services and could not endure the shadow of a slight. Up to this time [early in 1403] not a doubt had been cast on their fidelity. Northumberland was still the king's chief agent in Parliament, his most valued commander in the field, his Mattathias. It has been thought that Hotspur's grudge against the king began with the notion that the release of his brother-in-law, Edmund Mortimer [taken prisoner, the year before, by the Welsh], had been neglected by the king, or was caused by Henry's claim to deal with the prisoners taken at Homildon; the defenders of the Percies alleged that they had been deceived by Henry in the first instance, and only needed to be persuaded that Richard lived in order to desert the king. It is more probable that they suspected Henry's friendship, and were exasperated by his compulsory economies. . . . Yet Henry seems to have conceived no suspicion. . . . Northumberland and Hotspur were writing for increased forces [for the war with Scotland]. . . . On the

10th of July Henry had reached Northamptonshire on his way northwards; on the 17th he heard that Hotspur with his uncle the earl of Worcester were in arms in Shropshire. They raised no cry of private wrongs, but proclaimed themselves the vindicators of national right: their object was to correct the evils of the administration, to enforce the employment of wise counsellors, and the proper expenditure of public money. . . . The report ran like wildfire through the west that Richard was alive, and at Chester. Hotspur's army rose to 14,000 men, and not suspecting the strength and promptness of the king, he sat down with his uncle and his prisoner, the earl of Douglas, before Shrewsbury. Henry showed himself equal to the need. From Burton-on-Trent, where on July 17 he summoned the forces of the shires to join him, he marched into Shropshire, and offered to parley with the insurgents. The earl of Worcester went between the camps, but he was either an impolitic or a treacherous envoy, and the negotiations ended in mutual exasperation. On the 21st the battle of Shrewsbury was fought; Hotspur was slain; Worcester was taken and beheaded two days after. The old earl, who may or may not have been cognizant of his son's intentions from the first, was now marching to his succour. The earl of Westmoreland, his brother-in-law, met him and drove him back to Warkworth. But all danger was over. On the 11th of August he met the king at York, and submitted to him."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 18, sect. 632.

Also in: J. H. Wylie, *Hist. of Eng. under Henry IV.*, v. 1, ch. 25.—W. Shakespeare, *King Henry IV.*, pt. 1.

A. D. 1413.—Accession of King Henry V.

A. D. 1413-1422.—Parliamentary gains under Henry V.—"What the sword had won the sword should keep, said Henry V. on his accession; but what was meant by the saying has its comment in the fact that, in the year which witnessed his victory at Agincourt, he yielded to the House of Commons the most liberal measure of legislation which until then it had obtained. The dazzling splendour of his conquests in France had for the time cast into the shade every doubt or question of his title, but the very extent of those gains upon the French soil established more decisively the worse than uselessness of such acquisitions to the English throne. The distinction of Henry's reign in constitutional history will always be, that from it dates that power, indispensable to a free and limited monarchy, called Privilege of Parliament; the shield and buckler under which all the battles of liberty and good government were fought in the after time. Not only were its leading safeguards now obtained, but at once so firmly established, that against the shock of incessant resistance in later years they stood perfectly unmoved. Of the awful right of impeachment, too, the same is to be said. It was won in the same reign, and was never afterwards lost."—J. Forster, *Hist. and Biog. Essays*, v. 1, p. 207.

A. D. 1415-1422.—Conquests of Henry V. in France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1415; and 1417-1422.

A. D. 1422.—Accession of King Henry VI.

A. D. 1431-1453.—Loss of English conquests and possessions in France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1431-1453, and AQUITAINE: A. D. 1360-1453.

A. D. 1450.—Cade's Rebellion.—A formidable rebellion broke out in Kent, under the leadership of one Jack Cade, A. D. 1450. Overtaxation, the bad management of the council, the extortion of the subordinate officers, the injustice of the king's bench, the abuse of the right of purveyance, the "enquestes" and amercedments, and the illegitimate control of elections were the chief causes of the rising of 1450. "The rising was mainly political, only one complaint was economical, not a single one was religious. We find not a single demand for new legislation. . . . The movement was by no means of a distinctly plebeian or disorderly character, but was a general and organized rising of the people at large. It was a political upheaval. We find no trace of socialism or of democracy. . . . The commons in 1450 arose against Lancaster and in favor of York. Their rising was the first great struggle in the Wars of the Roses."—Kriehn, *Rising in 1450, Ch. IV., VII.*—Cade and his rebels took possession of London; but they were beaten in a battle and forced to quit the city. Cade and some followers continued to be turbulent and soon afterwards he was killed.—J. Gairdner, *Houses of Lancaster and York, ch. 7, sect. 6.*

ALSO IN: C. M. Yonge, *Cumeos from Eng. Hist., 3d series, c. 7.*

A. D. 1455.—Demoralized state of the nation.—**Effects of the wars in France.**—"The whole picture of the times is very depressing on the moral if not on the material side. There are few more pitiful episodes in history than the whole tale of the reign of Henry VI., the most unselfish and well-intentioned king that ever sat upon the English throne—a man of whom not even his enemies and oppressors could find an evil word to say; the troubles came, as they confessed, 'all because of his false lords, and never of him.' We feel that there must have been something wrong with the heart of a nation that could see unmoved the meek and holy king torn from wife and child, sent to wander in disguise up and down the kingdom for which he had done his poor best, and finally doomed to pine for five years a prisoner in the fortress where he had so long held his royal Court. Nor is our first impression concerning the demoralisation of England wrong. Every line that we read bears home to us more and more the fact that the nation had fallen on evil times. First and foremost among the causes of its moral deterioration was the wretched French War, a war begun in the pure spirit of greed and ambition,—there was not even the poor excuse that had existed in the time of Edward III.—carried on by the aid of hordes of debauched foreign mercenaries . . . and persisted in long after it had become hopeless, partly from misplaced national pride, partly because of the personal interests of the ruling classes. Thirty-five years of a war that was as unjust as it was unfortunate had both soured and demoralised the nation. . . . When the final catastrophe came and the fights of Formigny [or Fourmigny] and Chatillon [Castillon] ended the chapter of our disasters, the nation began to cast about for a scapegoat on whom to lay the burden of its failures. . . . At first the unfortunate Suffolk and Somerset had the responsibility laid upon them. A little later the outcry became more bold and fixed upon the Lancastrian dynasty itself as being to blame not only for disaster abroad, but for want of governance at home. If King Henry had understood

the charge, and possessed the wit to answer it, he might fairly have replied that his subjects must fit the burden upon their own backs, not upon his. The war had been weakly conducted, it was true; but weakly because the men and money for it were grudged. . . . At home, the bulwarks of social order seemed crumbling away. Private wars, riot, open highway robbery, murder, abduction, armed resistance to the law, prevailed on a scale that had been unknown since the troublous times of Edward II.—we might almost say since the evil days of Stephen. But it was not the Crown alone that should have been blamed for the state of the realm. The nation had chosen to impose over-stringent constitutional checks on the kingly power before it was ripe for self-government, and the Lancastrian house sat on the throne because it had agreed to submit to those checks. If the result of the experiment was disastrous, both parties to the contract had to bear their share of the responsibility. But a nation seldom allows that it has been wrong; and Henry of Windsor had to serve as a scapegoat for all the misfortunes of the realm, because Henry of Bolingbroke had committed his descendants to the unhappy compact. Want of a strong central government was undoubtedly the complaint under which England was labouring in the middle of the 15th century, and all the grievances against which outcry was made were but symptoms of one latent disease. . . . All these public troubles would have been of comparatively small importance if the heart of the nation had been sound. The phenomenon which makes the time so depressing is the terrible decay in private morals since the previous century. . . . There is no class or caste in England which comes well out of the scrutiny. The Church, which had served as the conscience of the nation in better times, had become dead to spiritual things. It no longer produced either men of saintly life or learned theologians or patriotic statesmen. . . . The baronage of England had often been unruly, but it had never before developed the two vices which distinguished it in the times of the Two Roses—a taste for indiscriminate bloodshed and a turn for political apostasy. . . . Twenty years spent in contact with French factions, and in command of the godless mercenaries who formed the bulk of the English armies, had taught our nobles lessons of cruelty and faithlessness such as they had not before imbibed. . . . The knights and squires showed on a smaller scale all the vices of the nobility. Instead of holding together and maintaining a united loyalty to the Crown, they bound themselves by solemn sealed bonds and the reception of 'liveries' each to the baron whom he preferred. This fatal system, by which the smaller landholder agreed on behalf of himself and his tenants to follow his greater neighbour in peace and war, had ruined the military system of England, and was quite as dangerous as the ancient feudalism. . . . If the gentry constituted themselves the voluntary followers of the baronage, and aided their employers to keep England unhappy, the class of citizens and burgesses took a very different line of conduct. If not actively mischievous, they were solidly inert. They refused to entangle themselves in politics at all. They submitted impassively to each ruler in turn, when they had ascertained that their own persons and property were not endangered by so doing. A town, it has been remarked, seldom or never

stood a siege during the Wars of the Roses, for no town ever refused to open its gates to any commander with an adequate force who asked for entrance."—C. W. Oman, *Warwick the King-maker*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1455-1471.—The Wars of the Roses.—Beginning with a battle fought at St. Albans on the 23d of May, 1455, England was kept in a pitiable state of civil war, with short intervals of troubled peace, during thirty years. The immediate cause of trouble was in the feebleness of King Henry VI., who succeeded to the throne while an infant, and whose mind, never strong, gave way under the trials of his position when he came to manhood. The control of the government, thus weakly commanded, became a subject of strife between successive factions. The final leaders in such contests were Queen Margaret of Anjou, the energetic consort of the helpless king (with the king himself sometimes in a condition of mind to cooperate with her), on one side, and, on the other side, the Duke of York, who traced his lineage to Edward III., and who had strong claims to the throne if Henry should leave no heir. The battle at St. Albans was a victory for the Yorkists and placed them in power for the next two years, the Duke of York being named Protector. In 1456 the king recovered so far as to resume the reigns of government, and in 1459 there was a new rupture between the factions. The queen's adherents were beaten in the battle of Bloreheath, Sept. 23d of that year; but defections in the ranks of the Yorkists soon obliged the latter to disperse and their leaders, York, Warwick and Salisbury, fled to Ireland and to Calais. In June, 1460, the earls of Warwick, Salisbury and March (the latter being the eldest son of the Duke of York) returned to England and gathered an army speedily, the city of London opening its gates to them. The king's forces were defeated at Northampton (July 10) and the king taken prisoner. A parliament was summoned and assembled in October. Then the Duke of York came over from Ireland, took possession of the royal palace and laid before parliament a solemn claim to the crown. After much discussion a compromise was agreed upon, under which Henry VI. should reign undisturbed during his life and the Duke of York should be his undisputed successor. This was embodied in an act of parliament and received the assent of the king; but queen Margaret who had retired into the north, refused to surrender the rights of her infant son, and a strong party sustained her. The Duke of York attacked these Lancastrian forces rashly, at Wakefield, Dec. 30, 1460, and was slain on the field of a disastrous defeat. The queen's army, then, marching towards London, defeated the Earl of Warwick at St. Albans, Feb. 17, 1461 (the second battle of the war at that place), and recovered possession of the person of the king. But Edward, Earl of March (now become Duke of York, by the death of his father), who had just routed a Lancastrian force at Mortimer's Cross, in Wales, joined his forces with those of Warwick and succeeded in occupying London, which steadily favored his cause. Calling together a council of lords, Edward persuaded them to declare King Henry deposed, on the ground that he had broken the agreement made with the late Duke of York. The next step was to elect Edward king, and he assumed the royal title and state at once. The new king lost no

time in marching northwards against the army of the deposed sovereign, which lay near York. On the 27th of March the advanced division of the Lancastrians was defeated at Ferrybridge, and, two days later, their main body was almost destroyed in the fearful battle of Towton, — said to have been the bloodiest encounter that ever took place on English soil. King Henry took refuge in Scotland and Queen Margaret repaired to France. In 1464 Henry reappeared in the north with a body of Scots and refugees and there were risings in his favor in Northumberland, which the Yorkists crushed in the successive battles of Hedgeley Moor and Hexham. The Yorkist king (Edward IV.) now reigned without much disturbance until 1470, when he quarreled with the powerful Earl of Warwick — the "king-maker," whose strong hand had placed him on the throne. Warwick then passed to the other side, offering his services to Queen Margaret and leading an expedition which sailed from Harfleur in September, convoyed by a French fleet. Edward found himself unprepared to resist the Yorkist risings which welcomed Warwick and he fled to Holland, seeking aid from his brother-in-law, the Duke of Burgundy. For nearly six months, the kingdom was in the hands of Warwick and the Lancastrians; the unfortunate Henry VI., released from captivity in the Tower, was once more seated on the throne. But on the 14th of March, 1471, Edward reappeared in England, landing at Ravenspur, professing that he came only to recover his dukedom of York. As he moved southwards he gathered a large force of supporters and soon reassumed the royal title and pretensions. London opened its gates to him, and, on the 14th of April — exactly one month after his landing — he defeated his opponents at Barnet, where Warwick, "the king-maker" — the last of the great feudal barons — was slain. Henry, again a captive, was sent back to the Tower. But Henry's dauntless queen, who landed at Weymouth, with a body of French allies on the very day of the disastrous Barnet fight, refused to submit. Cornwall and Devon were true to her cause and gave her an army with which she fought the last battle of the war at Tewksbury on the 4th of May. Defeated and taken prisoner, her young son slain — whether in the battle or after it is unknown — the long contention of Margaret of Anjou ended on that bloody field. A few days later, when the triumphant Yorkist King Edward entered London, his poor, demented Lancastrian rival died suddenly and suspiciously in the Tower. The two parties in the long contention had each assumed the badge of a rose — the Yorkists a white rose, the Lancastrians a red one. Hence the name of the Wars of the Roses. "As early as the time of John of Ghent, the rose was used as an heraldic emblem, and when he married Blanche, the daughter of the Duke of Lancaster, he used the red rose for a device. Edmund of Langley, his brother, the fifth son of Edward III., adopted the white rose in opposition to him; and their followers afterwards maintained these distinctions in the bloody wars of the fifteenth century. There is, however, no authentic account of the precise period when these badges were first adopted."—Mrs. Hookham, *Life and Times of Margaret of Anjou*, v. 2, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: J. Gairdner, *Houses of Lancaster and York*.—Sir J. Ramsay, *Lancaster and York*.

—C. W. Oman, *Warwick, the King-maker*, ch. 5-17.—See, also, TOWTON, BARNET, and TEWKSBURY.

The effects of the Wars of the Roses.—"It is astonishing to observe the rapidity with which it [the English nation] had settled down to order in the reign of Henry VII. after so many years of civil dissension. It would lead us to infer that those wars were the wars of a class, and not of the nation; and that the effects of them have been greatly exaggerated. With the single exception of Cade's rebellion, they had nothing in common with the revolutions of later or earlier times. They were not wars against classes, against forms of government, against the order or the institutions of the nation. It was the rivalry of two aristocratic factions struggling for superiority, neither of them hoping or desiring, whichever obtained the upper hand, to introduce momentous changes in the State or its administration. The main body of the people took little interest in the struggle; in the towns at least there was no intermission of employment. The war passed over the nation, ruffling the surface, toppling down high cliffs here and there, washing away ancient landmarks, attracting the imagination of the spectator by the mightiness of its waves, and the noise of its thunders; but the great body below the surface remained unmoved. No famines, no plagues, consequent on the intermittance of labour caused by civil war, are recorded; even the prices of land and provisions scarcely varied more than they have been known to do in times of profoundest peace. But the indirect and silent operation of these conflicts was much more remarkable. It reft into fragments the confederated ranks of a powerful territorial aristocracy, which had hitherto bid defiance to the King, however popular, however energetic. Henceforth the position of the Sovereign in the time of the Tudors, in relation to all classes of the people, became very different from what it had been: the royal supremacy was no longer a theory, but a fact. Another class had sprung up on the decay of the ancient nobility. The great towns had enjoyed uninterrupted tranquility, and even flourished, under the storm that was scourging the aristocracy and the rural districts. Their population had increased by numbers whom fear or the horrors of war had induced to find shelter behind stone walls. The diminution of agricultural labourers converted into soldiers by the folly of their lords had turned corn-lands into pasture, requiring less skill, less capital, and less labour."—J. S. Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, v. 1, ch. 2.—"Those who would estimate the condition of England aright should remember that the War of the Roses was only a repetition on a large scale of those private wars which distracted almost every county, and, indeed, by taking away all sense of security, disturbed almost every manor and every class of society during the same century. . . . The lawless condition of English society in the 15th century resembled that of Ireland in as recent a date as the beginning of the 19th century. . . . In both countries women were carried off, sometimes at night; they were first violated, then dragged to the altar in their night-dress and compelled to marry their captors. . . . Children were seized and thrown into a dungeon until ransomed by their parents."—W. Denton, *England in the 15th Century*, ch. 3.—"The Wars of the Roses which

filled the second half of the 15th century furnished the barons with an arena in which their instincts of violence had freer play than ever; it was they who, under the pretext of dynastic interests which had ceased to exist, of their own free choice prolonged the struggle. Altogether unlike the Italian condottieri, the English barons showed no mercy to their own order; they massacred and exterminated each other freely, while they were careful to spare the commonalty. Whole families were extinguished or submerged in the nameless mass of the nation, and their estates by confiscation or escheat helped to swell the royal domain. When Henry VII. had stifled the last movements of rebellion and had punished, through the Star Chamber, those nobles who were still suspected of maintaining armed bands, the baronage was reduced to a very low ebb; not more than twenty-nine lay peers were summoned by the king to his first Parliament. The old Norman feudal nobility existed no longer; the heroic barons of the great charter barely survived in the persons of a few doubtful descendants; their estates were split up or had been forfeited to the Crown. A new class came forward to fill the gap, that rural middle class which was formed . . . by the fusion of the knights with the free landowners. It had already taken the lead in the House of Commons, and it was from its ranks that Henry VII. chose nearly all the new peers. A peerage renewed almost throughout, ignorant of the habits and traditions of the earlier nobility, created in large batches, closely dependent on the monarch who had raised it from little or nothing and who had endowed it with his bounty—this is the phenomenon which confronts us at the end of the fifteenth century."

—E. Boutmy, *The English Constitution*, ch. 5.

A. D. 1461.—Accession of King Edward IV.
A. D. 1461-1485.—House of York.—The House of York, which triumphed in the Wars of the Roses, attaining the throne in the person of Edward IV. (A. D. 1461), derived its claim to the crown through descent, in the female line, from Lionel, Duke of Clarence, the third son of Edward III. (the second son who lived to manhood and left children); while the House of Lancaster traced its lineage to John of Gaunt, a younger son of the same king Edward III., but the line of Lancastrian succession was through males. "Had the crown followed the course of hereditary succession, it would have devolved on the posterity of Lionel. . . . By the decease of that prince without male issue, his possessions and pretensions fell to his daughter Philippa, who by a singular combination of circumstances had married Roger Mortimer earl of March, the male representative of the powerful baron who was attainted and executed for the murder of Edward II., the grandfather of the duke of Clarence. The son of that potent delinquent had been restored to his honours and estates at an advanced period in the reign of Edward III. . . . Edmund, his grandson, had espoused Philippa of Clarence. Roger Mortimer, the fourth in descent from the regicide, was lord Lieutenant of Ireland and was considered, or, according to some writers, declared to be heir of the crown in the early part of Richard's reign. Edmund Mortimer, earl of March, in whom the hereditary claim to the crown was vested at the deposition of Richard, was then only an infant of ten years of age. . . . Dying without issue, the preten-

sions to the crown, which he inherited through the duke of Clarence, devolved on his sister Anne Mortimer, who espoused Richard of York earl of Cambridge, the grandson of Edward III. by his fourth [fifth] son Edmund of Langley duke of York." Edward IV. was the grandson of this Anne Mortimer and Richard of York.—Sir J. Mackintosh, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 1, pp. 338-339.—The House of York occupied the throne but twenty-four years. On the death of Edward IV., in 1483, the crown was secured by his brother, Richard, duke of Gloucester, who caused Edward's two sons to be murdered in the Tower. The elder of these murdered princes is named in the list of English kings as Edward V.; but he cannot be said to have reigned. Richard III. was overthrown and slain on Bosworth field in 1485.

A. D. 1471-1485.—The New Monarchy.—The rise of Absolutism and the decline of Parliamentary government.—"If we use the name of the New Monarchy to express the character of the English sovereignty from the time of Edward IV. to the time of Elizabeth, it is because the character of the monarchy during this period was something wholly new in our history. There is no kind of similarity between the kingship of the Old English, of the Norman, the Angevin, or the Plantagenet sovereigns, and the kingship of the Tudors. . . . What the Great Rebellion in its final result actually did was to wipe away every trace of the New Monarchy, and to take up again the thread of our political development just where it had been snapped by the Wars of the Roses. . . . The founder of the New Monarchy was Edward IV. . . . While jesting with aldermen, or dallying with his mistresses, or idling over the new pages from the printing press [Caxton's] at Westminster, Edward was silently laying the foundations of an absolute rule which Henry VII. did little more than develop and consolidate. The almost total discontinuance of Parliamentary life was in itself a revolution. Up to this moment the two Houses had played a part which became more and more prominent in the government of the realm. . . . Under Henry VI. an important step in constitutional progress had been made by abandoning the old form of presenting the requests of the Parliament in the form of petitions which were subsequently moulded into statutes by the Royal Councils; the statute itself, in its final form, was now presented for the royal assent, and the Crown was deprived of its former privilege of modifying it. Not only does this progress cease, but the legislative activity of Parliament itself comes abruptly to an end. . . . The necessity for summoning the two Houses had, in fact, been removed by the enormous tide of wealth which the confiscation of the civil war poured into the royal treasury. . . . It was said that nearly a fifth of the land had passed into the royal possession at one period or another of the civil war. Edward added to his resources by trading on a vast scale. . . . The enterprises he had planned against France . . . enabled Edward not only to increase his hoard, but to deal a deadly blow at liberty. Setting aside the usage of loans sanctioned by the authority of Parliament, Edward called before him the merchants of the city and requested from each a present or benevolence in proportion to the need. Their compliance with his prayer was probably aided by his popularity

with the merchant class; but the system of benevolence was soon to be developed into the forced loans of Wolsey and the ship-money of Charles I."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the Eng. People*, ch. 6, sect. 3.

ALSO IN: W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 18, sect. 696.

A. D. 1474.—Treaty with the Hanseatic League. See HANSA TOWNS.

A. D. 1476.—Introduction of Printing by Caxton. See PRINTING, &c.: A. D. 1476-1491.

A. D. 1483-1485.—Murder of the young king, Edward V.—Accession of Richard III.—The battle of Bosworth and the fall of the House of York.—On the death of Edward IV., in 1483, his crafty and unscrupulous brother, Richard, Duke of Gloucester, gathered quickly into his hands the reins of power, proceeding with consummate audacity and ruthlessness to sweep every strong rival out of his path. Contenting himself for a few weeks, only, with the title of Protector, he soon disputed the validity of his brother Edward's marriage, caused an obsequious Parliament to set aside the young sons whom the latter had left, declaring them to be illegitimate, and placed the crown on his own head. The little princes (King Edward V., and Richard, Duke of York), immured in the Tower, were murdered presently at their uncle's command, and Richard III. appeared, for the time, to have triumphed in his ambitious villainy. But, popular as he made himself in many cunning ways, his deeds excited a horror which united Lancastrians with the party of York in a common detestation. Friends of Henry, Earl of Richmond, then in exile, were not slow to take advantage of this feeling. Henry could claim descent from the same John of Gaunt, son of Edward III., to whom the House of Lancaster traced its lineage; but his family—the Beauforts—sprang from the mistress, not the wife, of the great Duke of Lancaster, and had only been legitimated by act of Parliament. The Lancastrians, however, were satisfied with the royalty of his blood, and the Yorkists were made content by his promise to marry a daughter of Edward IV. On this understanding being arranged, Henry came over from Brittany to England, landing at Milford Haven on the 7th or 8th of August, 1485, and advancing through Wales, being joined by great numbers as he moved. Richard, who had no lack of courage, marched quickly to meet him, and the two forces joined battle on Bosworth Field, in Leicestershire, on Sunday, Aug. 21. At the outset of the fighting Richard was deserted by a large division of his army and saw that his fate was sealed. He plunged, with despairing rage, into the thickest of the struggle and was slain. His crowned helmet, which he had worn, was found by Sir Reginald Bray, battered and broken, under a hawthorn bush, and placed on the head of his rival, who soon attained a more solemn coronation, as Henry VII.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, 3d Series, c. 19-20.—"I must record my impression that a minute study of the facts of Richard's life has tended more and more to convince me of the general fidelity of the portrait with which we have been made familiar by Shakespeare and Sir Thomas More. I feel quite ashamed, at this day, to think how I mused over this subject long ago, wasting a great deal of time, ink and paper, in fruitless efforts to satisfy

even my own mind that traditional black was real historical white, or at worst a kind of grey. . . . Both the character and personal appearance of Richard III. have furnished matter of controversy. But with regard to the former the day has now gone by when it was possible to doubt the evidence at least of his principal crime; and that he was regarded as a tyrant by his subjects seems almost equally indisputable. At the same time he was not destitute of better qualities. . . . As king he seems really to have studied his country's welfare, passed good laws, endeavoured to put an end to extortion, declined the free gifts offered to him by several towns, and declared he would rather have the hearts of his subjects than their money. His munificence was especially shown in religious foundations. . . . His hypocrisy was not of the vulgar kind which seeks to screen habitual baseness of motive by habitual affectation of virtue. His best and his worst deeds were alike too well known to be either concealed or magnified; at least, soon after he became king, all doubt upon the subject must have been removed. . . . His ingratiating manners, together with the liberality of his disposition, seem really to have mitigated to a considerable extent the alarms created by his fitful deeds of violence. The reader will not require to be reminded of Shakespeare's portrait of a murderer who could cajole the woman whom he had most exasperated and made a widow into marrying himself. That Richard's ingenuity was equal to this extraordinary feat we do not venture to assert; but that he had a wonderful power of reassuring those whom he had most intimidated and deceiving those who knew him best there can be very little doubt. . . . His taste in building was magnificent and princely. . . . There is scarcely any evidence of Richard's [alleged] deformity to be derived from original portraits. The number of portraits of Richard which seem to be contemporary is greater than might have been expected. . . . The face in all the portraits is a remarkable one, full of energy and decision, yet gentle and sad-looking, suggesting the idea not so much of a tyrant as of a mind accustomed to unpleasant thoughts. Nowhere do we find depicted the warlike hard-favoured visage attributed to him by Sir Thomas More. . . . With such a one did the long reign of the Plantagenets terminate. The fierce spirit and the valour of the race never showed more strongly than at the close. The Middle Ages, too, as far as England was concerned, may be said to have passed away with Richard III."—J. Gairdner, *History of the Life and Reign of Richard The Third*, introd. and ch. 6.

A. D. 1485.—Accession of King Henry VII.

A. D. 1485-1528.—The Sweating Sickness. See SWEATING SICKNESS.

A. D. 1485-1603.—The Tudors.—The Tudor family, which occupied the English throne from the accession of Henry VII., 1485, until the death of Elizabeth, 1603, took its name, but not its royal lineage, from Sir Owen Tudor, a handsome Welsh chieftain, who won the heart and the hand of the young widow of Henry V., Catherine of France. The eldest son of that marriage, made Earl of Richmond, married in his turn Margaret Beaufort, great-granddaughter to John of Gaunt, or Ghent, who was one of the sons of Edward III. From this latter union came Henry of Richmond, as he was known, who disputed

the crown with Richard III. and made his claim good on Bosworth Field, where the hated Richard was killed. Henry's pretensions were based on the royal descent of his mother—derived, however, through John of Gaunt's mistress—and the dynasty which he founded was closely related in origin to the Lancastrian line. Henry of Richmond strengthened his hold upon the crown, though not his title to it, by marrying Elizabeth, daughter of Edward IV., thus joining the white rose to the red. He ascended the throne as Henry VII., A. D. 1485; was succeeded by his son, Henry VIII., in 1509, and the latter by his three children, in order as follows: Edward VI., 1547; Mary, 1553; Elizabeth, 1558. The Tudor family became extinct on the death of Queen Elizabeth, in 1603. "They [the Tudors] reigned in England, without a successful rising against them, for upwards of a hundred years; but not more by a studied avoidance of what might so provoke the country, than by the most resolute repression of every effort, on the part of what remained of the peerage and great families, to make head against the throne. They gave free indulgence to their tyranny only within the circle of the court, while they unceasingly watched and conciliated the temper of the people. The work they had to do, and which by more scrupulous means was not possible to be done, was one of paramount necessity; the dynasty uninterruptedly endured for only so long as was requisite to its thorough completion; and to each individual sovereign the particular task might seem to have been specially assigned. It was Henry's to spurn, renounce and utterly cast off, the Pope's authority, without too suddenly revolting the people's usages and habits; to arrive at blessed results by ways that a better man might have held to be accursed; during the momentous change in progress to keep in necessary check both the parties it affected; to persecute with an equal hand the Romanist and the Lutheran; to send the Protestant to the stake for resisting Popery, and the Roman Catholic to the scaffold for not admitting himself to be Pope; while he meantime plundered the monasteries, hunted down and rooted out the priests, alienated the abbey lands, and glutted himself and his creatures with that enormous spoil. It was Edward's to become the ready and undoubting instrument of Cranmer's design, and, with all the inexperience and more than the obstinacy of youth, so to force upon the people his compromise of doctrine and observance, as to render possible, even perhaps unavoidable, his elder sister's reign. It was Mary's to undo the effect of that precipitate eagerness of the Reformers, by lighting the fires of Smithfield; and opportunely to arrest the waverers from Protestantism, by exhibiting in their excess the very worst vices, the cruel bigotry, the hateful intolerance, the spiritual slavery, of Rome. It was Elizabeth's finally and forever to uproot that slavery from amongst us, to champion all over the world a new and nobler faith, and immovably to establish in England the Protestant religion."—J. Forster, *Hist. and Biog. Essays*, pp. 221-222.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner and J. B. Mullinger, *Introd. to the Study of Eng. Hist.*, ch. 6.—C. E. Moberly, *The Early Tudors*.

A. D. 1487-1497.—The Rebellions of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck.—Although Henry VII., soon after he attained the throne,

married Elizabeth of York, daughter of Edward IV., and thus united the two rival houses, the Yorkists were discontented with his rule. "With the help of Margaret of Burgundy, Edward IV.'s sister, and James IV. of Scotland, they actually set up two impostors, one after the other, to claim the throne. There was a real heir of the House of York still alive— young Edward, Earl of Warwick [son of the Duke of Clarence, brother to Edward IV.], . . . and Henry had taken the precaution to keep him in the Tower. But in 1487 a sham Earl of Warwick appeared in Ireland, and being supported by the Earl of Kildare, was actually crowned in Dublin Cathedral. Henry soon put down the imposture by showing the real earl to the people of London, and defeating the army of the pretended earl at Stoke, near Newark, June, 1487. He proved to be a lad named Lambert Simnel, the son of a joiner at Oxford, and he became a scullion in the king's kitchen." In 1492 another pretender of like character was brought forward. "A young man, called Perkin Warbeck, who proved afterwards to be a native of Tournay, pretended that he was Richard, Duke of York, the younger of the two little princes in the Tower, and that he had escaped when his brother Edward V. was murdered. He persuaded the king of France and Margaret of Burgundy to acknowledge him, and was not only received at the foreign courts, but, after failing in Ireland, he went to Scotland, where James IV. married him to his own cousin Catharine Gordon, and helped him to invade England in 1496. The invasion was defeated however, by the Earl of Surrey, and then Perkin went back to Ireland, where the people had revolted against the heavy taxes. There he raised an army and marched to Exeter, but meeting the king's troops at Taunton, he lost courage, and fled to the Abbey of Beaulieu, where he was taken prisoner, and sent to the Tower in 1497." In 1501 both Perkin Warbeck and the young Earl of Warwick were executed.—A. B. Buckley, *Hist. of Eng. for Beginners*, ch. 13.

ALSO IN: J. Gairdner, *Story of Perkin Warbeck* (app. to *Life of Richard III.*).—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, 3d series, c. 21 and 24.—J. Gairdner, *Henry VII.*, ch. 4 and 7.

15th-16th Centuries.—The Renaissance.—Life in "Merry England."—Preludes to the Elizabethan Age of literature.—"Toward the close of the fifteenth century . . . commerce and the woollen trade made a sudden advance, and such an enormous one that corn-fields were changed into pasture-lands, 'whereby the inhabitants of the said town (Manchester) have gotten and come into riches and wealthy livings,' so that in 1553, 40,000 pieces of cloth were exported in English ships. It was already the England which we see to-day, a land of meadows, green, intersected by hedgerows, crowded with cattle, abounding in ships, a manufacturing, opulent land, with a people of beef-eating toilers, who enrich it while they enrich themselves. They improved agriculture to such an extent, that in half a century the produce of an acre was doubled. They grew so rich, that at the beginning of the reign of Charles I. the Commons represented three times the wealth of the Upper House. The ruin of Antwerp by the Duke of Parma sent to England 'the third part of the merchants and manufacturers, who made silk, damask, stockings, taffetas, and serges.' The defeat of the Armada

and the decadence of Spain opened the seas to their merchants. The toiling hive, who would dare, attempt, explore, act in unison, and always with profit, was about to reap its advantages and set out on its voyages, buzzing over the universe. At the base and on the summit of society, in all ranks of life, in all grades of human condition, this new welfare became visible. . . . It is not when all is good, but when all is better, that they see the bright side of life, and are tempted to make a holiday of it. This is why at this period they did make a holiday of it, a splendid show, so like a picture that it fostered painting in Italy, so like a representation, that it produced the drama in England. Now that the battle-axe and sword of the civil wars had beaten down the independent nobility, and the abolition of the law of maintenance had destroyed the petty royalty of each great feudal baron, the lords quitted their sombre castles, battlemented fortresses, surrounded by stagnant water, pierced with narrow windows, a sort of stone breast-plates of no use but to preserve the life of their masters. They flock into new palaces, with vaulted roofs and turrets, covered with fantastic and manifold ornaments, adorned with terraces and vast staircases, with gardens, fountains, statues, such as were the palaces of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, half Gothic and half Italian, whose convenience, grandeur, and beauty announced already habits of society and the taste for pleasure. They came to court and abandoned their old manners; the four meals which scarcely sufficed their former voracity were reduced to two; gentlemen soon became refined, placing their glory in the elegance and singularity of their amusements and their clothes. . . . To vent the feelings, to satisfy the heart and eyes, to set free boldly on all the roads of existence the pack of appetites and instincts, this was the craving which the manners of the time betrayed. It was 'merry England,' as they called it then. It was not yet stern and constrained. It expanded widely, freely, and rejoiced to find itself so expanded. No longer at court only was the drama found but in the village. Strolling companies betook themselves thither, and the country folk supplied any deficiencies when necessary. Shakespeare saw, before he depicted them, stupid fellows, carpenters, joiners, bellow-menders, play Pyramus and Thisbe, represent the lion roaring as gently as possible, and the wall, by stretching out their hands. Every holiday was a pageant, in which townspeople, workmen, and children bore their parts. . . . A few sectarians, chiefly in the towns and of the people, clung gloomily to the Bible. But the court and the men of the world sought their teachers and their heroes from pagan Greece and Rome. About 1490 they began to read the classics; one after the other they translated them; it was soon the fashion to read them in the original. Elizabeth, Jane Grey, the Duchess of Norfolk, the Countess of Arundel, many other ladies, were conversant with Plato, Xenophon, and Cicero in the original, and appreciated them. Gradually, by an insensible change, men were raised to the level of the great and healthy minds who had freely handled ideas of all kinds fifteen centuries ago. They comprehended not only their language, but their thought; they did not repeat lessons from, but held conversations with them; they were their equals, and found in them intellects as manly as their own. . . .

Across the train of hooded schoolmen and sordid cavillers the two adult and thinking ages were united, and the moderns, silencing the infantine or snuffling voices of the middle-age, condescended only to converse with the noble ancients. They accepted their gods, at least they understand them, and keep them by their side. In poems, festivals, tapestries, almost all ceremonies they appear, not restored by pedantry merely, but kept alive by sympathy, and glorified by the arts of an age as flourishing and almost as profound as that of their earliest birth. After the terrible night of the middle-age, and the dolorous legends of spirits and the damned, it was a delight to see again Olympus shining upon us from Greece; its heroic and beautiful deities once more ravishing the heart of men, they raised and instructed this young world by speaking to it the language of passion and genius; and the age of strong deeds, free sensuality, bold invention, had only to follow its own bent, in order to discover in them the eternal promoters of liberty and beauty. Nearer still was another paganism, that of Italy; the more seductive because more modern, and because it circulates fresh sap in an ancient stock; the more attractive, because more sensuous and present, with its worship of force and genius, of pleasure and voluptuousness. . . . At that time Italy clearly led in every thing, and civilisation was to be drawn thence as from its spring. What is this civilisation which is thus imposed on the whole of Europe, whence every science and every elegance comes, whose laws are obeyed in every court, in which Surrey, Sidney, Spenser, Shakspeare sought their models and their materials? It was pagan in its elements and its birth; in its language, which is but slightly different from Latin; in its Latin traditions and recollections, which no gap has come to interrupt; in its constitution, whose old municipal life first led and absorbed the feudal life; in the genius of its race, in which energy and enjoyment always abounded."—H. A. Taine, *Hist. of English Literature*, bk. 2, ch. 1 (v. 1).—"The intellectual movement, to which we give the name of Renaissance, expressed itself in England mainly through the Drama. Other races in that era of quickened activity, when modern man regained the consciousness of his own strength and goodness after centuries of mental stagnation and social depression, threw their energies into the plastic arts and scholarship. The English found a similar outlet for their pent-up forces in the Drama. The arts and literature of Greece and Rome had been revealed by Italy to Europe. Humanism had placed the present once more in a vital relation to the past. The navies of Portugal and Spain had discovered new continents beyond the ocean; the merchants of Venice and Genoa had explored the farthest East. Copernicus had revolutionised astronomy, and the telescope was revealing fresh worlds beyond the sun. The Bible had been rescued from the mortmain of the Church; scholars studied it in the language of its authors, and the people read it in their own tongue. In this rapid development of art, literature, science, and discovery, the English had hitherto taken but little part. But they were ready to reap what other men had sown. Unfatigued by the labours of the pioneer, unsophisticated by the pedantries and sophistries of the schools, in the freshness of their youth and vigour, they surveyed the world unfolded to them.

For more than half a century they freely enjoyed the splendour of this spectacle, until the struggle for political and religious liberty replunged them in the hard realities of life. During that eventful period of spiritual disengagement from absorbing cares, the race was fully conscious of its national importance. It had shaken off the shackles of oppressive feudalism, the trammels of ecclesiastical tyranny. It had not yet passed under the Puritan yoke, or felt the encroachments of despotic monarchy. It was justly proud of the Virgin Queen, with whose idealised personality the people identified their newly acquired sense of greatness. . . . What in those fifty years they saw with the clairvoyant eyes of artists, the poets wrote. And what they wrote, remains imperishable. It is the portrait of their age, the portrait of an age in which humanity stood self-revealed, a miracle and marvel to its own admiring curiosity. England was in a state of transition when the Drama came to perfection. That was one of those rare periods when the past and the future are both coloured by imagination, and both shed a glory on the present. The medieval order was in dissolution; the modern order was in process of formation. Yet the old state of things had not faded from memory and usage; the new had not assumed despotic sway. Men stood then, as it were, between two dreams—a dream of the past, thronged with sinister and splendid reminiscences; a dream of the future, bright with unlimited aspirations and indefinite hopes. Neither the retreating forces of the Middle Ages nor the advancing forces of the modern era pressed upon them with the iron weight of actuality. The brutalities of feudalism had been softened; but the chivalrous sentiment remained to inspire the Surreys and the Sidneys of a milder epoch. . . . What distinguished the English at this epoch from the nations of the South was not refinement of manners, sobriety, or self-control. On the contrary they retained an unenviable character for more than common savagery. . . . Erasmus describes the filth of their houses, and the sicknesses engendered in their cities by bad ventilation. What rendered the people superior to Italians and Spaniards was the firmness of their moral fibre, the sweetness of their humanity, a more masculine temper, less vitiated instincts and sophisticated intellects, a law-abiding and religious conscience, contempt for treachery and baseness, intolerance of political or ecclesiastical despotism combined with fervent love of home and country. They were coarse, but not vicious; pleasure-loving, but not licentious; violent, but not cruel; luxurious but not effeminate. Machiavelli was a name of loathing to them. Sidney, Essex, Raleigh, More, and Drake were popular heroes; and whatever may be thought of these men, they certainly counted no Marquis of Pescara, no Duke of Valentino, no Malatesta Baglioni, no Cosimo de' Medici among them. The Southern European type betrayed itself but faintly in politicians like Richard Cromwell and Robert Dudley. . . . Affectations of foreign vices were only a varnish on the surface of society. The core of the nation remained sound and wholesome. Nor was the culture which the English borrowed from less unsophisticated nations, more than superficial. The incidents of Court gossip show how savage was the life beneath. Queen Elizabeth spat, in the presence of her nobles, at a gentleman who had dis-

pleased her; struck Essex on the cheek; drove Burleigh blubbering from her apartment. Laws in merry England were executed with uncompromising severity. Every township had its gallows; every village its stocks, whipping-post and pillory. Here and there, heretics were burned upon the market-place; and the block upon Tower Hill was seldom dry. . . . Men and women who read Plato, or discussed the elegancies of Petrarch, suffered brutal practical jokes, relished the obscenities of jesters, used the grossest language of the people. Carrying farms and acres on their backs in the shape of costly silks and laces, they lay upon rushes filthy with the vomit of old banquets. Glittering in suits of gilt and jewelled mail, they jostled with town-porters in the stench of the bear-gardens, or the bloody bull-pit. The church itself was not respected. The nave of old S. Paul's became a rendezvous for thieves and prostitutes. . . . It is difficult, even by noting an infinity of such characteristics, to paint the many-coloured incongruities of England at that epoch. Yet in the midst of this confusion rose cavaliers like Sidney, philosophers like Bacon, poets like Spenser; men in whom all that is pure, elevated, subtle, tender, strong, wise, delicate and learned in our modern civilisation displayed itself. And the masses of the people were still in harmony with these high strains. They formed the audience of Shakspeare. They wept for Desdemona, adored Imogen, listened with Jessica to music in the moon-light at Belmont, wandered with Rosalind through woodland glades of Arden. Such was the society of which our theatre became the mirror."—J. A. Symonds, *Shakspeare's Predecessors in the English Drama*, ch. 2, sect. 1, 2, and 5.

A. D. 1497.—Cabot's discovery of the North American Continent. See AMERICA: A. D. 1497.

A. D. 1498.—Voyage and discoveries of Sebastian Cabot.—Ground of English claims in the New World. See AMERICA: A. D. 1498.

A. D. 1502.—The marriage which brought the Stuarts to the English throne. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1502.

A. D. 1509.—The character and reign of Henry VII.—"As a king, Bacon tells us that he was 'a wonder for wise men.' Few indeed were the councillors that shared his confidence, but the wise men, competent to form an estimate of his statesmanship, had but one opinion of his consummate wisdom. Foreigners were greatly struck with the success that attended his policy. Ambassadors were astonished at the intimate knowledge he displayed of the affairs of their own countries. From the most unpropitious beginnings, a proscribed man and an exile, he had won his way in evil times to a throne beset with dangers; he had pacified his own country, cherished commerce, formed strong alliances over Europe, and made his personal influence felt by the rulers of France, Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands as that of a man who could turn the scale in matters of the highest importance to their own domestic welfare. . . . From first to last his policy was essentially his own; for though he knew well how to choose the ablest councillors, he asked or took their advice only to such an extent as he himself deemed expedient. . . . No one can understand his reign, or that of his son, or, we might add, of his granddaughter Queen Elizabeth, without appreciating the fact that,

however well served with councillors, the sovereign was in those days always his own Prime Minister. . . . Even the legislation of the reign must be regarded as in large measure due to Henry himself. We have no means, it is true, of knowing how much of it originated in his own mind; but that it was all discussed with him in Council and approved before it was passed we have every reason to believe. For he never appears to have put the royal veto upon any Bill, as constitutional usage both before and after his days allowed. He gave his assent to all the enactments sent up to him for approval, though he sometimes added to them provisos of his own. And Bacon, who knew the traditions of those times, distinctly attributes the good legislation of his days to the king himself. 'In that part, both of justice and policy, which is the most durable part, and cut, as it were, in brass or marble, the making of good laws, he did excel.' This statement, with but slight variations in the wording, appears again and again throughout the History; and elsewhere it is said that he was the best lawgiver to this nation after Edward I. . . . The parliaments, indeed, that Henry summoned were only seven in number, and seldom did any one of them last over a year, so that during a reign of nearly twenty-four years many years passed away without a Parliament at all. But even in those scanty sittings many Acts were passed to meet evils that were general subjects of complaint. . . . He could scarcely be called a learned man, yet he was a lover of learning, and gave his children an excellent education. His Court was open to scholars. . . . He was certainly religious after the fashion of his day. . . . His religious foundations and bequests perhaps do not necessarily imply anything more than conventional feeling. But we must not overlook the curious circumstance that he once argued with a heretic at the stake at Canterbury and got him to renounce his heresy. It is melancholy to add that he did not thereupon release him from the punishment to which he had been sentenced; but the fact seems to show that he was afraid of encouraging insincere conversions by such leniency. During the last two or three years of the 15th century there was a good deal of procedure against heretics, but on the whole, we are told, rather by penances than by fire. Henry had no desire to see the old foundations of the faith disturbed. His zeal for the Church was recognised by no less than three Popes in his time, who each sent him a sword and a cap of maintenance. . . . To commerce and adventure he was always a good friend. By his encouragement Sebastian Cabot sailed from Bristol and discovered Newfoundland—The New Isle, as it at first was called. Four years earlier Columbus had first set foot on the great western continent, and had not his brother been taken by pirates at sea, it is supposed that he too might have made his great discovery under Henry's patronage."—Jas. Gairdner, *Henry the Seventh*, ch. 13.

ALSO IN: Lord Bacon, *Hist. of the Reign of King Henry VII.*

A. D. 1509.—Accession of King Henry VIII.

A. D. 1511-1513.—Enlisted in the Holy League of Pope Julius II. against France. See ITALY: A. D. 1510-1513.

A. D. 1513.—Henry's invasion of France.—The victory of the Battle of the Spurs. See FRANCE: A. D. 1513-1515.

A. D. 1513-1529.—The ministry of Cardinal Wolsey.—From 1513 to 1529, Thomas Wolsey, who became Archbishop of York in 1514, and Cardinal in 1515, was the minister who guided the policy of Henry VIII., so far as that headstrong and absolute monarch could be guided at all. "England was going through a crisis politically, socially, and intellectually, when Wolsey undertook the management of affairs. . . . We must regret that he put foreign policy in the first place, and reserved his constructive measures for domestic affairs. . . . Yet even here we may doubt if the measures of the English Reformation would have been possible if Wolsey's mind had not inspired the king and the nation with a heightened consciousness of England's power and dignity. Wolsey's diplomacy at least tore away all illusions about Pope and Emperor, and the opinion of Europe, and taught Henry VIII. the measure of his own strength. It was impossible that Wolsey's powerful hand should not leave its impression upon everything which it touched. If Henry VIII. inherited a strong monarchy, Wolsey made the basis of monarchical power still stronger. . . . Wolsey saw in the royal power the only possible means of holding England together and guiding it through the dangers of impending change. . . . Wolsey was in no sense a constitutional minister, nor did he pay much heed to constitutional forms. Parliament was only summoned once during the time that he was in office, and then he tried to browbeat Parliament and set aside its privileges. In his view the only function of Parliament was to grant money for the king's needs. The king should say how much he needed, and Parliament ought only to advise how this sum might be most conveniently raised. . . . He was unwise in his attempt to force the king's will upon Parliament as an unchangeable law of its action. Henry VIII. looked and learned from Wolsey's failure, and when he took the management of Parliament into his own hands he showed himself a consummate master of that craft. . . . He was so skillful that Parliament at last gave him even the power over the purse, and Henry, without raising a murmur, imposed taxes which Wolsey would not have dared to suggest. . . . Where Wolsey would have made the Crown independent of Parliament, Henry VIII. reduced Parliament to be a willing instrument of the royal will. . . . Henry . . . clothed his despotism with the appearance of paternal solicitude. He made the people think that he lived for them, and that their interests were his, whereas Wolsey endeavoured to convince the people that the king alone could guard their interests, and that their only course was to put entire confidence in him. Henry saw that men were easier to cajole than to convince. . . . In spite of the disadvantage of a royal education, Henry was a more thorough Englishman than Wolsey, though Wolsey sprang from the people. It was Wolsey's teaching, however, that prepared Henry for his task. The king who could use a minister like Wolsey and then throw him away when he was no longer useful, felt that there was no limitation to his self-sufficiency. . . . For politics in the largest sense, comprising all the relations of the nation at home and abroad, Wolsey had a capacity which amounted to genius, and it is doubtful if this can be said of any other Englishman. . . . Taking England as he found her, he aimed at de-

veloping all her latent possibilities, and leading Europe to follow in her train. . . . He made England for a time the centre of European politics, and gave her an influence far higher than she could claim on material grounds. . . . He was indeed a political artist, who worked with a free hand and a certain touch. . . . He was, though he knew it not, fitted to serve England, but not to serve the English king. He had the aims of a national statesman, not of a royal servant. Wolsey's misfortune was that his lot was cast on days when the career of a statesman was not distinct from that of a royal servant."—M. Creighton, *Cardinal Wolsey*, ch. 8 and 11.

ALSO IN: J. S. Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII.*—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng. from the Fall of Wolsey*, ch. 1-2.—G. Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey*.

A. D. 1514.—Marriage of the king's sister with Louis XII. of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1513-1515.

A. D. 1516-1517.—Intrigues against France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1516-1517.

A. D. 1519.—Candidacy of Henry VIII. for the imperial crown. See GERMANY: A. D. 1519.

A. D. 1520-1521.—Rivalry of the Emperor and the French King for the English alliance. See FRANCE: A. D. 1520-1523.

A. D. 1525.—The king changes sides in European politics and breaks his alliance with the Emperor. See FRANCE: A. D. 1525-1526.

A. D. 1527.—New alliance with France and Venice against Charles V.—Formal renunciation of the claim of the English kings to the crown of France. See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

A. D. 1527-1534.—Henry VIII. and the Divorce question.—The rupture with Rome.—Henry VIII. "owed his crown to the early death of his brother Arthur, whose widow, Catharine of Aragon, the daughter of Ferdinand, and consequently the aunt of Charles V. [emperor], Henry was enabled to marry through a dispensation obtained by Henry VII. from Pope Julius II.,—marriage with the wife of a deceased brother being forbidden by the laws of the Church. Henry was in his twelfth year when the marriage was concluded, but it was not consummated until the death of his father. . . . The question of Henry's divorce from Catharine soon became a subject of discussion, and the effort to procure the annulling of the marriage from the pope was prosecuted for a number of years. Henry professed, and perhaps with sincerity, that he had long been troubled with doubts of the validity of the marriage, as being contrary to the divine law, and therefore not within the limit of the pope's dispensing power. The death of a number of his children, leaving only a single daughter, Mary, had been interpreted by some as a mark of the displeasure of God. At the same time the English people, in the fresh recollection of the long dynastic struggle, were anxious on account of the lack of a male heir to the throne. On the queen's side it was asserted that it was competent for the pope to authorize a marriage with a brother's widow, and that no doubt could possibly exist in the present case, since, according to her testimony, her marriage with Arthur had never been completed. The eagerness of Henry to procure the divorce increased with his growing passion for Anne Boleyn. The negotiations with Rome dragged slowly on. Catharine was six years older than himself, and had lost her charms. He was enamored of this young

English girl, fresh from the court of France. He resolved to break the marriage bond with the Spanish princess who had been his faithful wife for nearly twenty years. It was not without reason that the king became more and more incensed at the dilatory and vacillating course of the pope. . . . Henry determined to lay the question of the validity of his marriage before the universities of Europe, and this he did, making a free use of bribery abroad and of menaces at home. Meantime, he took measures to cripple the authority of the pope and of the clergy in England. In these proceedings he was sustained by a popular feeling, the growth of centuries, against foreign ecclesiastical interference and clerical control in civil affairs. The fall of Wolsey was the effect of his failure to procure the divorce, and of the enmity of Anne Boleyn and her family. . . . In order to convict of treason this minister, whom he had raised to the highest pinnacle of power, the king did not scruple to avail himself of the ancient statute of præmunire, which Wolsey was accused of having transgressed by acting as the pope's legate in England—it was dishonestly alleged, without the royal license. Early in 1531 the king charged the whole body of the clergy with having incurred the penalties of the same law by submitting to Wolsey in his legatine character. Assembled in convocation, they were obliged to implore his pardon, and obtained it only in return for a large sum of money. In their petition he was styled, in obedience to his dictation, 'The Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England,' to which was added, after long debate, at the suggestion of Archbishop Warham—'as far as is permitted by the law of Christ.' The Church, prostrate though it was at the feet of the despotic king, showed some degree of self-respect in inserting this amendment. Parliament forbade the introduction of papal bulls into England. The king was authorized if he saw fit, to withdraw the annats—first-fruits of benefices—from the pope. Appeals to Rome were forbidden. The retaliatory measures of Henry did not move the pope to recede from his position. On or about January 25, 1533, the king was privately married to Anne Boleyn. . . . In 1534 Henry was conditionally excommunicated by Clement VII. The papal decree deposing him from the throne, and absolving his subjects from their allegiance, did not follow until 1538, and was issued by Paul III. Clement's bull was sent forth on the 23 of March. On the 23 of November Parliament passed the Act of Supremacy, without the qualifying clause which the clergy had attached to their vote. The king was, moreover, clothed with full power and authority to repress and amend all such errors, heresies, and abuses as 'by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed.' Thus a visitatorial function of vast extent was recognized as belonging to him. In 1533 convocation was driven to engage not 'to enact or promulge or put in execution' any measures without the royal license, and to promise to change or to abrogate any of the 'provincial constitutions' which he should judge inconsistent with his prerogative. The clergy were thus stripped of all power to make laws. A mixed commission, which Parliament ordained for the revision of the whole canon law, was not appointed in this reign. The dissolution of the

king's marriage thus dissolved the union of England with the papacy."—G. P. Fisher, *History of the Christian Church*, period 8, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: J. S. Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, v. 2, ch. 27-35.—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 2.—S. H. Burke, *Hist. Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty*, v. 1, ch. 8-25.—J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 6, ch. 3.—T. E. Bridgett, *Life and Writings of Sir T. More*.

A. D. 1529-1535.—The execution of Sir Thomas More.—On the 25th of October, 1529, the king, by delivering the great seal to Sir Thomas More, constituted him Lord Chancellor. In making this appointment, Henry "hoped to dispose his chancellor to lend his authority to the projects of divorce and second marriage, which now agitated the king's mind, and were the main objects of his policy. . . . To pursue this subject through the long negotiations and discussions which it occasioned during six years, would be to lead us far from the life of sir Thomas More. . . . All these proceedings terminated in the sentence of nullity in the case of Henry's marriage with Catherine, pronounced by Cranmer, the espousal of Anne Boleyn by the king, and the rejection of the papal jurisdiction by the kingdom, which still, however, adhered to the doctrines of the Roman catholic church. The situation of More during a great part of these memorable events was embarrassing. The great offices to which he was raised by the king, the personal favour hitherto constantly shown to him, and the natural tendency of his gentle and quiet disposition, combined to disincline him to resistance against the wishes of his friendly master. On the other hand, his growing dread and horror of heresy, with its train of disorders; his belief that universal anarchy would be the inevitable result of religious dissension, and the operation of seven years' controversy for the Catholic church, in heating his mind on all subjects involving the extent of her authority, made him recoil from designs which were visibly tending towards disunion with the Roman pontiff. . . . Henry used every means of procuring an opinion favourable to his wishes from his chancellor, who excused himself as unmeet for such matters, having never professed the study of divinity. . . . But when the progress towards the marriage was so far advanced that he saw how soon the active co-operation of a chancellor must be required, he made suit to 'his singular dear friend,' the duke of Norfolk, to procure his discharge from this office. The duke, often solicited by More, then obtained, by importunate suit, a clear discharge for the chancellor. . . . The king directed Norfolk, when he installed his successor, to declare publicly, that his majesty had with pain yielded to the prayers of sir Thomas More, by the removal of such a magistrate. . . . It must be owned that Henry felt the weight of this great man's opinion, and tried every possible means to obtain at least the appearance of his spontaneous approbation. . . . The king . . . sent the archbishop of Canterbury, the chancellor, the duke of Norfolk, and Cromwell, to attempt the conversion of More. Audley reminded More of the king's special favour and many benefits. More admitted them; but modestly added, that his highness had most graciously declared that on this matter More should be molested no more. When in the end they saw that no persuasion could move him, they then said, 'that the king's highness had given

them in commandment, if they could by no gentleness win him, in the king's name with ingratitude to charge him, that never was servant to his master so villainous, nor subject to his prince so traitorous as he.' . . . By a tyrannical edict, mis-called a law, in the same session of 1533-4, it was made high treason, after the 1st of May, 1534, by writing, print, deed, or act, to do or to procure, or cause to be done or procured, anything to the prejudice, slander, disturbance, or derogation of the king's lawful matrimony with queen Anne. If the same offences were committed by words, they were only misprision. The same act enjoined all persons to take an oath to maintain the whole contents of the statute, and an obstinate refusal to make such oath was subjected to the penalties of misprision. . . . Sir T. More was summoned to appear before these commissioners at Lambeth, on Monday the 13th of April, 1534. . . . After having read the statute and the form of the oath, he declared his readiness to swear that he would maintain and defend the order of succession to the crown as established by parliament. He disclaimed all censure of those who had imposed, or on those who had taken, the oath, but declared it to be impossible that he should swear to the whole contents of it, without offending against his own conscience. . . . He never more returned to his house, being committed to the custody of the abbot of Westminster, in which he continued four days; and at the end of that time he was conveyed to the Tower on Friday the 17th of April, 1534. . . . On the 6th of May, 1535, almost immediately after the defeat of every attempt to practise on his firmness, More was brought to trial at Westminster, and it will scarcely be doubted, that no such culprit stood at any European bar for a thousand years. . . . It is lamentable that the records of the proceedings against such a man should be scanty. We do not certainly know the specific offence of which he was convicted. . . . On Tuesday, the 6th of July (St. Thomas's eve), 1535, sir Thomas Pope, 'his singular good friend,' came to him early with a message from the king and council, to say that he should die before nine o'clock of the same morning. . . . The lieutenant brought him to the scaffold, which was so weak that it was ready to fall, on which he said, merrily, 'Master lieutenant, I pray you see me safe up, and for my coming down let me shift for myself.' When he laid his head on the block he desired the executioner to wait till he had removed his beard, for that had never offended his highness."—Sir J. Mackintosh, *Sir Thos. More (Cabinet Cyclop.: Eminent British Statesmen, v. 1)*.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Historical Biographies, ch. 3*.—T. E. Bridgett, *Life and Writings of Sir Thomas More, ch. 12-24*.—S. H. Burke, *Hist. Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty, v. 1, ch. 29*.

A. D. 1531-1563.—The genesis of the Church of England.—"Henry VIII. attempted to constitute an Anglican Church differing from the Roman Catholic Church on the point of the supremacy, and on that point alone. His success in this attempt was extraordinary. The force of his character, the singularly favorable situation in which he stood with respect to foreign powers, the immense wealth which the spoliation of the abbey placed at his disposal, and the support of that class which still halted between two opinions, enabled him to bid defiance to both the extreme parties, to burn as heretics those who avowed

the tenets of the Reformers, and to hang as traitors those who owned the authority of the Pope. But Henry's system died with him. Had his life been prolonged, he would have found it difficult to maintain a position assailed with equal fury by all who were zealous either for the new or for the old opinions. The ministers who held the royal prerogatives in trust for his infant son could not venture to persist in so hazardous a policy; nor could Elizabeth venture to return to it. It was necessary to make a choice. The government must either submit to Rome, or must obtain the aid of the Protestants. The government and the Protestants had only one thing in common, hatred of the Papal power. The English reformers were eager to go as far as their brethren on the Continent. They unanimously condemned as Antichristian numerous dogmas and practices to which Henry had stubbornly adhered, and which Elizabeth reluctantly abandoned. Many felt a strong repugnance even to things indifferent which had formed part of the polity or ritual of the mystical Babylon. Thus Bishop Hooper, who died manfully at Gloucester for his religion, long refused to wear the episcopal vestments. Bishop Ridley, a martyr of still greater renown, pulled down the ancient altars of his diocese, and ordered the Eucharist to be administered in the middle of churches, at tables which the Papists irreverently termed oyster boards. Bishop Jewel pronounced the clerical garb to be a stage dress, a fool's coat, a relique of the Amorites, and promised that he would spare no labour to extirpate such degrading absurdities. Archbishop Grindal long hesitated about accepting a mitre from dislike of what he regarded as the mummary of consecration. Bishop Parkhurst uttered a fervent prayer that the Church of England would propose to herself the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community. Bishop Ponet was of opinion that the word Bishop should be abandoned to the Papist, and that the chief officers of the purified church should be called Superintendents. When it is considered that none of these prelates belonged to the extreme section of the Protestant party, it cannot be doubted that, if the general sense of that party had been followed, the work of reform would have been carried on as unsparingly in England as in Scotland. But, as the government needed the support of the Protestants, so the Protestants needed the protection of the government. Much was therefore given up on both sides: an union was effected; and the fruit of that union was the Church of England."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch. 1*.—"The Reformation in England was singular amongst the great religious movements of the sixteenth century. It was the least heroic of them all—the least swayed by religious passion, or moulded and governed by spiritual and theological necessities. From a general point of view, it looks at first little more than a great political change. The exigencies of royal passion, and the dubious impulses of statecraft, seem its moving and really powerful springs. But, regarded more closely, we recognise a significant train both of religious and critical forces at work. The lust and avarice of Henry, the policy of Cromwell, and the vacillations of the leading clergy, attract prominent notice; but there may be traced beneath the surface a widespread evangelical fervour amongst the people,

and, above all, a genuine spiritual earnestness and excitement of thought at the universities. These higher influences preside at the first birth of the movement. They are seen in active operation long before the reforming task was taken up by the Court and the bishops."—J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in Eng. in the 17th Century*, v. 1, ch. 2.—"The miserable fate of Anne Boleyn wins our compassion, and the greatness to which her daughter attained has been in some degree reflected back upon herself. Had she died a natural death, and had she not been the mother of Queen Elizabeth, we should have estimated her character at a very low value indeed. Protestantism might still, with its usual unhistorical partizanship, have gilded over her immoralities; but the Church of England must ever look upon Anne Boleyn with downcast eyes full of sorrow and shame. By the influence of her charms, Henry was induced to take those steps which ended in setting the Church of England free from an uncatholic yoke: but that such a result should be produced by such an influence is a fact which must constrain us to think that the land was guilty of many sins, and that it was these national sins which prevented better instruments from being raised up for so righteous an object."—J. H. Blunt, *The Reformation of the Church of England*, pp. 197-198.—"Cranmer's work might never have been carried out, there might have been no English Bible, no Ten Articles or 'Institution,' no reforming Primers, nor Proclamations against Ceremonies, had it not been for the tact, boldness and skill of Thomas Cromwell, who influenced the King more directly and constantly than Cranmer, and who knew how to make his influence acceptable by an unprincipled confiscation and an absurd exaggeration of the royal supremacy. Cromwell knew that in his master's heart there was a dislike and contempt of the clergy. . . . It is probable that Cromwell's policy was simply irreligious, and only directed towards preserving his influence with the King; but as the support of the reforming part of the nation was a useful factor in it, he was thus led to push forward religious information in conjunction with Cranmer. It has been before said that purity and disinterestedness are not to be looked for in all the actors in the English Reformation. To this it may be added that neither in the movement itself nor in those who took part in it is to be found complete consistency. This, indeed, is not to be wondered at. Men were feeling their way along untrodden paths, without any very clear perception of the end at which they were aiming, or any perfect understanding of the situation. The King had altogether misapprehended the meaning of his supremacy. A host of divines whose views as to the distinction between the secular and the spiritual had been confused by the action of the Popes, helped to mislead him. The clergy, accustomed to be crushed and humiliated by the Popes, submitted to be crushed and humiliated by the King; and as the tide of his autocratic temper ebbed and flowed, yielded to each change. Hence there was action and reaction throughout the reign. But in this there were obvious advantages for the Church. The gradual process accustomed men's thoughts to a reformation which should not be drastic or iconoclastic, but rather conservative and deliberate."—G. G. Perry, *Hist. of the Reformation in*

Eng., ch. 5.—"With regard to the Church of England, its foundations rest upon the rock of Scripture, not upon the character of the King by whom they were laid. This, however, must be affirmed in justice to Henry, that mixed as the motives were which first induced him to disclaim the Pope's authority, in all the subsequent measures he acted sincerely, knowing the importance of the work in which he had engaged, and prosecuting it sedulously and conscientiously, even when most erroneous. That religion should have had so little influence upon his moral conduct will not appear strange, if we consider what the religion was wherein he was trained up;—nor if we look at the generality of men even now, under circumstances immeasurably more fortunate than those in which he was placed. Undeniable proofs remain of the learning, ability, and diligence, with which he applied himself to the great business of weeding out superstition, and yet preserving what he believed to be the essentials of Christianity untouched. This praise (and it is no light one) is his due: and it is our part to be thankful to that all-ruling Providence, which rendered even his passions and his vices subservient to this important end."—R. Southey, *The Book of the Church*, ch. 12.

A. D. 1535-1539.—The suppression of the Monasteries.—"The enormous, and in a great measure ill-gotten, opulence of the regular clergy had long since excited jealousy in every part of Europe. . . . A writer much inclined to partiality towards the monasteries says that they held [in England] one-fifth part of the kingdom; no insignificant patrimony. . . . As they were in general exempted from episcopal visitation, and intrusted with the care of their own discipline, such abuses had gradually prevailed and gained strength by connivance as we may naturally expect in corporate bodies of men leading almost of necessity useless and indolent lives, and in whom very indistinct views of moral obligations were combined with a great facility of violating them. The vices that for many ages had been supposed to haunt the monasteries, had certainly not left their precincts in that of Henry VIII. Wolsey, as papal legate, at the instigation of Fox, bishop of Hereford, a favourer of the Reformation, commenced a visitation of the professed as well as secular clergy in 1523, in consequence of the general complaint against their manners. . . . Full of anxious zeal for promoting education, the noblest part of his character, he obtained bulls from Rome suppressing many convents (among which was that of St. Frideswide at Oxford), in order to erect and endow a new college in that university, his favourite work, which after his fall was more completely established by the name of Christ Church. A few more were afterwards extinguished through his instigation; and thus the prejudice against interference with this species of property was somewhat worn off, and men's minds gradually prepared for the sweeping confiscations of Cromwell [Thomas Cromwell, who succeeded Wolsey as chief minister of Henry VIII.]. The king indeed was abundantly willing to replenish his exchequer by violent means, and to avenge himself on those who gainsayed his supremacy; but it was this able statesman who, prompted both by the natural appetite of ministers for the subjects' money and by a secret partiality towards the Reformation, devised and

carried on with complete success, if not with the utmost prudence, a measure of no inconsiderable hazard and difficulty. . . . It was necessary, by exposing the gross corruptions of monasteries, both to intimidate the regular clergy, and to excite popular indignation against them. It is not to be doubted that in the visitation of these foundations, under the direction of Cromwell, as lord vice-gerent of the king's ecclesiastical supremacy, many things were done in an arbitrary manner, and much was unfairly represented. Yet the reports of these visitors are so minute and specific that it is rather a preposterous degree of incredulity to reject their testimony whenever it bears hard on the regulars. . . . The dread of these visitors soon induced a number of abbots to make surrenders to the king; a step of very questionable legality. But in the next session the smaller convents, whose revenues were less than £200 a year, were suppressed by act of parliament, to the number of 376, and their estates vested in the crown. This summary spoliation led to the great northern rebellion soon afterwards," headed by Robert Ask, a gentleman of Yorkshire, and assuming the title of a Pilgrimage of Grace.—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 2.—"Far from benefiting the cause of the monastic houses, the immediate effect of the Pilgrimage of Grace was to bring ruin on those monasteries which had as yet been spared. For their complicity or alleged complicity in it, twelve abbots were hanged, drawn and quartered, and their houses were seized by the Crown. Every means was employed by a new set of Commissioners to bring about the surrender of others of the greater abbeys. The houses were visited, and their pretended relics and various tricks to encourage the devotion of the people were exposed. Surrenders went rapidly on during the years 1537 and 1538, and it became necessary to obtain a new Act of Parliament to vest the property of the later surrenders in the Crown. . . . Nothing, indeed, can be more tragical than the way in which the greater abbeys were destroyed on manufactured charges and for imaginary crimes. These houses had been described in the first Act of Parliament as 'great and honourable,' wherein 'religion was right well kept and observed.' Yet now they were pitilessly destroyed. A revenue of about £131,607 is computed to have thus come to the Crown, while the movables are valued at £400,000. How was this vast sum of money expended? (1) By the Act for the suppression of the greater monasteries the King was empowered to erect six new sees, with their deans and chapters, namely, Westminster, Oxford, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol and Peterborough. . . . (2) Some monasteries were turned into collegiate churches, and many of the abbey churches . . . were assigned as parish churches. (3) Some grammar schools were erected. (4) A considerable sum is said to have been spent in making roads and in fortifying the coasts of the Channel. (5) But by far the greater part of the monastic property passed into the hands of the nobility and gentry, either by purchase at very easy rates, or by direct gift from the Crown. . . . The monks and nuns ejected from the monasteries had small pensions assigned to them, which are said to have been regularly paid; but to many of them the sudden return into a world with which they had become utterly

unacquainted, and in which they had no part to play, was a terrible hardship. . . . greatly increased by the Six Article Law, which . . . made the marriage of the secularized 'religious' illegal under heavy penalties."—G. G. Perry, *Hist. of the Reformation in Eng.*, ch. 4.—"The religious bodies, instead of uniting in their common defence, seem to have awaited singly their fate with the apathy of despair. A few houses only, through the agency of their friends, sought to purchase the royal favour with offers of money and lands; but the rapacity of the king refused to accept a part when the whole was at his mercy."—J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 6, ch. 4.—Some of the social results of the suppression "may be summed up in a few words. The creation of a large class of poor to whose poverty was attached the stigma of crime; the division of class from class, the rich mounting up to place and power, the poor sinking to lower depths; destruction of custom as a check upon the exactions of landlords; the loss by the poor of those foundations at schools and universities intended for their children; and the passing away of ecclesiastical tithes into the hands of lay owners."—F. A. Gasquet, *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, v. 2, p. 523.

A. D. 1536-1543.—Trial and execution of Anne Boleyn.—Her successors, the later wives of Henry VIII.—Anne Boleyn had been secretly married to the king in January, 1533, and had been crowned on Whitsunday of that year. "The princess Elizabeth, the only surviving child, was born on the 7th of September following. . . . The death of Catherine, which happened at Kimbolton on the 29th of January, 1536, seemed to leave queen Anne in undisturbed possession of her splendid seat." But the fickle king had now "cast his affections on Jane Seymour, the daughter of Sir John Seymour, a young lady then of the Queen's bed-chamber, as Anne herself had been in that of Catherine." Having lost her charms in the eyes of the lustful despot who had wedded her, her influence was gone—and her safety. Charges were soon brought against the unfortunate woman, a commission (her own father included in it) appointed to inquire into her alleged misdeeds, and "on the 10th of May an indictment for high treason was found by the grand jury of Westminster against the Lady Anne, Queen of England; Henry Norris, groom of the stole; Sir Francis Weston and William Brereton, gentlemen of the privy chamber; and Mark Smeaton, a performer on musical instruments, and a person 'of low degree,' promoted to be a groom of the chamber for his skill in the fine art which he professed. It charges the queen with having, by all sorts of bribes, gifts, caresses, and impure blandishments, which are described with unblushing coarseness in the barbarous Latinity of the indictment, allured these members of the royal household into a course of criminal connection with her, which had been carried on for three years. It included also George Boleyn viscount Rochford, the brother of Anne, as enticed by the same lures and snares with the rest of the accused, so as to have become the accomplice of his sister, by sharing her treachery and infidelity to the king. It is hard to believe that Anne could have dared to lead a life so unnaturally dissolute, without such vices being more early and very generally known in a watchful and adverse court. It is

still more improbable that she should in every instance be the seducer. . . . Norris, Weston, Brereton, and Smeaton were tried before a commission of oyer and terminer at Westminster, on the 12th of May, two days after the bill against them was found. They all, except Smeaton, firmly denied their guilt to the last moment. On Smeaton's confession it must be observed that we know not how it was obtained, how far it extended, or what were the conditions of it. . . . On the 12th of May, the four commoners were condemned to die. Their sentence was carried into effect amidst the complaints of the bystanders. . . . On the 15th of May, queen Anne and her brother Rochford were tried." The place of trial was in the Tower, "which concealed from the public eye whatever might be wanting in justice." Condemnation duly followed, and the unhappy queen was executed May 19, 1536. The king lost little time in wedding Jane Seymour. "She died in childbed of Edward VI. on the 13th of October, 1537. The next choice made by or for Henry, who remained a widower for the period of more than two years," was the "princess Anne, sister of the duke of Cleves, a considerable prince on the lower Rhine. . . . The pencil of Holbein was employed to paint this lady for the king, who, pleased by the execution, gave the flattering artist credit for a faithful likeness. He met her at Dover, and almost immediately betrayed his disappointment. Without descending into disgusting particulars, it is necessary to state that, though the marriage was solemnised, the king treated the princess of Cleves as a friend." At length, by common action of an obsequious parliament and a more obsequious convocation of the church, the marriage was declared to be annulled, for reasons not specified. The consent of the repudiated wife was "insured by a liberal income of £3,000 a year, and she lived for 16 years in England with the title of princess Anne of Cleves. . . . This annulment once more displayed the triumph of an English lady over a foreign princess." The lady who now captivated the brutally amorous monarch was lady Catherine Howard, niece to the duke of Norfolk, who became queen on the 8th of August, 1540. In the following November, the king received such information of lady Catherine's dissolute life before marriage "as immediately caused a rigid inquiry into her behaviour. . . . The confessions of Catherine and of lady Rochford, upon which they were attainted in parliament, and executed in the Tower on the 14th of February, are not said to have been at any time questioned. . . . On the 10th of July, 1543, Henry wedded Catherine Parr, the widow of Lord Latimer, a lady of mature age," who survived him.—Sir J. Mackintosh, *Hist. of Eng. (L. C. C.)*, v. 2, ch. 7-8.

ALSO IN: P. Friedmann, *Anne Boleyn*.—H. W. Herbert, *Memoirs of Henry VIII. and his Six Wives*.

A. D. 1539.—The Reformation checked.—The Six Articles.—"Yielding to the pressure of circumstances, he [Henry VIII.] had allowed the Reformers to go further than he really approved. The separation from the Church of Rome, the absorption by the Crown of the powers of the Papacy, the unity of authority over both Church and State centred in himself, had been his objects. In doctrinal matters he clung to the Church of which he had once been the champion. He had gained his objects because he had the

feeling of the nation with him. In his eagerness he had even countenanced some steps of doctrinal reform. But circumstances had changed. . . . Without detriment to his position he could follow his natural inclinations. He listened, therefore, to the advice of the reactionary party, of which Norfolk was the head. They were full of bitterness against the upstart Cromwell, and longed to overthrow him as they had overthrown Wolsey. The first step in their triumph was the bill of the Six Articles, carried in the Parliament of 1539. These laid down and fenced round with extraordinary severity the chief points of the Catholic religion at that time questioned by the Protestants. The bill enacted, first, 'that the natural body and blood of Jesus Christ were present in the Blessed Sacrament,' and that 'after consecration there remained no substance of bread and wine, nor any other but the substance of Christ'; whoever, by word or writing, denied this article was a heretic, and to be burned. Secondly, the Communion in both kinds was not necessary, both body and blood being present in each element; thirdly, priests might not marry; fourthly, vows of chastity by man or woman ought to be observed; fifthly, private masses ought to be continued; sixthly, auricular confession must be retained. Whoever wrote or spoke against these . . . Articles, on the first offence his property was forfeited; on the second offence he was a felon, and was put to death. Under this 'whip with six strings' the kingdom continued for the rest of the reign. The Bishops at first made wild work with it. Five hundred persons are said to have been arrested in a fortnight; the king had twice to interfere and grant pardons. It is believed that only twenty-eight persons actually suffered death under it."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 2, p. 411.

ALSO IN: J. H. Blunt, *Reformation of the Ch. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 8-9.—S. H. Burke, *Men and Women of the Eng. Reformation*, v. 2, pp. 17-24.

A. D. 1542-1547.—Alliance with Charles V. against Francis I.—Capture and restoration of Boulogne.—Treaty of Guines. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532-1547.

A. D. 1544-1548.—The wooing of Mary Queen of Scots. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1544-1548.

A. D. 1547.—Accession of King Edward VI.
A. D. 1547-1553.—The completing of the Reformation.—Henry VIII., dying on the 28th of January, 1547, was succeeded by his son Edward, —child of Jane Seymour,—then only nine years old. By the will of his father, the young king (Edward VI.) was to attain his majority at eighteen, and the government of his kingdom, in the meantime, was entrusted to a body of sixteen executors, with a second body of twelve councillors to assist with their advice. "But the first act of the executors and counsellors was to depart from the destination of the late king in a material article. No sooner were they met, than it was suggested that the government would lose its dignity for want of some head who might represent the royal majesty." The suggestion was opposed by none except the chancellor, Wriothesley,—soon afterwards raised to the peerage as Earl of Southampton. "It being therefore agreed to name a protector, the choice fell of course on the Earl of Hertford [afterwards Duke of Somerset], who, as he was the king's maternal uncle, was strongly interested in his

safety." The protector soon manifested an ambition to exercise his almost royal authority without any constraint, and, having found means to remove his principal opponent, Southampton, from the chancellorship, and to send him into disgrace, he procured a patent from the infant king which gave him unbounded power. With this power in his hand he speedily undertook to carry the work of church reform far beyond the intentions of Henry VIII. "The extensive authority and imperious character of Henry had retained the partisans of both religions in subjection; but upon his demise, the hopes of the Protestants, and the fears of the Catholics began to revive, and the zeal of these parties produced every where disputes and animosities, the usual preludes to more fatal divisions. The protector had long been regarded as a secret partisan of the reformers; and being now freed from restraint, he scrupled not to discover his intention of correcting all abuses in the ancient religion, and of adopting still more of the Protestant innovations. He took care that all persons intrusted with the king's education should be attached to the same principles; and as the young prince discovered a zeal for every kind of literature, especially the theological, far beyond his tender years, all men foresaw, in the course of his reign, the total abolition of the Catholic faith in England; and they early began to declare themselves in favour of those tenets which were likely to become in the end entirely prevalent. After Southampton's fall, few members of the council seemed to retain any attachment to the Romish communion; and most of the counsellors appeared even sanguine in forwarding the progress of the reformation. The riches which most of them had acquired from the spoils of the clergy, induced them to widen the breach between England and Rome; and by establishing a contrariety of speculative tenets, as well as of discipline and worship, to render a coalition with the mother church altogether impracticable. Their rapacity, also, the chief source of their reforming spirit, was excited by the prospect of pillaging the secular, as they had already done the regular clergy; and they knew, that while any share of the old principles remained, or any regard to the ecclesiastics, they could never hope to succeed in that enterprise. The numerous and burdensome superstitions with which the Romish church was loaded had thrown many of the reformers, by the spirit of opposition, into an enthusiastic strain of devotion; and all rites, ceremonies, pomp, order, and extreme observances were zealously proscribed by them, as hindrances to their spiritual contemplations, and obstructions to their immediate converse with heaven."—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 3, ch. 34.—"This year" [1547] says a contemporary, 'the Archbishop of Canterbury [Cranmer] did eat meat openly in Lent in the hall of Lambeth, the like of which was never seen since England was a Christian country.' This significant act was followed by a rapid succession of sweeping changes. The legal prohibitions of Lollardy were removed; the Six Articles were repealed; a royal injunction removed all pictures and images from the churches; priests were permitted to marry; the new communion which had taken the place of the mass was ordered to be administered in both kinds, and in the English tongue; an English Book of Common Prayer, the Liturgy, which with slight alterations is still

used in the Church of England, replaced the missal and breviary, from which its contents are mainly drawn; a new catechism embodied the doctrines of Cranmer and his friends; and a Book of Homilies compiled in the same sense was appointed to be read in churches. . . . The power of preaching was restricted by the issue of licenses only to the friends of the Primate. . . . The assent of the nobles about the Court was won by the suppression of chantries and religious guilds, and by glutting their greed with the last spoils of the Church. German and Italian mercenaries were introduced to stamp out the wider popular discontent which broke out in the East, in the West, and in the Midland counties. . . . The rule of the upstart nobles who formed the Council of Regency became simply a rule of terror. 'The greater part of the people,' one of their creatures, Cecil, avowed, 'is not in favour of defending this cause, but of aiding its adversaries, the greater part of the nobles who absent themselves from court, all the bishops save three or four, almost all the judges and lawyers, almost all the justices of the peace, the priests who can move their flocks any way; for the whole of the commonalty is in such a state of irritation that it will easily follow any stir towards change.' But with their triumph over the revolt, Cranmer and his colleagues advanced yet more boldly in the career of innovation. . . . The Forty-two Articles of Religion, which were now [1552] introduced, though since reduced by omissions to thirty-nine, have remained to this day the formal standard of doctrine in the English Church."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the Eng. People*, ch. 7, sect. 1.

ALSO IN: J. Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, bk. 2.—G. Burnet, *Hist. of the Ref. of Ch. of Eng.*, v. 2, bk. 1.—L. Von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, bk. 2, ch. 6.

A. D. 1548.—First Act for encouragement of Newfoundland fisheries. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578.

A. D. 1553.—The right of succession to the throne, on the death of Edward VI.—"If Henry VII. be considered as the stock of a new dynasty, it is clear that on mere principles of hereditary right, the crown would descend, first, to the issue of Henry VIII.; secondly, to those of [his elder sister] Margaret Tudor, queen of Scots; thirdly, to those of [his younger sister] Mary Tudor, queen of France. The title of Edward was on all principles equally undisputed; but Mary and Elizabeth might be considered as excluded by the sentence of nullity, which had been pronounced in the case of Catharine and in that of Anne Boleyn, both which sentences had been confirmed in parliament. They had been expressly pronounced to be illegitimate children. Their hereditary right of succession seemed thus to be taken away, and their pretensions rested solely on the conditional settlement of the crown on them, made by their father's will, in pursuance of authority granted to him by act of parliament. After Elizabeth Henry had placed the descendants of Mary, queen of France, passing by the progeny of his eldest sister Margaret. Mary of France, by her second marriage with Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, had two daughters,—lady Frances, who wedded Henry Grey, marquis of Dorset, created duke of Suffolk; and lady Elinor, who espoused Henry Clifford, earl of Cumberland. Henry afterwards

settled the crown by his will on the heirs of these two ladies successively, passing over his nieces themselves in silence. Northumberland obtained the hand of lady Jane Grey, the eldest daughter of Grey duke of Suffolk, by lady Frances Brandon, for lord Guilford Dudley, the admiral's son. The marriage was solemnised in May, 1553, and the fatal right of succession claimed by the house of Suffolk devolved on the excellent and unfortunate lady Jane."—Sir J. Mackintosh, *History of England*, v. 2, ch. 9.

A. D. 1553.—Accession of Queen Mary.

A. D. 1553.—The doubtful conflict of religions.—"Great as was the number of those whom conviction or self interest enlisted under the Protestant banner, it appears plain that the Reformation moved on with too precipitate a step for the majority. The new doctrines prevailed in London, in many large towns, and in the eastern counties. But in the north and west of England, the body of the people were strictly Catholics. The clergy, though not very scrupulous about conforming to the innovations, were generally averse to most of them. And, in spite of the church lands, I imagine that most of the nobility, if not the gentry, inclined to the same persuasion. . . . An historian, whose bias was certainly not unfavourable to protestantism [Burnet, iii. 190, 196] confesses that all endeavours were too weak to overcome the aversion of the people towards reformation, and even intimates that German troops were sent for from Calais on account of the bigotry with which the bulk of the nation adhered to the old superstition. This is somewhat an humiliating admission, that the protestant faith was imposed upon our ancestors by a foreign army. . . . It is certain that the re-establishment of popery on Mary's accession must have been acceptable to a large part, or perhaps to the majority, of the nation."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 2.—"Eight weeks and upwards passed between the proclaiming of Mary queen and the Parliament by her assembled; during which time two religions were together set on foot, Protestantism and Popery; the former hoping to be continued, the latter labouring to be restored. . . . No small justling was there betwixt the zealous promoters of these contrary religions. The Protestants had possession on their side, and the protection of the laws lately made by King Edward, and still standing in free and full force unrepealed. . . . The Papists put their ceremonies in execution, presuming on the queen's private practice and public countenance. . . . Many which were neuters before, conceiving to which side the queen inclined, would not expect, but prevent her authority in alteration: so that superstition generally got ground in the kingdom. Thus it is in the evening twilight, wherein light and darkness at first may seem very equally matched, but the latter within little time doth solely prevail."—T. Fuller, *Church Hist. of Britain*, bk. 8, sect. 1, ¶ 5.

ALSO IN: J. H. Blunt, *Reformation of the Ch. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 8-9.

A. D. 1554.—Wyat's Insurrection.—Queen Mary's marriage with Philip of Spain was opposed with great bitterness of popular feeling, especially in London and its neighborhood. Risings were undertaken in Kent, Devonshire, and the Midland counties, intended for the frustration of the marriage scheme; but they were ill-

planned and soon suppressed. That in Kent, led by Sir Thomas Wyatt, threatened to be formidable at first, and the Queen's troops retreated before it. Wyatt, however, lost his opportunity for securing London, by delays, and his followers dispersed. He was taken prisoner and executed. "Four hundred persons are said to have suffered for this rebellion."—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 36.

A. D. 1555-1558.—The restoration of Romanism.—The persecution of Protestants by Queen Mary.—"An attempt was made, by authority of King Edward's will, to set aside both his sisters from the succession, and raise Lady Jane Grey to the throne, who had lately been married to one of Northumberland's sons. This was Northumberland's doing; he was actuated by ambition, and the other members of the government assented to it, believing, like the late young King, that it was necessary for the preservation of the Protestant faith. Cranmer opposed the measure, but yielded. . . . But the principles of succession were in fact well ascertained at that time, and, what was of more consequence, they were established in public opinion. Nor could the intended change be supported on the ground of religion, for popular feeling was decidedly against the Reformation. Queen Mary obtained possession of her rightful throne without the loss of a single life, so completely did the nation acknowledge her claim; and an after insurrection, rashly planned and worse conducted, served only to hasten the destruction of the Lady Jane and her husband. . . . If any person may be excused for hating the Reformation, it was Mary. She regarded it as having arisen in this country from her mother's wrongs, and enabled the King to complete an iniquitous and cruel divorce. It had exposed her to inconvenience, and even danger, under her father's reign, to vexation and restraint under her brother; and, after having been bastardized in consequence of it, . . . an attempt had been made to deprive her of the inheritance, because she continued to profess the Roman Catholic faith. . . . Had the religion of the country been settled, she might have proved a good and beneficent, as well as conscientious, queen. But she delivered her conscience to the direction of cruel men; and, believing it her duty to act up to the worst principles of a persecuting Church, boasted that she was a virgin sent by God to ride and tame the people of England. . . . The people did not wait till the laws of King Edward were repealed; the Romish doctrines were preached, and in some places the Romish clergy took possession of the churches, turned out the incumbents, and performed mass in jubilant anticipation of their approaching triumph. What course the new Queen would pursue had never been doubtful; and as one of her first acts had been to make Gardiner Chancellor, it was evident that a fiery persecution was at hand. Many who were obnoxious withdrew in time, some into Scotland, and more into Switzerland and the Protestant parts of Germany. Cranmer advised others to fly; but when his friends entreated him to preserve himself by the like precaution, he replied, that it was not fitting for him to desert his post. . . . The Protestant Bishops were soon dispossessed of their sees; the marriages which the Clergy and Religioners had contracted were declared unlawful, and their children bastardized. The heads

of the reformed Clergy, having been brought forth to hold disputations, for the purpose rather of intimidating than of convincing them, had been committed to different prisons, and after these preparatories the fiery process began."—R. Southey, *Book of the Church*, ch. 14.—"The total number of those who suffered in this persecution, from the martyrdom of Rogers, in February, 1555, to September, 1558, when its last ravages were felt, is variously related, in a manner sufficiently different to assure us that the relaters were independent witnesses, who did not borrow from each other, and yet sufficiently near to attest the general accuracy of their distinct statements. By Cooper they are estimated at about 290. According to Burnet they were 284. Speed calculates them at 274. The most accurate account is probably that of Lord Burleigh, who, in his treatise called 'The Execution of Justice in England,' reckons the number of those who died in that reign by imprisonment, torments, famine and fire, to be near 400, of which those who were burnt alive amounted to 290. From Burnet's Tables of the separate years, it is apparent that the persecution reached its full force in its earliest year."—Sir J. Mackintosh, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 2, ch. 11.—"Though Pole and Mary could have laid their hands on earl and baron, knight and gentleman, whose heresy was notorious, although, in the queen's own guard, there were many who never listened to a mass, they durst not strike where there was danger that they would be struck in return. . . . They took the weaver from his loom, the carpenter from his workshop, the husbandman from his plough; they laid hands on maidens and boys 'who had never heard of any other religion than that which they were called on to abjure'; old men tottering into the grave, and children whose lips could but just lisp the articles of their creed; and of these they made their burnt-offerings; with these they crowded their prisons, and when filth and famine killed them, they flung them out to rot."—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 24.—Queen Mary's marriage with Philip of Spain and his arbitrary disposition, "while it thoroughly alienated the kingdom from Mary, created a prejudice against the religion which the Spanish court so steadily favoured. . . . Many are said to have become Protestants under Mary who, at her coming to the throne, had retained the contrary persuasion."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: J. Collier, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of Gt. B.*, pt. 2, bk. 5.—J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 7, ch. 2-3.—J. Fox, *Book of Martyrs*.—P. Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata*, v. 2.—J. Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, bk. 3.

A. D. 1557-1559.—Involved by the Spanish husband of Queen Mary in war with France.—Loss of Calais. See FRANCE: A. D. 1547-1559.

A. D. 1558.—Accession of Queen Elizabeth. A. D. 1558-1588.—The Age of Elizabeth: Recovery of Protestantism.—"The education of Elizabeth, as well as her interest, led her to favour the reformation; and she remained not long in suspense with regard to the party which she should embrace. But though determined in her own mind, she resolved to proceed by gradual and secure steps, and not to imitate the example of Mary, in encouraging the bigots of her party to make immediately a violent invasion on the

established religion. She thought it requisite, however, to discover such symptoms of her intentions as might give encouragement to the Protestants, so much depressed by the late violent persecutions. She immediately recalled all the exiles, and gave liberty to the prisoners who were confined on account of religion. . . . Elizabeth also proceeded to exert, in favour of the reformers, some acts of power, which were authorized by the extent of royal prerogative during that age. Finding that the Protestant teachers, irritated by persecution, broke out in a furious attack on the ancient superstition, and that the Romanists replied with no less zeal and acrimony, she published a proclamation, by which she inhibited all preaching without a special licence; and though she dispensed with these orders in favour of some preachers of her own sect, she took care that they should be the most calm and moderate of the party. She also suspended the laws, so far as to order a great part of the service, the litany, the Lord's prayer, the creed, and the gospels, to be read in English. And, having first published injunctions that all churches should conform themselves to the practice of her own chapel, she forbade the host to be any more elevated in her presence: an innovation which, however frivolous it may appear, implied the most material consequences. These declarations of her intentions, concurring with preceding suspicions, made the bishops foresee, with certainty, a revolution in religion. They therefore refused to officiate at her coronation; and it was with some difficulty that the Bishop of Carlisle was at last prevailed on to perform the ceremony. . . . Elizabeth, though she threw out such hints as encouraged the Protestants, delayed the entire change of religion till the meeting of the Parliament, which was summoned to assemble. The elections had gone entirely against the Catholics, who seem not indeed to have made any great struggle for the superiority; and the Houses met, in a disposition of gratifying the queen in every particular which she could desire of them. . . . The first bill brought into Parliament, with a view of trying their disposition on the head of religion, was that for suppressing the monasteries lately erected, and for restoring the tenths and first-fruits to the queen. This point being gained without much difficulty, a bill was next introduced, annexing the supremacy to the crown; and though the queen was there denominated governess, not head, of the church, it conveyed the same extensive power, which, under the latter title, had been exercised by her father and brother. . . . By this act, the crown, without the concurrence either of the Parliament or even of the convocation, was vested with the whole spiritual power; might repress all heresies, might establish or repeal all canons, might alter every point of discipline, and might ordain or abolish any religious rite or ceremony. . . . A law was passed, confirming all the statutes enacted in King Edward's time with regard to religion; the nomination of bishops was given to the crown without any election of the chapters. . . . A solemn and public disputation was held during this session, in presence of Lord Keeper Bacon, between the divines of the Protestant and those of the Catholic communion. The champions appointed to defend the religion of the sovereign were, as in all former instances, entirely triumphant; and the popish disputants, being pro-

nounced refractory and obstinate, were even punished by imprisonment. Emboldened by this victory, the Protestants ventured on the last and most important step, and brought into Parliament a bill for abolishing the mass, and re-establishing the liturgy of King Edward. Penalties were enacted as well against those who departed from this mode of worship, as against those who absented themselves from the church and the sacraments. And thus, in one session, without any violence, tumult, or clamour, was the whole system of religion altered, on the very commencement of a reign, and by the will of a young woman, whose title to the crown was by many thought liable to great objections."—D. Hume, *Hist. of England*, ch. 38, pp. 375-380 (v. 3).—
 "Elizabeth ascended the throne much more in the character of a Protestant champion than her own convictions and inclinations would have dictated. She was, indeed, the daughter of Ann Boleyn, whom by this time the Protestants were beginning to regard as a martyr of the faith; but she was also the child of Henry VIII., and the heiress of his imperious will. Soon, however, she found herself Protestant almost in her own despite. The Papacy, in the first pride of successful reaction, offered her only the alternative of submission or excommunication, and she did not for a moment hesitate to choose the latter. Then commenced that long and close alliance between Catholicism and domestic treason which is so differently judged as it is approached from the religious or the political side. These seminary priests, who in every various disguise come to England, moving secretly about from manor-house to manor-house, celebrating the rites of the Church, confirming the wavering, consoling the dying, winning back the lapsed to the fold, too well acquainted with Elizabeth's prisons, and often finding their way to her scaffolds,—what are they but the intrepid missionaries, the self-devoted heroes, of a proscribed faith? On the other hand, the Queen is excommunicate, an evil woman, with whom it is not necessary to keep faith, to depose whom would be the triumph of the Church, whose death, however compassed, its occasion: how easy to weave plots under the cloak of religious intercourse, and to make the unity of the faith a conspiracy of rebellion! The next heir to the throne, Mary of Scotland, was a Catholic, and, as long as she lived, a perpetual centre of domestic and European intrigue: plot succeeded plot, in which the traitorous subtlety was all Catholic—the keenness of discovery, the watchfulness of defence, all Protestant. Then, too, the shadow of Spanish supremacy began to cast itself broadly over Europe: the unequal struggle with Holland was still prolonged: it was known that Philip's dearest wish was to recover to his empire and the Church the island kingdom which had once unwillingly accepted his rule. It was thus the instinct of self-defence which placed Elizabeth at the head of the Protestant interest in Europe: she sent Philip Sidney to die at Zutphen: her sailor buccaneers, whether there were peace at home or not, bit and tore at everything Spanish upon the southern main: till at last, 1588, Philip gathered up all his naval strength and hurled the Armada at our shores. 'Afflavit Deus, et dissipati sunt.' The valour of England did much; the storms of heaven the rest. Mary of Scotland had gone to her death the year before, and her son had been trained to

hate his mother's faith. There could be no question any more of the fixed Protestantism of the English people."—C. Beard, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1883: *The Reformation*, lect. 9.

A. D. 1558-1598.—The Age of Elizabeth: The Queen's chief councillors.—"Sir William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burleigh, already officially experienced during three reigns, though still young, was the queen's chief adviser from first to last—that is to say, till he died in 1598. Philip II., who also died in that year, was thus his exact contemporary; for he mounted the Spanish throne just when Elizabeth and her minister began their work together. He was not long in discovering that there was one man, possessed of the most balanced judgment ever brought to the head of English affairs, who was capable of unwinding all his most secret intrigues; and, in fact, the two arch-enemies, the one in London and the other in Madrid, were pitted against each other for forty years. Elizabeth had also the good sense to select the wisest and most learned ecclesiastic of his day, Matthew Parker, for her Primate and chief adviser in Church affairs. It should be noted that both of these sages, as well as the queen herself, had been Conformists to the Papal obedience under Mary—a position far from heroic, but not for a moment to be confused with that of men whose philosophical indifference to the questions which exercised all the highest minds enabled them to join in the persecution of Romanists and Anglicans at different times with a sublime impartiality. . . . It was under the advice of Cecil and Parker that Elizabeth, on coming to the throne, made her famous settlement or Establishment of religion."—M. Burrows, *Commentaries on the Hist. of England*, bk. 2, ch. 17.

A. D. 1558-1603.—The Age of Elizabeth: Parliament.—"The house of Commons, upon a review of Elizabeth's reign, was very far, on the one hand, from exercising those constitutional rights which have long since belonged to it, or even those which by ancient precedent they might have claimed as their own; yet, on the other hand, was not quite so servile and submissive an assembly as an artful historian has represented it. If many of its members were but creatures of power, . . . there was still a considerable party, sometimes carrying the house along with them, who with patient resolution and inflexible aim recurred in every session to the assertion of that one great privilege which their sovereign contested, the right of parliament to inquire into and suggest a remedy for every public mischief or danger. It may be remarked that the ministers, such as Knollys, Hatton, and Robert Cecil, not only sat among the commons, but took a very leading part in their discussions; a proof that the influence of argument could no more be dispensed with than that of power. This, as I conceive, will never be the case in any kingdom where the assembly of the estates is quite subservient to the crown. Nor should we put out of consideration the manner in which the commons were composed. Sixty-two members were added at different times by Elizabeth to the representation; as well from places which had in earlier times discontinued their franchise, as from those to which it was first granted; a very large proportion of them petty boroughs, evidently under the influence of the crown or peerage. The ministry took much pains with elections, of which many proofs remain. The house accordingly was

filled with placemen, civilians, and common lawyers grasping at preferment. The slavish tone of these persons, as we collect from the minutes of D'Ewes, is strikingly contrasted by the manliness of independent gentlemen. And as the house was by no means very fully attended, the divisions, a few of which are recorded, running from 200 to 250 in the aggregate, it may be perceived that the court, whose followers were at hand, would maintain a formidable influence. But this influence, however pernicious to the integrity of parliament, is distinguishable from that exertion of almost absolute prerogative which Hume has assumed as the sole spring of Elizabeth's government, and would never be employed till some deficiency of strength was experienced in the other."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 5.

A. D. 1558-1603.—The Age of Elizabeth: Literature.—"The age of Elizabeth was distinguished beyond, perhaps, any other in our history by a number of great men, famous in different ways, and whose names have come down to us with unblemished honours: statesmen, warriors, divines, scholars, poets, and philosophers; Raleigh, Drake, Coke, Hooker, and—high and more sounding still, and still more frequent in our mouths—Shakespeare, Spenser, Sidney, Bacon, Jonson, Beaumont, and Fletcher, men whom fame has eternised in her long and lasting scroll, and who, by their words and acts, were benefactors of their country, and ornaments of human nature. Their attainments of different kinds bore the same general stamp, and it was sterling; what they did had the mark of their age and country upon it. Perhaps the genius of Great Britain (if I may so speak without offence or flattery) never shone out fuller or brighter, or looked more like itself, than at this period. Our writers and great men had something in them that savoured of the soil from which they grew: they were not French; they were not Dutch, or German, or Greek, or Latin; they were truly English. They did not look out of themselves to see what they should be; they sought for truth and nature, and found it in themselves. There was no tinsel, and but little art; they were not the spoilt children of affectation and refinement, but a bold, vigorous, independent race of thinkers, with prodigious strength and energy, with none but natural grace, and heartfelt, unobtrusive delicacy. . . . For such an extraordinary combination and development of fancy and genius many causes may be assigned; and we may seek for the chief of them in religion, in politics, in the circumstances of the time, the recent diffusion of letters, in local situation, and in the character of the men who adorned that period, and availed themselves so nobly of the advantages placed within their reach. . . . The first cause I shall mention, as contributing to this general effect, was the Reformation, which had just then taken place. This event gave a mighty impulse and increased activity to thought and inquiry, and agitated the inert mass of accumulated prejudices throughout Europe. . . . The translation of the Bible was the chief engine in the great work. It threw open, by a secret spring, the rich treasures of religion and morality, which had been there locked up as in a shrine. It revealed the visions of the prophets, and conveyed the lessons of inspired teachers (such they were thought) to the meanest of the people. It

gave them a common interest in the common cause. Their hearts burnt within them as they read. It gave a mind to the people, by giving them common subjects of thought and feeling. . . . The immediate use or application that was made of religion to subjects of imagination and fiction was not (from an obvious ground of separation) so direct or frequent as that which was made of the classical and romantic literature. For much about the same time, the rich and fascinating stores of the Greek and Roman mythology, and those of the romantic poetry of Spain and Italy, were eagerly explored by the curious, and thrown open in translations to the admiring gaze of the vulgar. . . . What also gave an unusual impetus to the mind of man at this period, was the discovery of the New World, and the reading of voyages and travels. Green islands and golden sands seemed to arise, as by enchantment, out of the bosom of the watery waste, and invite the cupidity, or wing the imagination of the dreaming speculator. Fairyland was realised in new and unknown worlds. . . . Again, the heroic and martial spirit which breathes in our elder writers, was yet in considerable activity in the reign of Elizabeth. The age of chivalry was not then quite gone, nor the glory of Europe extinguished forever. . . . Lastly, to conclude this account: What gave a unity and common direction to all these causes, was the natural genius of the country, which was strong in these writers in proportion to their strength. We are a nation of islanders, and we cannot help it, nor mend ourselves if we would. We are something in ourselves, nothing when we try to ape others. Music and painting are not our forte: for what we have done in that way has been little, and that borrowed from others with great difficulty. But we may boast of our poets and philosophers. That's something. We have had strong heads and sound hearts among us. Thrown on one side of the world, and left to bustle for ourselves, we have fought out many a battle for truth and freedom. That is our natural style; and it were to be wished we had in no instance departed from it. Our situation has given us a certain cast of thought and character; and our liberty has enabled us to make the most of it. We are of a stiff clay, not moulded into every fashion, with stubborn joints not easily bent. We are slow to think, and therefore impressions do not work upon us till they act in masses. . . . We may be accused of grossness, but not of flimsiness; of extravagance, but not of affectation; of want of art and refinement, but not of a want of truth and nature. Our literature, in a word, is Gothic and grotesque; unequal and irregular; not cast in a previous mould, nor of one uniform texture, but of great weight in the whole, and of incomparable value in the best parts. It aims at an excess of beauty or power, hits or misses, and is either very good indeed, or absolutely good for nothing. This character applies in particular to our literature in the age of Elizabeth, which is its best period, before the introduction of a rage for French rules and French models."—W. Hazlitt, *Lectures on the Literature of the Age of Elizabeth*, lect. 1.—"Humanism, before it moulded the mind of the English, had already permeated Italian and French literature. Classical erudition had been adapted to the needs of modern thought. Antique authors had been collected, printed, annotated, and translated. They

were fairly mastered in the south, and assimilated to the style of the vernacular. By these means much of the learning popularised by our poets, essayists, and dramatists came to us at second-hand, and bore the stamp of contemporary genius. In like manner, the best works of Italian, French, Spanish, and German literature were introduced into Great Britain together with the classics. The age favoured translation, and English readers before the close of the sixteenth century, were in possession of a cosmopolitan library in their mother tongue, including choice specimens of ancient and modern masterpieces. These circumstances sufficiently account for the richness and variety of Elizabethan literature. They also help to explain two points which must strike every student of that literature—its native freshness, and its marked unity of style. Elizabethan literature was fresh and native, because it was the utterance of a youthful race, aroused to vigorous self-consciousness under conditions which did not depress or exhaust its energies. The English opened frank eyes upon the discovery of the world and man, which had been effected by the Renaissance. They were not wearied with collecting, collating, correcting, transmitting to the press. All the hard work of assimilating the humanities had been done for them. They had only to survey and to enjoy, to feel and to express, to lay themselves open to delightful influences, to con the noble lessons of the past, to thrill beneath the beauty and the awe of an authentic revelation. Criticism had not laid its cold, dry finger on the blossoms of the fancy. The new learning was still young enough to be a thing of wonder and entrancing joy.”—J. A. Symonds, *A Comparison of Elizabethan with Victorian Poetry* (*Fortnightly Rev.*, v. 45, p. 56).

A. D. 1559.—The Act of Supremacy, the Act of Uniformity, and the Court of High Commission.—“When Elizabeth’s first Parliament met in January 1559, Convocation, of course, met too. It at once claimed that the clergy alone had authority in matters of faith, and proceeded to pass resolutions in favour of Transubstantiation, the Mass, and the Papal Supremacy. The bishops and the Universities signed a formal agreement to this effect. That in the constitution of the English Church, Convocation, as Convocation, has no such power as this, was proved by the steps now taken. The Crown, advised by the Council and Parliament, took the matter in hand. As every element, except the Roman, had been excluded from the clerical bodies, a consultation was ordered between the representatives of both sides, and all preaching was suspended till a settlement had been arrived at between the queen and the Three Estates of the realm. The consultation broke up on the refusal of the Romanist champions to keep to the terms agreed upon; but even before it took place Parliament restored the Royal Supremacy, repealed the laws of Mary affecting religion, and gave the queen by her own desire, not the title of ‘Supreme Head,’ but ‘Supreme Governor,’ of the Church of England.”—M. Burrows, *Commentaries on the Hist. of Eng.*, bk. 2, ch. 17.—This first Parliament of Elizabeth passed two memorable acts of great importance in English history,—the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity of Common Prayer. “The former is entitled ‘An act for restoring to the crown the antient jurisdiction over the State

Ecclesiastical and Spiritual; and for abolishing foreign power.’ It is the same for substance with the 25th of Henry VIII. . . . but the commons incorporated several other bills into it; for besides the title of ‘Supreme Governor in all causes Ecclesiastical and Temporal,’ which is restored to the Queen, the act revives those laws of King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI. which had been repealed in the late reign. It forbids all appeals to Rome, and exonerates the subjects from all exactions and impositions heretofore paid to that court; and as it revives King Edward’s laws, it repeals a severe act made in the late reign for punishing heresy. . . . ‘Moreover, all persons in any public employs, whether civil or ecclesiastical, are obliged to take an oath in recognition of the Queen’s right to the crown, and of her supremacy in all causes ecclesiastical and civil, on penalty of forfeiting all their promotions in the church, and of being declared incapable of holding any public office.’ . . . Further, ‘The act forbids all writing, printing, teaching, or preaching, and all other deeds or acts whereby any foreign jurisdiction over these realms is defended, upon pain that they and their abettors, being thereof convicted, shall for the first offence forfeit their goods and chattels; . . . spiritual persons shall lose their benefices, and all ecclesiastical preferments; for the second offence they shall incur the penalties of a præmunire; and the third offence shall be deemed high treason.’ There is a remarkable clause in this act, which gave rise to a new court, called ‘The Court of High Commission.’ The words are these, ‘The Queen and her successors shall have power, by their letters patent under the great seal, to assign, name, and authorize, as often as they shall think meet, and for as long a time as they shall please, persons being natural-born subjects, to use, occupy, and exercise, under her and them, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, and preeminences, touching any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, &c., to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences and enormities whatsoever. Provided, that they have no power to determine anything to be heresy, but what has been adjudged to be so by the authority of the canonical scripture, or by the first four general councils, or any of them; or by any other general council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of canonical scripture; or such as shall hereafter be declared to be heresy by the high court of parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation.’ Upon the authority of this clause the Queen appointed a certain number of ‘Commissioners’ for ecclesiastical causes, who exercised the same power that had been lodged in the hands of one vicegerent in the reign of King Henry VIII. And how sadly they abused their power in this and the two next reigns will appear in the sequel of this history. They did not trouble themselves much with the express words of scripture, or the four first general councils, but entangled their prisoners with oaths ex-officio, and the inextricable mazes of the popish canon law. . . . The papists being vanquished, the next point was to unite the reformed among themselves. . . . Though all the reformers were of one faith, yet they were far from agreeing about discipline and ceremonies, each party being for settling the church accord-

ing to their own model. . . . The Queen . . . therefore appointed a committee of divines to review King Edward's liturgy, and to see if in any particular it was fit to be changed; their names were Dr. Parker, Grindal, Cox, Pilkington, May, Bill, Whitehead, and Sir Thomas Smith, doctor of the civil law. Their instructions were, to strike out all offensive passages against the pope, and to make people easy about the belief of the corporal presence of Christ in the sacraments; but not a word in favour of the stricter protestants. Her Majesty was afraid of reforming too far; she was desirous to retain images in churches, crucifixes and crosses, vocal and instrumental music, with all the old popish garments; it is not therefore to be wondered, that in reviewing the liturgy of King Edward, no alterations were made in favour of those who now began to be called Puritans, from their attempting a purer form of worship and discipline than had yet been established. . . . The book was presented to the two houses and passed into a law. . . . The title of the act is 'An act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and administration of the Sacraments.' It was brought into the House of Commons April 18th, and was read a third time April 20th. It passed the House of Lords April 28th, and took place from the 24th of June 1559."—D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 1, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: G. Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation of the Ch. of Eng.*, v. 2, bk. 3.—P. Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata: Elizabeth, Anno 1*.

A. D. 1559-1566.—Puritanism taking form.—"The Church of England was a latitudinarian experiment, a contrivance to enable men of opposing creeds to live together without shedding each others' blood. It was not intended, and it was not possible, that Catholics or Protestants should find in its formulas all that they required. The services were deliberately made elastic; comprehending in the form of positive statement only what all Christians agreed in believing, while opportunities were left open by the rubric to vary the ceremonial according to the taste of the congregations. The management lay with the local authorities in town or parish; where the people were Catholics the Catholic aspect could be made prominent; where Popery was a bugbear, the people were not disturbed by the obtrusion of doctrines which they had outgrown. In itself it pleased no party or section. To the heated controversialist its chief merit was its chief defect. . . . Where the tendencies to Rome were strongest, there the extreme Reformers considered themselves bound to exhibit in the most marked contrast the unloveliness of the purer creed. It was they who furnished the noble element in the Church of England. It was they who had been its martyrs; they who, in their scorn of the world, in their passionate desire to consociate themselves in life and death to the Almighty, were able to rival in self-devotion the Catholic Saints. But they had not the wisdom of the serpent, and certainly not the harmlessness of the dove. Had they been let alone—had they been unharassed by perpetual threats of revolution and a return of the persecutions—they, too, were not disinclined to reason and good sense. A remarkable specimen survives, in an account of the Church of Northampton, of what English Protestantism could become under favouring conditions. . . . The fury of the times

unhappily forbade the maintenance of this wise and prudent spirit. As the power of evil gathered to destroy the Church of England, a fiercer temper was required to combat with them, and Protestantism became impatient, like David, of the uniform in which it was sent to the battle. It would have fared ill with England had there been no hotter blood there than filtered in the sluggish veins of the officials of the Establishment. There needed an enthusiasm fiercer far to encounter the revival of Catholic fanaticism; and if the young Puritans, in the heat and glow of their convictions, snapped their traces and flung off their harness, it was they, after all, who saved the Church which attempted to disown them, and with the Church saved also the stolid mediocrity to which the fates then and ever committed and commit the government of it."—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 10, ch. 20.—"The compromise arranged by Cranmer had from the first been considered by a large body of Protestants as a scheme for serving two masters, as an attempt to unite the worship of the Lord with the worship of Baal. In the days of Edward VI. the scruples of this party had repeatedly thrown great difficulties in the way of the government. When Elizabeth came to the throne, those difficulties were much increased. Violence naturally engenders violence. The spirit of Protestantism was therefore far fiercer and more intolerant after the cruelties of Mary than before them. Many persons who were warmly attached to the new opinions had, during the evil days, taken refuge in Switzerland and Germany. They had been hospitably received by their brethren in the faith, had sate at the feet of the great doctors of Strasburg, Zurich and Geneva, and had been, during some years, accustomed to a more simple worship, and to a more democratical form of church government, than England had yet seen. These men returned to their country, convinced that the reform which had been effected under King Edward had been far less searching and extensive than the interests of pure religion required. But it was in vain that they attempted to obtain any concession from Elizabeth. Indeed, her system, wherever it differed from her brother's, seemed to them to differ for the worse. They were little disposed to submit, in matters of faith, to any human authority. . . . Since these men could not be convinced, it was determined that they should be persecuted. Persecution produced its natural effect on them. It found them a sect; it made them a faction. . . . The power of the discontented sectaries was great. They were found in every rank; but they were strongest among the mercantile classes in the towns, and among the small proprietors in the country. Early in the reign of Elizabeth they began to return a majority of the House of Commons. And doubtless, had our ancestors been then at liberty to fix their attention entirely on domestic questions, the strife between the crown and the Parliament would instantly have commenced. But that was no season for internal dissensions. . . . Roman Catholic Europe and reformed Europe were struggling for death or life. . . . Whatever might be the faults of Elizabeth, it was plain that, to speak humanly, the fate of the realm and of all reformed churches was staked on the security of her person and on the success of her administration. . . . The Puritans, even in the depths of the prisons to

which she had sent them, prayed, and with no simulated fervour, that she might be kept from the dagger of the assassin, that rebellion might be put down under her feet, and that her arms might be victorious by sea and land."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 1.—"Two parties quickly evolved themselves out of the mass of Englishmen who held Calvinistic opinions; namely those who were willing to conform to the requirements of the Queen, and those who were not. To both is often given indiscriminately by historians the name of Puritan; but it seems more correct, and certainly is more convenient, to restrict the use of the name to those who are sometimes called conforming Puritans. . . . To the other party fitly belongs the name of Nonconformist. . . . It was against the Nonconformist organization that Elizabeth's efforts were chiefly directed. . . . The war began in the enforcement by Archbishop Parker in 1565 of the Advertisements as containing the minimum of ceremonial that would be tolerated. In 1566 the clergy of London were required to make the declaration of Conformity which was appended to the Advertisements, and thirty-seven were suspended or deprived for refusal. Some of the deprived ministers continued to conduct services and preach in spite of their deprivation, and so were formed the first bodies of Nonconformists, organized in England."—H. O. Wakeman, *The Church and the Puritans*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: J. Tulloch, *Eng. Puritanism and its Leaders*, int.—D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 1, ch. 4.—D. Campbell, *The Puritan in Holland, Eng., and Am.*, ch. 8-10 (v. 1).

A. D. 1562-1567.—Hawkins' slave-trading voyages to America.—First English enterprise in the New World. See AMERICA: A. D. 1562-1567.

A. D. 1564-1565 (?).—The first naming of the Puritans.—"The English bishops, conceiving themselves empowered by their canons, began to show their authority in urging the clergy of their dioceses to subscribe to the Liturgy, ceremonies and discipline of the Church; and such as refused the same were branded with the odious name of Puritans. A name which in this notion first began in this year [A. D. 1564]; and the grief had not been great if it had ended in the same. The philosopher banisheth the term, (which is Polysæmon), that is subject to several senses, out of the predicaments, as affording too much covert for cavil by the latitude thereof. On the same account could I wish that the word Puritan were banished common discourse, because so various in the acceptations thereof. We need not speak of the ancient Cathari or primitive Puritans, sufficiently known by their heretical opinions. Puritan here was taken for the opposers of the hierarchy and church service, as resenting of superstition. But profane mouths quickly improved this nickname, therewith on every occasion to abuse pious people; some of them so far from opposing the Liturgy, that they endeavoured (according to the instructions thereof in the preparative to the Confession) 'to accompany the minister with a pure heart,' and laboured (as it is in the Absolution) 'for a life pure and holy.' We will, therefore, decline the word to prevent exceptions; which, if casually slipping from our pen, the reader knoweth that only nonconformists are thereby intended."—T. Fuller, *Church Hist. of Britain*, bk. 9, sect. 1.—"For in this year

[1565] it was that the Zuinglian or Calvinian faction began to be first known by the name of Puritans, if Genebrard, Gualter, and Spondanus (being all of them right good chronologers) be not mistaken in the time. Which name hath ever since been appropriate to them, because of their pretending to a greater purity in the service of God than was held forth unto them (as they gave out) in the Common Prayer Book; and to a greater opposition to the rites and usages of the Church of Rome than was agreeable to the constitution of the Church of England."—P. Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata: Elizabeth, Anno 7, sect. 6.*

A. D. 1568.—Detention and imprisonment of Mary Queen of Scots. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1561-1568.

A. D. 1569.—Quarrel with the Spanish governor of the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1568-1572.

A. D. 1572-1580.—Drake's piratical warfare with Spain and his famous voyage. See AMERICA: A. D. 1572-1580.

A. D. 1572-1603.—Queen Elizabeth's treatment of the Roman Catholics.—Persecution of the Seminary Priests and the Jesuits.—"Camden and many others have asserted that by systematic connivance the Roman Catholics enjoyed a pretty free use of their religion for the first fourteen years of Elizabeth's reign. But this is not reconcilable to many passages in Strype's collections. We find abundance of persons harassed for recusancy, that is, for not attending the protestant church, and driven to insincere promises of conformity. Others were dragged before ecclesiastical commissions for harbouring priests, or for sending money to those who had fled beyond sea. . . . A great majority both of clergy and laity yielded to the times; and of these temporizing conformists it cannot be doubted that many lost by degrees all thought of returning to their ancient fold. But others, while they complied with exterior ceremonies, retained in their private devotions their accustomed mode of worship. . . . Priests . . . travelled the country in various disguises, to keep alive a flame which the practice of outward conformity was calculated to extinguish. There was not a county throughout England, says a Catholic historian, where several of Mary's clergy did not reside, and were commonly called the old priests. They served as chaplains in private families. By stealth, at the dead of night, in private chambers, in the secret lurking places of an ill-peopled country, with all the mystery that subdues the imagination, with all the mutual trust that invigorates constancy, these proscribed ecclesiastics celebrated their solemn rites, more impressive in such concealment than if surrounded by all their former splendour. . . . It is my thorough conviction that the persecution, for it can obtain no better name, carried on against the English Catholics, however it might serve to delude the government by producing an apparent conformity, could not but excite a spirit of disloyalty in many adherents of that faith. Nor would it be safe to assert that a more conciliating policy would have altogether disarmed their hostility, much less laid at rest those busy hopes of the future, which the peculiar circumstances of Elizabeth's reign had a tendency to produce."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 3.—"The more vehement Catholics had withdrawn from the country, on account of the dan-

gers which there beset them. They had taken refuge in the Low Countries, and there Allen, one of the chief among them, had established a seminary at Douay, for the purpose of keeping up a supply of priests in England. To Douay numbers of young Englishmen from Oxford continually flocked. The establishment had been broken up by Requesens, and removed to Rheims, and a second college of the same description was established at Rome. From these two centres of intrigue numerous enthusiastic young men constantly repaired to England, and in the disguise of laymen carried on their priestly work and attempted to revive the Romanist religion. But abler and better disciplined workmen were now wanted. Allen and his friends therefore opened negotiations with Mercuriano, the head of the Jesuit order, in which many Englishmen had enrolled themselves. In 1580, as part of a great combined Catholic effort, a regular Jesuit mission, under two priests, Campion and Parsons, was despatched to England. . . . The new missionaries were allowed to say that that part of the Bull [of excommunication issued against Elizabeth] which pronounced censures upon those who clung to their allegiance applied to heretics only, that Catholics might profess themselves loyal until the time arrived for carrying the Bull into execution; in other words, they were permitted to be traitors at heart while declaring themselves loyal subjects. This explanation of the Bull was of itself sufficient to justify severity on the part of the government. It was impossible henceforward to separate Roman Catholicism from disloyalty. Proclamations were issued requiring English parents to summon their children from abroad, and declaring that to harbour Jesuit priests was to support rebels. . . . Early in December several priests were apprehended and closely examined, torture being occasionally used for the purpose. In view of the danger which these examinations disclosed, stringent measures were taken. Attendance at church was rendered peremptorily necessary. Parliament was summoned in the beginning of 1581 and laws passed against the action of the Jesuits. . . . Had Elizabeth been conscious of the full extent of the plot against her, had she known the intention of the Guises [then dominant in France] to make a descent upon England in co-operation with Spain, and the many ramifications of the plot in her own country, it is reasonable to suppose that she would have been forced at length to take decided measures. But in ignorance of the abyss opening before her feet, she continued for some time longer her old temporizing policy." At last, in November, 1583, the discovery of a plot for the assassination of the queen, and the arrest of one Throgmorton, whose papers and whose confession were of startling import, brought to light the whole plan and extent of the conspiracy. "Some of her Council urged her at once to take a straightforward step, to make common cause with the Protestants of Scotland and the Netherlands, and to bid defiance to Spain. To this honest step, she as usual could not bring herself, but strong measures were taken in England. Great numbers of Jesuits and seminary priests were apprehended and executed, suspected magistrates removed, and those Catholic Lords whose treachery might have been fatal to her ejected from their places of authority and deprived of influence."—J. F.

Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period 2, pp. 546-549*.—"That the conspiracy with which these men were charged was a fiction cannot be doubted. They had come to England under a prohibition to take any part in secular concerns, and with the sole view of exercising the spiritual functions of the priesthood. . . . At the same time it must be owned that the answers which six of them gave to the queries were far from satisfactory. Their hesitation to deny the opposing power (a power then indeed maintained by the greater number of divines in Catholic kingdoms) rendered their loyalty very problematical, in case of an attempt to enforce the bull by any foreign prince. It furnished sufficient reason to watch their conduct with an eye of jealousy . . . but could not justify their execution for an imaginary offence."—J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng., v. 8, ch. 3*.—"It is probable that not many more than 200 Catholics were executed, as such, in Elizabeth's reign, and this was ten score too many. . . . 'Dod reckons them at 191; Milner has raised the list to 204. Fifteen of these, according to him, suffered for denying the Queen's supremacy, 126 for exercising their ministry, and the rest for being reconciled to the Romish church. Many others died of hardships in prison, and many were deprived of their property. There seems, nevertheless [says Hallam], to be good reason for doubting whether any one who was executed might not have saved his life by explicitly denying the Pope's power to depose the Queen.'"—J. L. Motley, *Hist. of the United Netherlands, ch. 17, with foot-note*.

ALSO IN: J. Foley, *Records of the Eng. Province of the Soc. of Jesus*.

A. D. 1574.—Emancipation of villeins on the royal domains.—Practical end of serfdom. See SLAVERY, MEDIEVAL: ENGLAND.

A. D. 1575.—Sovereignty of Holland and Zealand offered to Queen Elizabeth, and declined. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1575-1577.

A. D. 1581.—Marriage proposals of the Duke of Anjou declined by Queen Elizabeth. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1581-1584.

A. D. 1583.—The expedition of Sir Humphrey Gilbert.—Formal possession taken of Newfoundland. See AMERICA: A. D. 1583.

A. D. 1584-1590.—Raleigh's colonizing attempts in America. See AMERICA: A. D. 1584-1586; and 1587-1590.

A. D. 1585-1586.—Leicester in the Low Countries.—Queen Elizabeth's treacherous dealing with the struggling Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1585-1586.

A. D. 1585-1587.—Mary Queen of Scots and the Catholic conspiracies.—Her trial and execution.—"Maddened by persecution, by the hopelessness of rebellion within or deliverance from without, the fiercer Catholics listened to schemes of assassination, to which the murder of William of Orange lent at the moment a terrible significance. The detection of Somerville, a fanatic who had received the host before setting out for London 'to shoot the Queen with his dagger,' was followed by measures of natural severity, by the flight and arrest of Catholic gentry, by a vigorous purification of the Inns of Court, where a few Catholics lingered, and by the dispatch of fresh batches of priests to the block. The trial and death of Parry, a member of the House of Commons who had served in the Queen's household, on a similar charge, brought the Parlia-

ment together in a transport of horror and loyalty. All Jesuits and seminary priests were banished from the realm on pain of death. A bill for the security of the Queen disqualified any claimant of the succession who had instigated subjects to rebellion or hurt to the Queen's person from ever succeeding to the crown. The threat was aimed at Mary Stuart. Weary of her long restraint, of her failure to rouse Philip or Scotland to aid her, of the baffled revolt of the English Catholics and the baffled intrigues of the Jesuits, she bent for a moment to submission. 'Let me go,' she wrote to Elizabeth; 'let me retire from this island to some solitude where I may prepare my soul to die. Grant this and I will sign away every right which either I or mine can claim.' But the cry was useless, and her despair found a new and more terrible hope in the plots against Elizabeth's life. She knew and approved the vow of Anthony Babington and a band of young Catholics, for the most part connected with the royal household, to kill the Queen; but plot and approval alike passed through Walsingham's hands, and the seizure of Mary's correspondence revealed her guilt. In spite of her protests, a commission of peers sat as her judges at Fotheringay Castle; and their verdict of 'guilty' annihilated, under the provisions of the recent statute, her claim to the crown. The streets of London blazed with bonfires, and peals rang out from steeple to steeple, at the news of her condemnation; but, in spite of the prayer of Parliament for her execution, and the pressure of the Council, Elizabeth shrank from her death. The force of public opinion, however, was now carrying all before it, and the unanimous demand of her people wrested at last a sullen consent from the Queen. She flung the warrant signed upon the floor, and the Council took on themselves the responsibility of executing it. Mary died [Feb. 8, 1587] on a scaffold which was erected in the castle hall at Fotheringay, as dauntlessly as she had lived. 'Do not weep,' she said to her ladies, 'I have given my word for you.' 'Tell my friends,' she charged Melville, 'that I die a good Catholic.'—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the Eng. People*, ch. 7, sect. 6.—"Who now doubts," writes an eloquent modern writer, 'that it would have been wiser in Elizabeth to spare her life?' Rather, the political wisdom of a critical and difficult act has never in the world's history been more signally justified. It cut away the only interest on which the Scotch and English Catholics could possibly have combined. It determined Philip upon the undisguised pursuit of the English throne, and it enlisted against him and his projects the passionate patriotism of the English nobility."—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 12, ch. 34.

ALSO IN: A. De Lamartine, *Mary Stuart*, ch. 31-34.—L. S. F. Buckingham, *Memoirs of Mary Stuart*, v. 2, ch. 5-6.—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, bk. 3, ch. 5.—J. D. Leader, *Mary Queen of Scots in Captivity*.—C. Nau, *Hist. of Mary Stuart*.—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of Mary Queen of Scots*, ch. 9-10.

A. D. 1587-1588.—The wrath of Catholic Europe.—Spanish vengeance and ambition astir.—"The death of Mary [Queen of Scots] may have preserved England from the religious struggle which would have ensued upon her accession to the throne, but it delivered Elizabeth

from only one, and that the weakest of her enemies; and it exposed her to a charge of injustice and cruelty, which, being itself well founded, obtained belief for any other accusation, however extravagantly false. It was not Philip [of Spain] alone who prepared for making war upon her with a feeling of personal hatred: throughout Romish Christendom she was represented as a monster of iniquity; that representation was assiduously set forth, not in ephemeral libels, but in histories, in dramas, in poems, and in hawkers' pamphlets; and when the king of Spain equipped an armament for the invasion of England, volunteers entered it with a passionate persuasion that they were about to bear a part in a holy war against the wickedest and most inhuman of tyrants. The Pope exhorted Philip to engage in this great enterprise for the sake of the Roman Catholic and apostolic church, which could not be more effectually nor more meritoriously extended than by the conquest of England. . . . And he promised, as soon as his troops should have set foot in that island, to supply him with a million of crowns of gold towards the expenses of the expedition. . . . Such exhortations accorded with the ambition, the passions, and the rooted principles of the king of Spain. The undertaking was resolved."—R. Southey, *Lives of the British Admirals*, v. 2, p. 319.—"The succours which Elizabeth had from time to time afforded to the insurgents of the Netherlands was not the only cause of Philip's resentment and of his desire for revenge. She had fomented the disturbances in Portugal, . . . and her captains, among whom Sir Francis Drake was the most active, had for many years committed unjustifiable depredations on the Spanish possessions of South America, and more than once on the coasts of the Peninsula itself. . . . By Spanish historians, these hostilities are represented as unprovoked."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal*, bk. 4, sect. 1, ch. 1.—When the intentions of the Spaniard were known, Drake's activity increased. In the spring of 1587, he sailed into the harbor of Cadiz, and destroyed 50 or 60 ships, which is said to have delayed the expedition for a year. This he called "singeing the king of Spain's beard."

ALSO IN: J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 12, ch. 35.

A. D. 1588.—The Spanish Armada.—"Perhaps in the history of mankind there has never been a vast project of conquest conceived and matured in so protracted and yet so desultory a manner, as was this famous Spanish invasion. . . . At last, on the 28th, 29th and 30th May, 1588, the fleet, which had been waiting at Lisbon more than a month for favourable weather, set sail from that port, after having been duly blessed by the Cardinal Archduke Albert, viceroy of Portugal. There were rather more than 130 ships in all, divided into 10 squadrons. . . . The total tonnage of the fleet was 59,120; the number of guns was 3,165. Of Spanish troops there were 19,295 on board: there were 8,252 sailors and 2,088 galley-slaves. Besides these, there was a force of noble volunteers, belonging to the most illustrious houses of Spain, with their attendants, amounting to nearly 2,000 in all. . . . The size of the ships ranged from 1,200 tons to 300. The galleons, of which there were about 60, were huge round-stemmed clumsy vessels, with bulwarks three or four feet thick, and built up at stem and stern, like castles. The

galleasses—of which there were four—were a third larger than the ordinary galley, and were rowed each by 300 galley-slaves. They consisted of an enormous towering fortress at the stern, a castellated structure almost equally massive in front, with seats for the rowers amidships. At stem and stern and between each of the slaves' benches were heavy cannon. These galleasses were floating edifices, very wonderful to contemplate. They were gorgeously decorated. There were splendid state-apartments, cabins, chapels, and pulpits in each, and they were amply provided with awnings, cushions, streamers, standards, gilded saints and bands of music. To take part in an ostentatious pageant, nothing could be better devised. To fulfil the great objects of a war-vessel—to sail and to fight—they were the worst machines ever launched upon the ocean. The four galleys were similar to the galleasses in every respect except that of size, in which they were by one-third inferior. All the ships of the fleet—galleasses, galleys, galleons, and hulks—were so encumbered with top-hamper, so over-weighted in proportion to their draught of water, that they could bear but little canvas, even with smooth seas and light and favourable winds. . . . Such was the machinery which Philip had at last set afloat, for the purpose of dethroning Elizabeth and establishing the inquisition in England. One hundred and forty ships, 11,000 Spanish veterans, as many more recruits, partly Spanish, partly Portuguese, 2,000 grandees, as many galley slaves, and 300 barefooted friars and inquisitors. The plan was simple. Medina Sidonia [the captain-general of the Armada] was to proceed straight from Lisbon to Calais roads: there he was to wait for the Duke of Parma [Spanish commander in the Netherlands], who was to come forth from Newport, Sluys, and Dunkirk, bringing with him his 17,000 veterans, and to assume the chief command of the whole expedition. They were then to cross the channel to Dover, land the army of Parma, reinforced with 6,000 Spaniards from the fleet, and with these 23,000 men Alexander was to march at once upon London. Medina Sidonia was to seize and fortify the Isle of Wight, guard the entrance of the harbours against any interference from the Dutch and English fleets, and—so soon as the conquest of England had been effected—he was to proceed to Ireland. . . . A strange omission had however been made in the plan from first to last. The commander of the whole expedition was the Duke of Parma: on his head was the whole responsibility. Not a gun was to be fired—if it could be avoided—until he had come forth with his veterans to make his junction with the Invincible Armada off Calais. Yet there was no arrangement whatever to enable him to come forth—not the slightest provision to effect that junction. . . . Medina could not go to Farnese [Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma], nor could Farnese come to Medina. The junction was likely to be difficult, and yet it had never once entered the heads of Philip or his counsellors to provide for that difficulty. . . . With as much sluggishness as might have been expected from their clumsy architecture, the ships of the Armada consumed nearly three weeks in sailing from Lisbon to the neighbourhood of Cape Finisterre. Here they were overtaken by a tempest. . . . Of the squadron

of galleys, one was already sunk in the sea, and two of the others had been conquered by their own slaves. The fourth rode out the gale with difficulty, and joined the rest of the fleet, which ultimately reassembled at Coruña; the ships having, in distress, put in first at Vivera, Ribadeo, Gijon, and other northern ports of Spain. At the Groyne—as the English of that day were accustomed to call Coruña—they remained a month, repairing damages and recruiting; and on the 22d of July (N. S.) the Armada set sail. Six days later, the Spaniards took soundings, thirty leagues from the Scilly Islands, and on Friday, the 29th of July, off the Lizard, they had the first glimpse of the land of promise presented them by Sixtus V. of which they had at last come to take possession. On the same day and night the blaze and smoke of ten thousand beacon-fires from the Land's End to Margate, and from the Isle of Wight to Cumberland, gave warning to every Englishman that the enemy was at last upon them.—J. L. Motley, *Hist. of the United Netherlands*, ch. 19.

ALSO IN: J. A. Froude, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 12, ch. 36.—The same, *The Spanish Story of the Armada*.—R. Southey, *Lives of British Admirals*, v. 2, pp. 327-334.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, 5th series, c. 27.

A. D. 1588.—The Destruction of the Armada.—“The great number of the English, the whole able-bodied population being drilled, counterbalanced the advantage possessed, from their universal use of firearms, by the invaders. In all the towns there were trained bands (a civic militia); and, either in regular service or as volunteers, thousands of all ranks had received a military training on the continent. The musters represented 100,000 men as ready to assemble at their head-quarters at a day's notice. It was, as nearly always, in its military administration that the vulnerable point of England lay. The fitting-out and victualling of the navy was disgraceful; and it is scarcely an excuse for the councillors that they were powerless against the parsimony of the Queen. The Government maintained its hereditary character from the days of Ethelred the Unready, and the arrangements for assembling the defensive forces were not really completed by them until after the Armada was destroyed. The defeat of the invaders, if they had landed, must have been accomplished by the people. The flame of patriotism never burnt purer: all Englishmen alike, Romanists, Protestant Episcopalians, and Puritans, were banded together to resist the invader. Every hamlet was on the alert for the beacon-signal. Some 15,000 men were already under arms in London; the compact Tilbury Fort was full, and a bridge of boats from Tilbury to Gravesend blocked the Thames. Philip's preparations had been commensurate with the grandeur of his scheme. The dockyards in his ports in the Low Countries, the rivers, the canals, and the harbours of Spain, Portugal, Naples, and Italy, echoed the clang of the shipwrights' hammers. A vast armament, named, as if to provoke Nemesis, the ‘Invincible Armada,’ on which for three years the treasures of the American mines had been lavished, at length rode the seas, blessed with Papal benedictions and under the patronage of the saints. It comprised 65 huge galleons, of from 700 to 1,300 tons, with sides of enormous thickness, and built high like castles; four great galleys, each carry-

ing 50 guns and 450 men, and rowed by 300 slaves; 56 armed merchantmen, and 20 pinnaces. These 129 vessels were armed with 2,430 brass and iron guns of the best manufacture, but each gun was furnished only with 50 rounds. They carried 5,000 seamen: Parma's army amounted to 30,000 men—Spaniards, Germans, Italians and Walloons; and 19,000 Castilians and Portuguese, with 1,000 gentlemen volunteers, were coming to join him. To maintain this army after it had effected a landing, a great store of provisions—sufficient for 40,000 men for six months—was placed on board. The overthrow of this armament was effected by the navy and the elements. From the Queen's parsimony the State had only 36 ships in the fleet; but the City of London furnished 33 vessels; 18 were supplied by the liberality of private individuals; and nearly 100 smaller ships were obtained on hire; so that the fleet was eventually brought up to nearly 30,000 tons, carrying 16,000 men, and equipped with 837 guns. But there was sufficient ammunition for only a single day's fighting. Fortunately for Elizabeth's Government, the Spaniards, having been long driven from the channel by privateers, were now unacquainted with its currents; and they could procure, as the Dutch were in revolt, only two or three competent pilots. The Spanish commander was the Duke of Medina-Sidonia, an incapable man, but he had under him some of the ablest of Philip's officers. When the ships set out from the Tagus, on the 29th May, 1588, a storm came on, and the Armada had to put into Coruña to refit. From that port the Armada set out at the beginning of July, in lovely weather, with just enough wind to wave from the mastheads the red crosses which they bore as symbols of their crusade. The Duke of Medina entered the Channel on the 18th July, and the rear of his fleet was immediately harassed by a cannonade from the puny ships of England, commanded by Lord Howard of Effingham (Lord High Admiral), with Drake, Hawkins, Frobisher, Winter, Fenner, and other famous captains. With the loss of three galleons from fire or boarding, the Spanish commander, who was making for Flanders to embark Parma's army, anchored in Calais roads. In the night fire-ships—an ancient mode of warfare which had just been reintroduced by the Dutch—passed in among the Armada, a fierce gale completed their work, and morning revealed the remnant of the Invincible Armada scattered along the coast from Calais to Ostend. Eighty vessels remained to Medina, and with these he sailed up the North Sea, to round the British Isles. But the treacherous currents of the Orkneys and the Hebrides were unknown to his officers, and only a few ships escaped the tempests of the late autumn. More than two-thirds of the expedition perished, and of the remnant that again viewed the hills of Spain all but a few hundreds returned only to die.”—H. R. Clinton, *From Crécy to Assye*, ch. 7.—In the fighting on the 23d of July, “the Spaniards’ shot flew for the most part over the heads of the English, without doing execution, Cock being the only Englishman that died bravely in the midst of his enemies in a ship of his own. The reason of this was, that the English ships, being far less than the enemy’s, made the attack with more quickness and agility; and when they had given a broadside, they presently sheered off to a convenient distance, and levelled their shot so directly

at the bigger and more unwieldy ships of the Spaniards, as seldom to miss their aim; though the Lord Admiral did not think it safe or proper to grapple with them, as some advised, with much more heat than discretion, because that the enemy’s fleet carried a considerable army within their sides, whereas ours had no such advantage. Besides their ships far exceeded ours in number and bulk, and were much stronger and higher built; insomuch that their men, having the opportunity to ply us from such lofty hatches, must inevitably destroy those that were obliged, as it were, to fight beneath them. . . . On the 24th day of the month there was a cessation on both sides, and the Lord Admiral sent some of his smaller vessels to the nearest of the English harbours, to fetch a supply of powder and ammunition; then he divided the fleet into four squadrons, the first of which he commanded himself, the second he committed to Drake, the third to Hawkins, and the fourth to Frobisher. He likewise singled out of the main fleet some smaller vessels to begin the attack on all sides at once, in the very dead of the night; but a calm happening spoiled his design.” On the 26th “the Spanish fleet sailed forward with a fair and soft gale at southwest and by south; and the English chased them close at the heels; but so far was this Invincible Armada from alarming the sea-coasts with any frightful apprehensions, that the English geutry of the younger sort entered themselves volunteers, and taking leave of their parents, wives, and children, did, with incredible cheerfulness, hire ships at their own charge; and, in pure love to their country, joined the grand fleet in vast numbers. . . . On the 27th of this month the Spanish Fleet came to an anchor before Calais, their pilots having acquainted them that if they ventured any farther there was some danger that the force of the current might drive them away into the Northern Channel. Not far from them came likewise the English Admiral to an anchor, and lay within shot of their ships. The English fleet consisted by this time of 140 sail; all of them ships of force, and very tight and nimble sailors, and easily manageable upon a tack. But, however, the main brunt of the engagement lay not upon more than 15 or 16 of them. . . . The Lord Admiral got ready eight of his worst ships the very day after the Spaniards came to an anchor; and having bestowed upon them a good plenty of pitch, tar, and rosin, and lined them well with brimstone and other combustible matter, they sent them before the wind, in the dead time of the night, under the conduct of Young and Prowse, into the midst of the Spanish fleet. . . . The Spaniards reported that the duke, upon the approach of the fire-ships, ordered the whole fleet to weigh anchor and stand to sea, but that when the danger was over every ship should return to her station. This is what he did himself, and he likewise discharged a great gun as a signal to the rest to do as he did; the report, however, was heard but by very few, by reason their fears had dispersed them at that rate that some of them ventured out of the main ocean, and others sailed up the shallows of Flanders. In the meantime Drake and Fenner played briskly with their cannon upon the Spanish fleet, as it was rendezvousing over against Graveling. . . . On the last day of the month the wind blew hard at north-west early in the morning, and the Spanish fleet attempting to get back again to the

Straits of Calais, was driven toward Zealand. The English then gave over the chase, because, in the Spaniards' opinion, they perceived them making haste enough to their own destruction. For the wind, lying at the W. N. W. point, could not choose but force them on the shoals and sands on the coast of Zealand. But the wind happening to come about in a little time to S. W. and by W. they went before the wind. . . . Being now, therefore, clear of danger in the main ocean, they steered northward, and the English fleet renewed the chase after them. . . . The Spaniards having now laid aside all the thoughts and hopes of returning to attempt the English, and perceiving their main safety lay in their flight, made no stay or stop at any port whatever. And thus this mighty armada, which had been three whole years fitting out, and at a vast expense, met in one month's time with several attacks, and was at last routed, with a vast slaughter on their side, and but a very few of the English missing, and not one ship lost, except that small vessel of Cock's. . . . When, therefore, the Spanish fleet had taken a large compass round Britain, by the coasts of Scotland, the Orkades, and Ireland, and had weathered many storms, and suffered as many wrecks and blows, and all the inconveniences of war and weather, it made a shift to get home again, laden with nothing but shame and dishonour. . . . Certain it is that several of their ships perished in their flight, being cast away on the coasts of Scotland and Ireland, and that above 700 soldiers were cast on shore in Scotland. . . . As for those who had the ill fortune to be drove upon the Irish shore, they met with the most barbarous treatment; for some of them were butchered by the wild Irish, and the rest put to the sword by the Lord Deputy."—W. Camden, *Hist. of Queen Elizabeth*.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. Biographies: Drake*.—E. S. Creasy, *Fifteen Decisive Battles*, ch. 10.—C. Kingsley, *Westward Ho!* ch. 31.—R. Hakluyt, *Principal Navigations, &c.* (E. Goldsmid's ed.), v. 7.

A. D. 1596.—Alliance with Henry IV. of France against Spain. See FRANCE: A. D. 1593–1598.

A. D. 1596.—Dutch and English expedition against Cadiz. See SPAIN: A. D. 1596.

16th Century.—Commercial Progress.—Beginnings of the East India Company. See TRADE, MODERN; HANSA TOWNS; and INDIA: A. D. 1600–1702.

A. D. 1601.—The first Poor Law. See POOR LAWS, THE ENGLISH.

A. D. 1603.—Accession of King James I.—The Stuart family.—On the death of Queen Elizabeth, in 1603, James VI. of Scotland became also the accepted king of England (under the title of James I.), by virtue of his descent from that daughter of Henry VII. and sister of Henry VIII., Margaret Tudor, who married James IV. king of Scots. His grandfather was James V.; his mother was Marie Stuart, or Mary, Queen of Scots, born of her marriage with Lord Darnley. He was the ninth in the line of the Scottish dynasty of the Stuarts, or Stewarts, for an account of the origin of which see SCOTLAND: A. D. 1370. He had been carefully alienated from the religion of his mother and reared in Protestantism, to make him an acceptable heir to the English throne. He came to it at a time when the autocratic spirit of the Tudors, making

use of the peculiar circumstances of their time, had raised the royal power and prerogative to their most exalted pitch; and he united the two kingdoms of Scotland and England under one sovereignty. "The noble inheritance fell to a race who, comprehending not one of the conditions by which alone it was possible to be retained, profligately misused until they lost it utterly. The calamity was in no respect foreseen by the statesman, Cecil, to whose exertion it was mainly due that James was seated on the throne: yet in regard to it he cannot be held blameless. He was doubtless right in the course he took, in so far as he thereby satisfied a national desire, and brought under one crown two kingdoms that with advantage to either could not separately exist; but it remains a reproach to his name that he let slip the occasion of obtaining for the people some ascertained and settled guarantees which could not then have been refused, and which might have saved half a century of bloodshed. None such were proposed to James. He was allowed to seize a prerogative, which for upwards of fifty years had been strained to a higher pitch than at any previous period of the English history; and his clumsy grasp closed on it without a sign of quavering or remonstrance from the leading statesmen of England. 'Do I mak the judges? Do I mak the bishops?' he exclaimed, as the powers of his new dominion dawned on his delighted sense: 'Then, God's wauns! I mak what likes me, law and gospel!' It was even so. And this license to make gospel and law was given, with other far more questionable powers, to a man whose personal appearance and qualities were as suggestive of contempt, as his public acts were provocative of rebellion. It is necessary to dwell upon this part of the subject; for it is only just to his not more culpable but far less fortunate successor to say, that in it lies the source and explanation of not a little for which the penalty was paid by him. What is called the Great Rebellion can have no comment so pregnant as that which is suggested by the character and previous career of the first of the Stuart kings."—J. Forster, *Hist. and Biog. Essays*, p. 227.

A. D. 1604.—The Hampton Court Conference.—James I. "was not long seated on the English throne, when a conference was held at Hampton Court, to hear the complaints of the puritans, as those good men were called who scrupled to conform to the ceremonies, and sought a reformation of the abuses of the church of England. On this occasion, surrounded with his deans, bishops, and archbishops, who breathed into his ears the music of flattery, and worshipped him as an oracle, James, like king Solomon, to whom he was fond of being compared, appeared in all his glory, giving his judgment on every question, and displaying before the astonished prelates, who kneeled every time they addressed him, his polemic powers and theological learning. Contrasting his present honours with the scenes from which he had just escaped in his native country, he began by congratulating himself that, 'by the blessing of Providence, he was brought into the promised land, where religion was professed in its purity; where he sat among grave, learned, and reverend men; and that now he was not, as formerly, a king without state and honour, nor in a place where order was banished, and beardless boys would brave him to his

face.' After long conferences, during which the king gave the most extraordinary exhibitions of his learning, drollery, and profaneness, he was completely thrown off his guard by the word presbytery, which Dr. Reynolds, a representative of the puritans, had unfortunately employed. Thinking that he aimed at a 'Scotch presbytery,' James rose into a towering passion, declaring that presbytery agreed as well with monarchy as God and the devil. 'Then,' said he, 'Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick, shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me and my council, and all our proceedings. Then Will shall stand up and say, It must be thus: Then Dick shall reply, and say, Nay marry, but we will have it thus. And, therefore, here I must once reiterate my former speech, *Le Roy s'avisera* (the king will look after it). Stay, I pray you, for one seven years before you demand that of me; and if you then find me pursy and fat, and my wind-pipes stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you; for let that government be once up, I am sure I shall be kept in breath; then we shall all of us have work enough, both our hands full. But, Dr. Reynolds, till you find that I grow lazy, let that alone.' Then, putting his hand to his hat, 'My lords the bishops,' said his majesty, 'I may thank you that these men plead for my supremacy; they think they can't make their party good against you, but by appealing unto it. But if once you are out, and they in place, I know what would become of my supremacy; for no bishop, no king, as I said before.' Then rising from his chair, he concluded the conference with, 'If this be all they have to say, I'll make them conform, or I'll harry them out of this land, or else do worse.' The English lords and prelates were so filled with admiration at the quickness of apprehension and dexterity in controversy shown by the king, that, as Dr. Barlow informs us, 'one of them said his majesty spoke by the instinct of the Spirit of God; and the lord chancellor, as he went out, said to the dean of Chester, I have often heard that *Rex est mixta persona cum sacerdote* (that a king is partly a priest), but I never saw the truth thereof till this day!' In these circumstances, buoyed up with flattery by his English clergy, and placed beyond the reach of the faithful admonitions of the Scottish ministry, we need not wonder to find James prosecuting, with redoubled ardour, his scheme of reducing the church of Scotland to the English model.—T. McCrie, *Sketches of Scottish Church Hist.*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*, ch. 1, sect. 3.—G. G. Perry, *Hist. of the Ch. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 2.—T. Fuller, *Church Hist. of Britain*, bk. 10, sect. 1 (v. 3).

A. D. 1605.—*The Gunpowder Plot*.—"The Roman Catholics had expected great favour and indulgence on the accession of James, both as he was descended from Mary, whose life they believed to have been sacrificed to their cause, and as he himself, in his early youth, was imagined to have shown some partiality towards them.

... Very soon they discovered their mistake; and were at once surprised and enraged to find James, on all occasions, express his intention of strictly executing the laws enacted against them, and of persevering in all the rigorous measures of Elizabeth. Catesby, a gentleman of good parts and of an ancient family, first thought of a most extraordinary method of revenge; and he opened

his intention to Piercy, a descendant of the illustrious house of Northumberland. In vain, said he, would you put an end to the king's life: he has children. . . . To serve any good purpose, we must destroy, at one blow, the king, the royal family, the Lords, the Commons, and bury all our enemies in one common ruin. Happily, they are all assembled on the first meeting of Parliament, and afford us the opportunity of glorious and useful vengeance. Great preparations will not be requisite. A few of us, combining, may run a mine below the hall in which they meet, and choosing the very moment when the king harangues both Houses, consign over to destruction these determined foes to all piety and religion. . . . Piercy was charmed with this project of Catesby; and they agreed to communicate the matter to a few more, and among the rest to Thomas Winter, whom they sent over to Flanders, in quest of Fawkes, an officer in the Spanish service, with whose zeal and courage they were all thoroughly acquainted. . . . All this passed in the spring and summer of the year 1604; when the conspirators also hired a house in Piercy's name, adjoining to that in which the Parliament was to assemble. Towards the end of that year they began their operations. . . . They soon pierced the wall, though three yards in thickness; but on approaching the other side they were somewhat startled at hearing a noise which they knew not how to account for. Upon inquiry, they found that it came from the vault below the House of Lords; that a magazine of coals had been kept there; and that, as the coals were selling off, the vault would be let to the highest bidder. The opportunity was immediately seized; the place hired by Piercy; thirty-six barrels of powder lodged in it; the whole covered up with faggots and billets; the doors of the cellar boldly flung open, and everybody admitted, as if it contained nothing dangerous. . . . The day [November 5, 1605], so long wished for, now approached, on which the Parliament was appointed to assemble. The dreadful secret, though communicated to above twenty persons, had been religiously kept, during the space of near a year and a half. No remorse, no pity, no fear of punishment, no hope of reward, had as yet induced any one conspirator, either to abandon the enterprise or make a discovery of it." But the betrayal was unwittingly made, after all, by one in the plot, who tried to deter Lord Montague from attending the opening session of Parliament, by sending him a mysterious message of warning. Lord Montague showed the letter to Lord Salisbury, secretary of state, who attached little importance to it, but who laid it before the king. The Scottish Solomon read it with more anxiety and was shrewdly led by some expressions in the missive to order an inspection of the vaults underneath the parliamentary houses. The gunpowder was discovered and Guy Fawkes was found in the place, with matches for the firing of it on his person. Being put to the rack he disclosed the names of his accomplices. They were seized, tried and executed, or killed while resisting arrest.—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 4, ch. 46.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 6, (v. 1).—J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 9, ch. 1.

A. D. 1606.—The chartering of the Virginia Company, with its London and Plymouth branches. See VIRGINIA: A. D. 1606-1607.

A. D. 1620.—The Monopoly granted to the Council for New England. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1620-1623.

A. D. 1620.—The exodus of the Pilgrims and the planting of their colony at New Plymouth. See MASSACHUSETTS (PLYMOUTH COLONY): A. D. 1620.

A. D. 1621.—Grant of Nova Scotia. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1621-1631.

A. D. 1622.—First printed newspaper. See PRINTING AND PRESS: A. D. 1622-1702.

A. D. 1623-1638.—The grants in Newfoundland to Baltimore and Kirke. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1610-1655.

A. D. 1625.—The Protestant Alliance in the Thirty Years War. See GERMANY: A. D. 1624-1626.

A. D. 1625.—The gains of Parliament in the reign of James I.—"The commons had now been engaged [at the end of the reign of James I.], for more than twenty years, in a struggle to restore and to fortify their own and their fellow subjects' liberties. They had obtained in this period but one legislative measure of importance, the late declaratory act against monopolies. But they had rescued from disuse their ancient right of impeachment. They had placed on record a protestation of their claim to debate all matters of public concern. They had remonstrated against the usurped prerogatives of binding the subject by proclamation, and of levying customs at the out-ports. They had secured beyond controversy their exclusive privilege of determining contested elections of their members. They had maintained, and carried indeed to an unwarrantable extent, their power of judging and inflicting punishment, even for offences not committed against their house. Of these advantages some were evidently incomplete; and it would require the most vigorous exertions of future parliaments to realize them. But such exertions the increased energy of the nation gave abundant cause to anticipate. A deep and lasting love of freedom had taken hold of every class except perhaps the clergy; from which, when viewed together with the rash pride of the court, and the uncertainty of constitutional principles and precedents, collected through our long and various history, a calm by-stander might presage that the ensuing reign would not pass without disturbance, nor perhaps end without confusion."—H. Hallam, *Constitutional Hist. of England*, ch. 6.

A. D. 1625.—Marriage of Charles with Henrietta Maria of France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624-1626.

A. D. 1625-1628.—The accession of Charles I.—Beginning of the struggle of King and Parliament.—"The political and religious schism which had originated in the 16th century was, during the first quarter of the 17th century, constantly widening. Theories tending to Turkish despotism were in fashion at Whitehall. Theories tending to republicanism were in favour with a large portion of the House of Commons. . . . While the minds of men were in this state, the country, after a peace of many years, at length engaged in a war [with Spain, and with Austria and the Emperor in the Palatinate] which required strenuous exertions. This war hastened the approach of the great constitutional crisis. It was necessary that the king should have a large military force. He could not have such a force without money. He could not legally raise

money without the consent of Parliament. It followed, therefore, that he either must administer the government in conformity with the sense of the House of Commons, or must venture on such a violation of the fundamental laws of the land as had been unknown during several centuries. . . . Just at this conjuncture James died [March 27, 1625]. Charles I. succeeded to the throne. He had received from nature a far better understanding, a far stronger will, and a far keener and firmer temper than his father's. He had inherited his father's political theories, and was much more disposed than his father to carry them into practice. . . . His taste in literature and art was excellent, his manner dignified though not gracious, his domestic life without blemish. Faithlessness was the chief cause of his disasters, and is the chief stain on his memory. He was, in truth, impelled by an incurable propensity to dark and crooked ways. . . . He seems to have learned from the theologians whom he most esteemed that between him and his subjects there could be nothing of the nature of mutual contract; that he could not, even if he would, divest himself of his despotic authority; and that, in every promise which he made, there was an implied reservation that such promise might be broken in case of necessity, and that of the necessity he was the sole judge. And now began that hazardous game on which were staked the destinies of the English people. It was played on the side of the House of Commons with keenness, but with admirable dexterity, coolness and perseverance. Great statesmen who looked far behind them and far before them were at the head of that assembly. They were resolved to place the king in such a situation that he must either conduct the administration in conformity with the wishes of his Parliament, or make outrageous attacks on the most sacred principles of the constitution. They accordingly doled out supplies to him very sparingly. He found that he must govern either in harmony with the House of Commons, or in defiance of all law. His choice was soon made. He dissolved his first Parliament, and levied taxes by his own authority. He convoked a second Parliament [1626] and found it more intractable than the first. He again resorted to the expedient of dissolution, raised fresh taxes without any show of legal right, and threw the chiefs of the opposition into prison. At the same time a new grievance, which the peculiar feelings and habits of the English nation made insupportably painful, and which seemed to all discerning men to be of fearful augury, excited general discontent and alarm. Companies of soldiers were billeted on the people; and martial law was, in some places, substituted for the ancient jurisprudence of the realm. The king called a third Parliament [1628], and soon perceived that the opposition was stronger and fiercer than ever. He now determined on a change of tactics. Instead of opposing an inflexible resistance to the demands of the commons, he, after much altercation and many evasions, agreed to a compromise which, if he had faithfully adhered to it, would have averted a long series of calamities. The Parliament granted an ample supply. The King ratified, in the most solemn manner, that celebrated law which is known by the name of the Petition of Right, and which is the second Great Charter of the liberties of England."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: J. R. Green, *Hist. of the Eng. People*, bk. 7, ch. 5 (v. 3).—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of the Eng. Revolution*, bk. 1.

A. D. 1627-1628.—Buckingham's war with France and expedition to La Rochelle. See FRANCE: A. D. 1627-1628.

A. D. 1628.—The Petition of Right.—“Charles had recourse to many subterfuges in hopes to elude the passing of this law; rather perhaps through wounded pride, as we may judge from his subsequent conduct, than much apprehension that it would create a serious impediment to his despotic schemes. He tried to persuade them to acquiesce in his royal promise not to arrest any one without just cause, or in a simple confirmation of the Great Charter and other statutes in favour of liberty. The peers, too pliant in this instance to his wishes, and half receding from the patriot banner they had lately joined, lent him their aid by proposing amendments (insidious in those who suggested them, though not in the body of the house) which the commons firmly rejected. Even when the bill was tendered to him for that assent which it had been necessary, for the last two centuries, that the king should grant or refuse in a word, he returned a long and equivocal answer, from which it could only be collected that he did not intend to remit any portion of what he had claimed as his prerogative. But on an address from both houses for a more explicit answer, he thought fit to consent to the bill in the usual form. The commons, of whose harshness towards Charles his advocates have said so much, immediately passed a bill for granting five subsidies, about £350,000; a sum not too great for the wealth of the kingdom or for his exigencies, but considerable according to the precedents of former times, to which men naturally look. . . . The Petition of Right, . . . this statute is still called, from its not being drawn in the common form of an act of parliament.” Although the king had been defeated in his attempt to qualify his assent to the Petition of Right, and had been forced to accede to it unequivocally, yet “he had the absurd and audacious insincerity (for we can use no milder epithets), to circulate 1,500 copies of it through the country, after the prorogation, with his first answer annexed; an attempt to deceive without the possibility of success. But instances of such ill-faith, accumulated as they are through the life of Charles, render the assertion of his sincerity a proof either of historical ignorance or of a want of moral delicacy.”—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 7.—The following is the text of the Petition of Right: “To the King's Most Excellent Majesty. Humbly show unto our Sovereign Lord the King, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in Parliament assembled, that whereas it is declared and enacted by a statute made in the time of the reign of King Edward the First, commonly called, ‘Statutum de Tallagio non concedendo,’ that no tallage or aid shall be laid or levied by the King or his heirs in this realm, without the goodwill and assent of the Archbishops, Bishops, Earls, Barons, Knights, Burgesses, and other the freemen of the commonalty of this realm: and by authority of Parliament holden in the five and twentieth year of the reign of King Edward the Third, it is declared and enacted, that from thenceforth no person shall be compelled to make any loans to the King against his will, because such loans were

against reason and the franchise of the land; and by other laws of this realm it is provided, that none should be charged by any charge or imposition, called a Benevolence, or by such like charge, by which the statutes before-mentioned, and other the good laws and statutes of this realm, your subjects have inherited this freedom, that they should not be compelled to contribute to any tax, tallage, aid, or other like charge, not set by common consent in Parliament: Yet nevertheless, of late divers commissions directed to sundry Commissioners in several counties with instructions have issued, by means whereof your people have been in divers places assembled, and required to lend certain sums of money unto your Majesty, and many of them upon their refusal so to do, have had an oath administered unto them, not warrantable by the laws or statutes of this realm, and have been constrained to become bound to make appearance and give attendance before your Privy Council, and in other places, and others of them have been therefore imprisoned, confined, and sundry other ways molested and disquieted: and divers other charges have been laid and levied upon your people in several counties, by Lords Lieutenants, Deputy Lieutenants, Commissioners for Musters, Justices of Peace and others, by command or direction from your Majesty or your Privy Council, against the laws and free customs of this realm: And where also by the statute called, ‘The Great Charter of the Liberties of England,’ it is declared and enacted, that no freeman may be taken or imprisoned or be disseised of his freeholds or liberties, or his free customs, or be outlawed or exiled; or in any manner destroyed, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land: And in the eight and twentieth year of the reign of King Edward the Third, it was declared and enacted by authority of Parliament, that no man of what estate or condition that he be, should be put out of his lands or tenements, nor taken, nor imprisoned, nor disherited, nor put to death, without being brought to answer by due process of law: Nevertheless, against the tenor of the said statutes, and other the good laws and statutes of your realm, to that end provided, divers of your subjects have of late been imprisoned without any cause showed, and when for their deliverance they were brought before your Justices, by your Majesty's writs of Habeas Corpus, there to undergo and receive as the Court should order, and their keepers commanded to certify the causes of their detainer; no cause was certified, but that they were detained by your Majesty's special command, signified by the Lords of your Privy Council, and yet were returned back to several prisons, without being charged with anything to which they might make answer according to the law: And whereas of late great companies of soldiers and mariners have been dispersed into divers counties of the realm, and the inhabitants against their wills have been compelled to receive them into their houses, and there to suffer them to sojourn, against the laws and customs of this realm, and to the great grievance and vexation of the people: And whereas also by authority of Parliament, in the 25th year of the reign of King Edward the Third, it is declared and enacted, that no man shall be forejudged of life or limb against the form of the Great Charter, and the law of the land: and by the said Great Charter and other

the laws and statutes of this your realm, no man ought to be adjudged to death; but by the laws established in this your realm, either by the customs of the same realm or by Acts of Parliament: and whereas no offender of what kind soever is exempted from the proceedings to be used, and punishments to be inflicted by the laws and statutes of this your realm: nevertheless of late divers commissions under your Majesty's Great Seal have issued forth, by which certain persons have been assigned and appointed Commissioners with power and authority to proceed within the land, according to the justice of martial law against such soldiers and mariners, or other dissolute persons joining with them, as should commit any murder, robbery, felony, mutiny, or other outrage or misdemeanour whatsoever, and by such summary course and order, as is agreeable to martial law, and is used in armies in time of war, to proceed to the trial and condemnation of such offenders, and them to cause to be executed and put to death, according to the law martial: By pretext whereof, some of your Majesty's subjects have been by some of the said Commissioners put to death, when and where, if by the laws and statutes of the land they had deserved death, by the same laws and statutes also they might, and by no other ought to have been, adjudged and executed: And also sundry grievous offenders by colour thereof, claiming an exemption, have escaped the punishments due to them by the laws and statutes of this your realm, by reason that divers of your officers and ministers of justice have unjustly refused, or forborne to proceed against such offenders according to the same laws and statutes, upon pretence that the said offenders were punishable only by martial law, and by authority of such commissions as aforesaid, which commissions, and all other of like nature, are wholly and directly contrary to the said laws and statutes of this your realm: They do therefore humbly pray your Most Excellent Majesty, that no man hereafter be compelled to make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or such like charge, without common consent by Act of Parliament; and that none be called to make answer, or take such oath, or to give attendance, or be confined, or otherwise molested or disquieted concerning the same, or for refusal thereof; and that no freeman, in any such manner as is before-mentioned, be imprisoned or detained; and that your Majesty will be pleased to remove the said soldiers and mariners, and that your people may not be so burdened in time to come; and that the foresaid commissions for proceeding by martial law, may be revoked and annulled; and that hereafter no commissions of like nature may issue forth to any person or persons whatsoever, to be executed as aforesaid, lest by colour of them any of your Majesty's subjects be destroyed or put to death, contrary to the laws and franchise of the land. All which they most humbly pray of your Most Excellent Majesty, as their rights and liberties according to the laws and statutes of this realm: and that your Majesty would also vouchsafe to declare, that the awards, doings, and proceedings to the prejudice of your people, in any of the premises, shall not be drawn hereafter into consequence or example; and that your Majesty would be also graciously pleased, for the further comfort and safety of your people, to declare your royal will and pleasure, that in the things aforesaid all your

officers and ministers shall serve you, according to the laws and statutes of this realm, as they tender the honour of your Majesty, and the prosperity of this kingdom. [Which Petition being read the 2nd of June 1628, the King's answer was thus delivered unto it. The King willett that right be done according to the laws and customs of the realm; and that the statutes be put in due execution, that his subjects may have no cause to complain of any wrong or oppressions, contrary to their just rights and liberties, to the preservation whereof he holds himself as well obliged as of his prerogative. On June 7 the answer was given in the accustomed form, 'Soit droit fait comme il est désiré.']"

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 63 (v. 6).—The same, *Const. Doc's of the Puritan Rev.*, p. 1.—J. L. De Lolme, *The Eng. Constitution*, ch. 7 (v. 1).

A. D. 1628.—Assassination of Buckingham. —"While the struggle [over the Petition of Right] was going on, the popular hatred of Buckingham [the King's favourite, whose influence at court was supreme] showed itself in a brutal manner. In the streets of London, the Duke's physician, Dr. Lambe, was set upon by the mob, called witch, devil, and the Duke's conjuror, and absolutely beaten to death. The Council set inquiries on foot, but no individual was brought before it, and the rhyme went from mouth to mouth—'Let Charles and George do what they can, The Duke shall die like Doctor Lambe.' . . . Charles, shocked and grieved, took his friend in his own coach through London to see the ten ships which were being prepared at Deptford for the relief of Rochelle. It was reported that he was heard to say, 'George, there are some that wish that both these and thou might perish. But care not thou for them. We will both perish together if thou dost.' There must have been something strangely attractive about the man who won and kept the hearts of four personages so dissimilar as James and Charles of England, Anne of Austria, and William Laud. . . . In the meantime Rochelle held out." One attempt to relieve the beleaguered town had failed. Buckingham was to command in person the armament now in preparation for another attempt. "The fleet was at Portsmouth, and Buckingham went down thither in high spirits to take the command. The King came down to Sir Daniel Norton's house at Southwick. On the 23d of August Buckingham rose and 'cut a caper or two' before the barber dealt with his moustache and lovelocks. Then he was about to sit down to breakfast with a number of captains, and as he rose he received letters which made him believe that Rochelle had been relieved. He said he must tell the King instantly, but Soubise and the other refugees did not believe a word of it, and there was a good deal of disputing and gesticulation between them. He crossed a lobby, followed by the eager Frenchmen, and halted to take leave of an officer, Sir Thomas Fryar. Over the shoulder of this gentleman, as he bowed, a knife was thrust into Buckingham's breast. There was an effort to withdraw it; a cry 'The Villain!' and the great Duke, at 36 years old, was dead. The attendants at first thought the blow came from one of the noisy Frenchmen, and were falling on them." But a servant had seen the deed committed, and ran after the assassin, who was arrested and

proved to be one John Felton, a soldier and a man of good family. He had suffered wrongs which apparently unhinged his mind.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, 6th series, c. 17.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1603-1642, ch. 65.

A. D. 1628-1632.—Conquest and brief occupation of Canada and Nova Scotia. See CANADA (NEW FRANCE): A. D. 1628-1635.

A. D. 1629.—The royal charter granted to the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1623-1629.

A. D. 1629.—The King's Carolina grant to Sir Robert Heath. See AMERICA: A. D. 1629.

A. D. 1629.—Tonnage and Poundage.—The tumult in Parliament and the dissolution.—Charles' third Parliament, prorogued on the 26th of June, 1623, reassembled on the 20th of January, 1629. "The Parliament Session proved very brief; but very energetic, very extraordinary. Tonnage and Poundage, what we now call Customhouse duties, a constant subject of quarrel between Charles and his Parliaments hitherto, had again been levied without Parliamentary consent; in the teeth of old 'Tallagio non concedendo,' nay even of the late solemnly confirmed Petition of Right; and naturally gave rise to Parliamentary consideration. Merchants had been imprisoned for refusing to pay it; Members of Parliament themselves had been 'suppoena'd': there was a very ravelled coil to deal with in regard to Tonnage and Poundage. Nay the Petition of Right itself had been altered in the Printing; a very ugly business too. In regard to Religion also, matters looked equally ill. Sycophant Mainwaring, just censured in Parliament, had been promoted to a fatter living. Sycophant Montague, in the like circumstances, to a Bishopric: Laud was in the act of consecrating him at Croydon, when the news of Buckingham's death came thither. There needed to be a Committee of Religion. The House resolved itself into a Grand Committee of Religion; and did not want for matter. Bishop Neile of Winchester, Bishop Laud now of London, were a frightfully ceremonial pair of Bishops; the fountain they of innumerable tendencies to Papistry and the old clothes of Babylon. It was in this Committee of Religion, on the 11th day of February, 1623-9, that Mr. Cromwell, Member for Huntingdon, stood up and made his first speech, a fragment of which has found its way into History. . . . A new Remonstrance behoves to be resolved upon; Bishops Neile and Laud are even to be 'named' there. Whereupon, before they could get well 'named'. . . the King hastily interfered. This Parliament, in a fortnight more, was dissolved; and that under circumstances of the most unparalleled sort. For Speaker Finch, as we have seen, was a Courtier, in constant communication with the King: one day, while these high matters were astir, Speaker Finch refused to 'put the question' when ordered by the House! He said he had orders to the contrary; persisted in that;—and at last took to weeping. What was the House to do? Adjourn for two days, and consider what to do! On the second day, which was Wednesday, Speaker Finch signified that by his Majesty's command they were again adjourned till Monday next. On Monday next, Speaker Finch, still recusant, would not put the former nor indeed any question, having the King's order to

adjourn again instantly. He refused; was reprimanded, menaced; once more took to weeping; then started up to go his ways. But young Mr. Holles, Denzil Holles, the Earl of Clare's second son, he and certain other honourable members were prepared for that movement: they seized Speaker Finch, set him down in his chair, and by main force held him there! A scene of such agitation as was never seen in Parliament before. 'The House was much troubled.' 'Let him go,' cried certain Privy Counsellors, Majesty's Ministers as we should now call them, who in those days sat in front of the Speaker, 'Let Mr. Speaker go!' cried they imploringly. 'No!' answered Holles; 'God's wounds, he shall sit there till it please the House to rise!' The House in a decisive though almost distracted manner, with their Speaker thus held down for them, locked their doors; redacted Three emphatic Resolutions, their Protest against Arminianism, Papistry, and illegal Tonnage and Poundage; and passed the same by acclamation; letting no man out, refusing to let even the King's Usher in; then swiftly vanishing so soon as the resolutions were passed, for they understood the soldiery was coming. For which surprising procedure, vindicated by Necessity the mother of Invention, and supreme of Lawgivers, certain honourable gentlemen, Denzil Holles, Sir John Eliot, William Strode, John Selden, and others less known to us, suffered fine, imprisonment, and much legal tribulation: nay Sir John Eliot, refusing to submit, was kept in the Tower till he died. This scene fell out on Monday, 2d of March, 1629."—T. Carlyle, *Int. to Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: J. Forster, *Sir John Eliot: a Biography*, bk. 10, sect. 6-8 (v. 2).

A. D. 1630.—Emigration of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay, with their royal charter. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1629-1630.

A. D. 1631.—Aid to Gustavus Adolphus in Germany. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631-1632.

A. D. 1632.—Cession of Acadia (Nova Scotia) to France. See NOVA SCOTIA (ACADIA): A. D. 1621-1668.

A. D. 1632.—The Palatine grant of Maryland to Lord Baltimore. See MARYLAND: A. D. 1632.

A. D. 1633-1640.—The Ecclesiastical despotism of Laud.—"When Charles, having quarreled with his parliament, stood alone in the midst of his kingdom, seeking on all sides the means of governing, the Anglican clergy believed this day [for establishing the independent and uncontrolled power of their church] was come. They had again got immense wealth, and enjoyed it without dispute. The papists no longer inspired them with alarm. The primate of the church, Laud, possessed the entire confidence of the king and alone directed all ecclesiastical affairs. Among the other ministers, none professed, like lord Burleigh under Elizabeth, to fear and struggle against the encroachments of the clergy. The courtiers were indifferent, or secret papists. Learned men threw lustre over the church. The universities, that of Oxford more especially, were devoted to her maxims. Only one adversary remained—the people, each day more discontented with uncompleted reform, and more eager fully to accomplish it. But this adversary was also the adversary of the throne; it

claimed at the same time, the one to secure the other, evangelical faith and civil liberty. The same peril threatened the sovereignty of the crown and of episcopacy. The king, sincerely pious, seemed disposed to believe that he was not the only one who held his authority from God, and that the power of the bishops was neither of less high origin, nor of less sacred character. Never had so many favourable circumstances seemed combined to enable the clergy to achieve independence of the crown, dominion over the people. Laud set himself to work with his accustomed vehemence. First, it was essential that all dissensions in the bosom of the church itself should cease, and that the strictest uniformity should infuse strength into its doctrines, its discipline, its worship. He applied himself to this task with the most unhesitating and unscrupulous resolution. Power was exclusively concentrated into the hands of the bishops. The court of high commission, where they took cognizance of and decided everything relating to religious matters, became day by day more arbitrary, more harsh in its jurisdiction, its forms and its penalties. The complete adoption of the Anglican canons, the minute observance of the liturgy, and the rites enforced in cathedrals, were rigorously exacted on the part of the whole ecclesiastical body. A great many livings were in the hands of nonconformists; they were withdrawn from them. The people crowded to their sermons; they were forbidden to preach. . . . Persecution followed and reached them everywhere. . . . Meantime, the pomp of catholic worship speedily took possession of the churches deprived of their pastors; while persecution kept away the faithful, magnificence adorned the walls. They were consecrated amid great display, and it was then necessary to employ force to collect a congregation. Laud was fond of prescribing minutely the details of new ceremonies—sometimes borrowed from Rome, sometimes the production of his own imagination, at once ostentatious and austere. On the part of the nonconformists, every innovation, the least derogation from the canons or the liturgy, was punished as a crime; yet Laud innovated without consulting anybody, looking to nothing beyond the king's consent, and sometimes acting entirely upon his own authority. . . . And all these changes had, if not the aim, at all events the result, of rendering the Anglican church more and more like that of Rome. . . . Books were published to prove that the doctrine of the English bishops might very well adapt itself to that of Rome; and these books, though not regularly licensed, were dedicated to the king or to Laud, and openly tolerated. . . . The splendour and exclusive dominion of episcopacy thus established, at least so he flattered himself, Laud proceeded to secure its independence. . . . The divine right of bishops became, in a short time, the official doctrine, not only of the upper clergy, but of the king himself. . . . By the time things had come to this pass, the people were not alone in their anger. The high nobility, part of them at least, took the alarm. They saw in the progress of the church far more than mere tyranny; it was a regular revolution, which, not satisfied with crushing popular reforms, disfigured and endangered the first reformation; that which kings had made and the aristocracy adopted.”—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of the Eng. Revolution of 1640*, bk. 2.

ALSO IN: D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 2, ch. 4-6.—G. G. Perry, *Hist. of the Ch. of Eng.*, ch. 13-16 (v. 1).—P. Bayne, *The Chief Actors of the Puritan Revolution*, ch. 3.

A. D. 1634-1637.—Hostile measures against the Massachusetts Colony. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1634-1637.

A. D. 1634-1637.—Ship-money.—“The aspect of public affairs grew darker and darker. . . . All the promises of the king were violated without scruple or shame. The Petition of Right, to which he had, in consideration of moneys duly numbered, given a solemn assent, was set at naught. Taxes were raised by the royal authority. Patents of monopoly were granted. The old usages of feudal times were made pretexts for harassing the people with exactions unknown during many years. The Puritans were persecuted with cruelty worthy of the Holy Office. They were forced to fly from the country. They were imprisoned. They were whipped. Their ears were cut off. Their noses were slit. Their cheeks were branded with red-hot iron. But the cruelty of the oppressor could not tire out the fortitude of the victims. . . . The hardy sect grew up and flourished, in spite of everything that seemed likely to stunt it, struck its roots deep into a barren soil, and spread its branches wide to an inclement sky. . . . For the misgovernment of this disastrous period, Charles himself is principally responsible. After the death of Buckingham, he seemed to have been his own prime minister. He had, however, two counsellors who seconded him, or went beyond him, in intolerance and lawless violence; the one a superstitious driveller, as honest as a vile temper would suffer him to be; the other a man of great valour and capacity, but licentious, faithless, corrupt, and cruel. Never were faces more strikingly characteristic of the individuals to whom they belonged than those of Laud and Strafford, as they still remain portrayed by the most skilful hand of that age. The mean forehead, the pinched features, the peering eyes of the prelate suit admirably with his disposition. They mark him out as a lower kind of Saint Dominic. . . . But Wentworth—who ever names him without thinking of those harsh dark features, ennobled by their expression into more than the majesty of an antique Jupiter! . . . Among the humbler tools of Charles were Chief-Justice Finch and Noy, the attorney-general. Noy had, like Wentworth, supported the cause of liberty in Parliament, and had, like Wentworth, abandoned that cause for the sake of office. He devised, in conjunction with Finch, a scheme of exaction which made the alienation of the people from the throne complete. A writ was issued by the king, commanding the city of London to equip and man ships of war for his service. Similar writs were sent to the towns along the coast. These measures, though they were direct violations of the Petition of Right, had at least some show of precedent in their favour. But, after a time, the government took a step for which no precedent could be pleaded, and sent writs of ship-money to the inland counties. This was a stretch of power on which Elizabeth herself had not ventured, even at a time when all laws might with propriety have been made to bend to that highest law, the safety of the state. The inland counties had not been required to furnish ships, or money in the room of ships, even when the

Armada was approaching our shores. It seemed intolerable that a prince, who, by assenting to the Petition of Right, had relinquished the power of levying ship-money even in the outports, should be the first to levy it on parts of the kingdom where it had been unknown, under the most absolute of his predecessors. Clarendon distinctly admits that this tax was intended, not only for the support of the navy, but 'for a spring and magazine that should have no bottom, and for an everlasting supply on all occasions.' The nation well understood this; and from one end of England to the other, the public mind was strongly excited. Buckinghamshire was assessed at a ship of 450 tons, or a sum of £4,500. The share of the tax which fell to Hampden was very small [twenty shillings]; so small, indeed, that the sheriff was blamed for setting so wealthy a man at so low a rate. But, though the sum demanded was a trifle, the principle of the demand was despotism. Hampden, after consulting the most eminent constitutional lawyers of the time, refused to pay the few shillings at which he was assessed; and determined to incur all the certain expense and the probable danger of bringing to a solemn hearing this great controversy between the people and the crown. . . . Towards the close of the year 1636, this great cause came on in the Exchequer Chamber before all the judges of England. The leading counsel against the writ was the celebrated Oliver St. John; a man whose temper was melancholy, whose manners were reserved, and who was as yet little known in Westminster Hall; but whose great talents had not escaped the penetrating eye of Hampden. The arguments of the counsel occupied many days; and the Exchequer Chamber took a considerable time for deliberation. The opinion of the bench was divided. So clearly was the law in favour of Hampden, that though the judges held their situations only during the royal pleasure, the majority against him was the least possible. Four of the twelve pronounced decidedly in his favour; a fifth took a middle course. The remaining seven gave their voices in favour of the writ. The only effect of this decision was to make the public indignation stronger and deeper. 'The judgment,' says Clarendon, 'proved of more advantage and credit to the gentleman condemned than to the king's service.' The courage which Hampden had shown on this occasion, as the same historian tells us, 'raised his reputation to a great height generally throughout the kingdom.'—Lord Macaulay, *Essays*, v. 2 (*Nugent's Memorials of Hampden*).

ALSO IN: J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Hampden*.—S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1603-1642, ch. 74 (v. 7), and ch. 77 and 82 (v. 8); also *Const. Doc's of the Puritan Rev.*, pp. 37-53, and 115.

A. D. 1638-1640.—Presbyterianism of the Puritan party.—Rise of the Independents.—"It is the artifice of the favourers of the Catholic and of the prelatical party to call all who are sticklers for the constitution in church or state, or would square their actions by any rule, human or divine, Puritans."—J. Rushworth, *Hist. Coll.*, v. 2, 1355.—"These men [the Puritan party], at the commencement of the civil war, were presbyterians: and such had at that time been the great majority of the serious, the sober, and the conscientious people of England. There was a sort of imputation of laxness of principles, and of

a tendency to immorality of conduct, upon the adherents of the establishment, which was infinitely injurious to the episcopal church. But these persons, whose hearts were in entire opposition to the hierarchy, had for the most part no difference of opinion among themselves, and therefore no thought of toleration for difference of opinion in others. Their desire was to abolish episcopacy and set up presbytery. They thought and talked much of the unity of the church of God, and of the cordial consent and agreement of its members, and considered all sects and varieties of sentiment as a blemish and scandal upon their holy religion. They would put down popery and episcopacy with the strong hand of the law, and were disposed to employ the same instrument to suppress all who should venture to think the presbyterian church itself not yet sufficiently spiritual and pure. Against this party, which lorded it for a time almost without contradiction, gradually arose the party of the independents. . . . Before the end of the civil war they became almost as strong as the party of the presbyterians, and greatly surpassed them in abilities, intellectual, military and civil."—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*, bk. 2, ch. 1 (v. 2).—See, also, INDEPENDENTS; ENGLAND: A. D. 1643 (JULY) and (JULY—SEPTEMBER), A. D. 1646 (MARCH), A. D. 1647 (APRIL—AUGUST), and A. D. 1648 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1639.—The First Bishops' War in Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1638-1640.

A. D. 1640.—The Short Parliament and the Second Bishops' War.—The Scots Army in England.—"His Majesty having burnt Scotch paper Declarations 'by the hands of the common hangman,' and almost cut the Scotch Chancellor Loudon's head off, and being again resolute to chastise the rebel Scots with an Army, decides on summoning a Parliament for that end, there being no money attainable otherwise. To the great and glad astonishment of England; which, at one time, thought never to have seen another Parliament! Oliver Cromwell sat in this Parliament for Cambridge; recommended by Hampden, say some; not needing any recommendation in those Fen-countries, think others. Oliver's Colleague was a Thomas Meautys, Esq. This Parliament met, 13th April, 1640: it was by no means prompt enough with supplies against the rebel Scots; the king dismissed it in a huff, 5th May; after a Session of three weeks: Historians call it the Short Parliament. His Majesty decides on raising money and an Army 'by other methods': to which end Wentworth, now Earl Strafford and Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, who had advised that course in the Council, did himself subscribe £20,000. Archbishop Laud had long ago seen 'a cloud rising' against the Four surplices at Allhallowtide; and now it is covering the whole sky in a most dismal and really thundery-looking manner. His Majesty by 'other methods,' commission of array, benevolence, forced loan, or how he could, got a kind of Army on foot, and set it marching out of the several Counties in the South towards the Scotch Border; but it was a most hopeless Army. The soldiers called the affair a Bishops' War; they mutinied against their officers, shot some of their officers: in various Towns on their march, if the Clergyman were reputed Puritan, they went and gave him three cheers; if of Surplice-tendency, they sometimes threw his furniture

out of the window. No fighting against poor Scotch Gospellers was to be hoped for from these men. Meanwhile the Scots, not to be behindhand, had raised a good Army of their own; and decided on going into England with it, this time, 'to present their grievances to the King's Majesty.' On the 20th of August, 1640, they cross the Tweed at Coldstream; Montrose wading in the van of them all. They wore uniform of hodden gray, with blue caps; and each man had a moderate haversack of oatmeal on his back. August 28th, the Scots force their way across the Tyne, at Newburn, some miles above Newcastle; the King's Army making small fight, most of them no fight; hurrying from Newcastle, and all town and country quarters, towards York again, where his Majesty and Strafford were. The Bishops' War was at an end. The Scots, striving to be gentle as doves in their behaviour, and publishing boundless brotherly Declarations to all the brethren that loved Christ's Gospel and God's Justice in England,—took possession of Newcastle next day; took possession gradually of all Northumberland and Durham,—and stayed there, in various towns and villages, about a year. The whole body of English Puritans looked upon them as their saviours. . . . His Majesty and Strafford, in a fine frenzy at the turn of affairs, found no refuge, except to summon a 'Council of Peers,' to enter upon a 'Treaty' with the Scots; and alas, at last, summon a New Parliament. Not to be helped in any way. . . . A Parliament was appointed for the 3d of November next;—whereupon London cheerfully lent £200,000; and the Treaty with the Scots at Ripon, 1st October, 1640, by and by transferred to London, went peaceably on at a very leisurely pace. The Scotch Army lay quartered at Newcastle, and over Northumberland and Durham, on an allowance of £850 a day; an Army indispensable for Puritan objects; no haste in finishing its Treaty. The English army lay across in Yorkshire; without allowance except from the casualties of the King's Exchequer; in a dissatisfied manner, and occasionally getting into 'Army-Plots.' This Parliament, which met on the 3d of November, 1640, has become very celebrated in History by the name of the 'Long Parliament.'—T. Carlyle, *Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, pt. 1: 1640.

ALSO IN: J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Strafford*.—S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1603-1642, ch. 91-94.—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, ch. 72-73 (v. 7).

A. D. 1640.—Acquisition and settlement of Madras. See INDIA: A. D. 1600-1702.

A. D. 1640-1641.—The Long Parliament and the beginning of its work.—Impeachment and Execution of Strafford.—"The game of tyranny was now up. Charles had risked and lost his last stake. It is impossible to trace the mortifications and humiliations which this bad man now had to endure without a feeling of vindictive pleasure. His army was mutinous; his treasury was empty; his people clamoured for a Parliament; addresses and petitions against the government were presented. Strafford was for shooting those who presented them by martial law, but the king could not trust the soldiers. A great council of Peers was called at York, but the king would not trust even the Peers. He struggled, he evaded, he hesitated, he tried every shift rather than again face the representatives

of his injured people. At length no shift was left. He made a truce with the Scots, and summoned a Parliament. . . . On the 3d of November, 1640—a day to be long remembered—met that great Parliament, destined to every extreme of fortune—to empire and to servitude, to glory and to contempt;—at one time the sovereign of its sovereign, at another time the servant of its servants, and the tool of its tools. From the first day of its meeting the attendance was great, and the aspect of the members was that of men not disposed to do the work negligently. The dissolution of the late Parliament had convinced most of them that half measures would no longer suffice. Clarendon tells us that 'the same men who, six months before, were observed to be of very moderate tempers, and to wish that gentle remedies might be applied, talked now in another dialect both of kings and persons; and said that they must now be of another temper than they were the last Parliament.' The debt of vengeance was swollen by all the usury which had been accumulating during many years; and payment was made to the full. This memorable crisis called forth parliamentary abilities, such as England had never before seen. Among the most distinguished members of the House of Commons were Falkland, Hyde, Digby, Young, Harry Vane, Oliver St. John, Denzil Hollis, Nathaniel Fiennes. But two men exercised a paramount influence over the legislature and the country—Pym and Hampden; and, by the universal consent of friends and enemies, the first place belonged to Hampden."—Lord Macaulay, *Nugent's Memorials of Hampden (Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, v. 2)*.—"The resolute looks of the members as they gathered at Westminster contrasted with the hesitating words of the king, and each brought from borough or county a petition of grievances. Fresh petitions were brought every day by bands of citizens or farmers. Forty committees were appointed to examine and report on them, and their reports formed the grounds on which the Commons acted. One by one the illegal acts of the Tyranny were annulled. Prynne and his fellow 'martyrs' recalled from their prisons, entered London in triumph, amid the shouts of a great multitude who strewed laurel in their path. The civil and criminal jurisdiction of the Privy Council, the Star Chamber, the Court of High Commission, the irregular jurisdictions of the Council of the North, of the Duchy of Lancaster, the County of Chester, and a crowd of lesser tribunals, were summarily abolished. Ship-money was declared illegal, and the judgment in Hampden's case annulled. A statute declaring 'the ancient right of the subjects of this kingdom that no subsidy, custom, impost, or any charge whatsoever, ought or may be laid or imposed upon any merchandize exported or imported by subjects, denizens or allies, without common consent of Parliament,' put an end forever to all pretensions to a right of arbitrary taxation on the part of the crown. A Triennial Bill enforced the Assembly of the Houses every three years, and bound the sheriff and citizens to proceed to election if the Royal writ failed to summon them. Charles protested, but gave way. He was forced to look helplessly on at the wreck of his Tyranny, for the Scotch army was still encamped in the north. . . . Meanwhile the Commons were dealing roughly with the agents of the Royal

system. . . . Windebank, the Secretary of State, with the Chancellor, Finch, fled in terror over sea. Laud himself was flung into prison. . . . But even Laud, hateful as he was to all but the poor neighbours whose prayers his alms had won, was not the centre of so great and universal a hatred as the Earl of Strafford. Strafford's guilt was more than the guilt of a servile instrument of tyranny—it was the guilt of 'that grand apostate to the Commonwealth who,' in the terrible words which closed Lord Digby's invective, 'must not expect to be pardoned in this world till he be dispatched to the other.' He was conscious of his danger, but Charles forced him to attend the Court." He came to London with the solemn assurance of his master that, "while there was a king in England, not a hair of Strafford's head should be touched by the Parliament." Immediately impeached of high treason by the Commons, and sent to the Tower, he received from the king a second and more solemn pledge, by letter, that, "upon the word of a king, you shall not suffer in life, honour or fortune." But the "word of a king" like Charles Stuart, had neither honor nor gratitude, nor a decent self respect behind it. He could be false to a friend as easily as to an enemy. When the Commons, fearing failure on the trial of their impeachment, resorted to a bill of attainder, Charles signed it with a little resistance, and Strafford went bravely and manfully to the block. "As the axe fell, the silence of the great multitude was broken by a universal shout of joy. The streets blazed with bonfires. The bells clashed out from every steeple."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 8, sect. 6.—The king "was as deeply pledged to Strafford as one man could be to another; he was as vitally concerned in saving the life and prolonging the service of incomparably his ablest servant as was ever any sovereign in the case of any minister; yet it is clear that for some days past, probably ever since the first signs of popular tumult began to manifest themselves, he had been wavering. Four days before the Bill passed the Lords, Strafford as is well known, entreated the king to assent to it. There is no reason to doubt the absolute sincerity with which, at the moment of its conception, the prisoner penned his famous letter from the Tower. That passionate chivalry of loyalty, which has never animated any human heart in equal intensity since Strafford's ceased to beat, inspires every line. . . . Charles turned distractedly from one adviser to another, not so much for counsel as for excuse. He did not want his judgment guided, but his conscience quieted; and his counsellors knew it. They had other reasons, too, for urging him to his dishonour. Panic seems to have seized upon them all. The only man who would not have quailed before the fury of the populace was the man himself whose life was trembling in the balance. The judges were summoned to declare their opinion, and replied, with an admirable choice of non-committing terms, that 'upon all that which their Lordships have voted to be proved the Earl of Strafford doth deserve to undergo the pains and forfeitures of high treason.' Charles sent for the bishops, and the bishops, with the honourable exception of Juxon, informed him that he had two consciences,—a public and a private conscience,—and that 'his public conscience as a king might not only dis-

pense with, but oblige him to do, that which was against his conscience as a man.' What passed between these two tenants in common of the royal breast during the whole of Sunday, May 9th, 1641, is within no earthly knowledge; but at some time on that day Charles's public conscience got the better of its private rival. He signed a commission for giving the royal assent to the Bill, and on Monday, May 10th, in the presence of a House scarcely able to credit the act of betrayal which was taking place before them, the Commissioners pronounced the fatal *Le roi le veult* over the enactment which condemned his Minister to the block. Charles, of course, might still have reprieved him by an exercise of the prerogative, but the fears which made him acquiesce in the sentence availed to prevent him from arresting its execution."—H. D. Traill, *Lord Strafford*, pp. 195-198.—"It is a sorry office to plant the foot on a worm so crushed and writhing as the wretched king . . . [who abandoned Strafford] for it was one of the few crimes of which he was in the event thoroughly sensible, and friend has for once cooperated with foe in the steady application to it of the branding iron. There is in truth hardly any way of relieving the 'damned spot' of its intensity of hue even by distributing the concentrated infamy over other portions of Charles's character. . . . When we have convinced ourselves that this 'unthankful king' never really loved Strafford; that, as much as in him lay, he kept the dead Buckingham in his old privilege of mischief, by adopting his aversions and abiding by his spleenful purposes; that, in his refusals to award those increased honours for which his minister was a petitioner, on the avowed ground of the royal interest, may be discerned the petty triumph of one who dares not dispense with the services thrust upon him, but revenges himself by withholding their well-earned reward;—still does the blackness accumulate to baffle our efforts. The paltry tears he is said to have shed only burn that blackness in. If his after conduct indeed had been different, he might have availed himself of one excuse,—but that the man, who, in a few short months, proved that he could make so resolute a stand somewhere, should have judged this event no occasion for attempting it, is either a crowning infamy or an infinite consolation, according as we may judge wickedness or weakness to have preponderated in the constitution of Charles I. . . . As to Strafford's death, the remark that the people had no alternative, includes all that it is necessary to urge. The king's assurances of his intention to afford him no further opportunity of crime, could surely weigh nothing with men who had observed how an infinitely more disgusting minister of his will had only seemed to rise the higher in his master's estimation for the accumulated curses of the nation. Nothing but the knife of Felton could sever in that case the weak head and the wicked instrument, and it is to the honour of the adversaries of Strafford that they were earnest that their cause should vindicate itself completely, and look for no adventitious redress. Strafford had outraged the people—this was not denied. He was defended on the ground of those outrages not amounting to a treason against the king. For my own part, this defence appears to me decisive, looking at it in a technical view, and with our present settlement of evidence and treason. But to concede

that point, after the advances they had made, would have been in that day to concede all. It was to be shown that another power had claim to the loyalty and the service of Strafford—and if a claim, then a vengeance to exact for its neglect. And this was done. . . . One momentary emotion . . . escaped . . . [Strafford] when he was told to prepare for death. He asked if the king had indeed assented to the bill. Secretary Carleton answered in the affirmative; and Strafford, laying his hand on his heart, and raising his eyes to heaven, uttered the memorable words, —‘Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sons of men, for in them there is no salvation.’ Charles’s conduct was indeed incredibly monstrous.”—R. Browning, *Thomas Wentworth, Earl of Strafford* (*Eminent British Statesmen*, by John Forster, v. 2, pp. 403-406).

ALSO IN: J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Strafford; Pym*.—Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. 3 (v. 1).—Lord Nugent, *Memoirs of Hampden*, pt. 5-6 (v. 1-2).—Lady T. Lewis, *Life of Lord Falkland*.

The following are the Articles of Impeachment under which Strafford was tried and condemned: “Articles of the Commons, assembled in Parliament, against Thomas Earl of Strafford, in Maintenance of their Accusation, whereby he stands charged with High Treason. I. That he the said Thomas earl of Strafford hath traiterously endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws and government of the realms of England and Ireland, and, instead thereof, to introduce an arbitrary and tyrannical government, against law, which he hath declared by traiterous words, counsels, and actions, and by giving his majesty advice, by force of arms, to compel his loyal subjects to submit thereunto. II. That he hath traiterously assumed to himself regal power over the lives, liberties of persons, lands, and goods of his majesty’s subjects, in England and Ireland, and hath exercised the same tyrannically, to the subversion and undoing of many, both peers and others, of his majesty’s liege people. III. The better to enrich, and enable himself to go through with his traiterous designs, he hath detained a great part of his majesty’s revenue, without giving any legal accounts; and hath taken great sums of money out of the exchequer, converting them to his own use, when his majesty was necessitated for his own urgent occasions, and his army had been a long time unpaid. IV. That he hath traiterously abused the power and authority of his government, to the increasing, countenancing, and encouraging of Papists, that so he might settle a mutual dependence and confidence betwixt himself and that party, and by their help prosecute and accomplish his malicious and tyrannical designs. V. That he hath maliciously endeavoured to stir up enmity and hostility between his majesty’s subjects of England and those of Scotland. VI. That he hath traiterously broken the great trust reposed in him by his majesty, of lieutenant general of his Army, by wilfully betraying divers of his majesty’s subjects to death, his majesty’s Army to a dishonourable defeat by the Scots at Newborne, and the town of Newcastle into their hands, to the end that, by effusion of blood, by dishonour, by so great a loss as of Newcastle, his majesty’s realm of England might be engaged in a national and irreconcilable quarrel with the Scots. VII. That, to preserve himself from being questioned for these

and other his traiterous courses, he laboured to subvert the right of parliaments, and the ancient course of parliamentary proceedings, and, by false and malicious slanders, to incense his maj. against parliaments.—By which words, counsels, and actions, he hath traiterously, and contrary to his allegiance, laboured to alienate the hearts of the king’s liege people from his maj. to set a division between them, and to ruin and destroy his majesty’s kingdoms, for which they do impeach him of High Treason against our sovereign lord the king, his crown and dignity. And he the said earl of Strafford was lord deputy of Ireland, or lord lieutenant of Ireland, and lieutenant general of the Army there, under his majesty, and a sworn privy counsellor to his maj. for his kingdoms both of England and Ireland, and lord president of the North, during the time that all and every of the crimes and offences before set forth were done and committed; and he the said earl was lieutenant general of his majesty’s Army in the North parts of England, during the time that the crimes and offences in the 5th and 6th Articles set forth were done and committed.—And the said commons, by protestation, saving to themselves the liberty of exhibiting at any time hereafter any other Accusation or Impeachment against the said earl, and also of replying to the Answer that he the said earl shall make unto the said Articles, or to any of them, and of offering proof also of the premises, or any of them, or of any other Accusation or Impeachment that shall be by them exhibited, as the case shall, according to the course of parliaments, require; and do pray that the said earl may be put to answer to all and every the premises; and that such proceedings, examination, trial, and judgment, may be upon every of them had and used, as is agreeable to law and justice.”—*Cobbett’s Parliamentary Hist. of England*, v. 2, pp. 737-739.

A. D. 1641 (March—May).—The Root and Branch Bill.—“A bill was brought in [March, 1641], known as the Restraining Bill, to deprive Bishops of their rights of voting in the House of Lords. The opposition it encountered in that House induced the Commons to follow it up [May 27] with a more vehement measure, ‘for the utter abolition of Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, Prebendaries and Canons,’ a measure known by the title of the Root and Branch Bill. By the skill of the royal partisans, this bill was long delayed in Committee.”—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.*, period 2 (v. 2), p. 650.

ALSO IN: D. Masson, *Life of John Milton*, v. 2, bk. 2, ch. 3.

A. D. 1641 (October).—Roundheads and Cavaliers.—The birth of English parties.—“After ten months of assiduous toil, the Houses, in September, 1641, adjourned for a short vacation and the king visited Scotland. He with difficulty pacified that kingdom, by consenting not only to relinquish his plans of ecclesiastical reform, but even to pass, with a very bad grace, an act declaring that episcopacy was contrary to the word of God. The recess of the English Parliament lasted six weeks. The day on which the houses met again is one of the most remarkable epochs in our history. From that day dates the corporate existence of the two great parties which have ever since alternately governed the country. . . . During the first months of the Long Parliament, the indignation excited by

many years of lawless oppression was so strong and general that the House of Commons acted as one man. Abuse after abuse disappeared without a struggle. If a small minority of the representative body wished to retain the Star Chamber and the High Commission, that minority, overawed by the enthusiasm and by the numerical superiority of the reformers, contented itself with secretly regretting institutions which could not, with any hope of success, be openly defied. At a later period the Royalists found it convenient to antedate the separation between themselves and their opponents, and to attribute the Act which restrained the king from dissolving or proroguing the Parliament, the Triennial Act, the impeachment of the ministers, and the attainder of Strafford, to the faction which afterwards made war on the king. But no artifice could be more disingenuous. Every one of those strong measures was actively promoted by the men who were afterwards foremost among the Cavaliers. No republican spoke of the long misgovernment of Charles more severely than Colepepper. The most remarkable speech in favour of the Triennial Bill was made by Digby. The impeachment of the Lord Keeper was moved by Falkland. The demand that the Lord Lieutenant should be kept close prisoner was made at the bar of the Lords by Hyde. Not till the law attainting Strafford was proposed did the signs of serious disunion become visible. Even against that law, a law which nothing but extreme necessity could justify, only about sixty members of the House of Commons voted. It is certain that Hyde was not in the minority, and that Falkland not only voted with the majority, but spoke strongly for the bill. Even the few who entertained a scruple about inflicting death by a retrospective enactment thought it necessary to express the utmost abhorrence of Strafford's character and administration. But under this apparent concord a great schism was latent; and when, in October 1641, the Parliament reassembled after a short recess, two hostile parties, essentially the same with those which, under different names, have ever since contended, and are still contending, for the direction of public affairs, appeared confronting each other. During some years they were designated as Cavaliers and Roundheads. They were subsequently called Tories and Whigs; nor does it seem that these appellations are likely soon to become obsolete."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, ch. 1.—It was not until some months later, however, that the name of Roundheads was applied to the defenders of popular rights by their royalist adversaries. See ROUNDHEADS.

A. D. 1641 (November).—The Grand Remonstrance.—Early in November, 1641, the king being in Scotland, and news of the insurrection in Ireland having just reached London, the party of Pym, Hampden, and Cromwell "resolved on a great pitched battle between them and the opposition, which should try their relative strengths before the king's return; and they chose to fight this battle over a vast document, which they entitled 'A Declaration and Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdom,' but which has come to be known since as The Grand Remonstrance. . . . The notion of a great general document which, under the name of 'A Remonstrance,' should present to the king in one view a survey of the principal evils that had crept into the kingdom in his

own and preceding reigns, with a detection of their causes, and a specification of the remedies, had more than once been before the Commons. It had been first mooted by Lord Digby while the Parliament was not a week old. Again and again set aside for more immediate work, it had recurred to the leaders of the Movement party, just before the king's departure for Scotland, as likely to afford the broad battle-ground with the opposition then becoming desirable. 'A Remonstrance to be made, how we found the Kingdom and the Church, and how the state of it now stands,' such was the description of the then intended document (Aug. 7). The document had doubtless been in rehearsal through the Recess, for on the 8th of November the rough draft of it was presented to the House and read at the clerk's table. When we say that the document in its final form occupies thirteen folio pages of rather close print in Rushworth, and consists of a preamble followed by 206 articles or paragraphs duly numbered, one can conceive what a task the reading of even the first draft of it must have been, and through what a storm of successive debates over proposed amendments and additions it reached completeness. There had been no such debates yet in the Parliament."—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton*, v. 2, bk. 2, ch. 6.—"It [The Grand Remonstrance] embodies the case of the Parliament against the Ministers of the king. It is the most authentic statement ever put forth of the wrongs endured by all classes of the English people, during the first fifteen years of the reign of Charles I.; and, for that reason, the most complete justification upon record of the Great Rebellion." The debates on The Grand Remonstrance were begun Nov. 9 and ended Nov. 22, when the vote was taken: Ayes, 159.—Noes, 148.—So evenly were the parties in the great struggle then divided.—J. Forster, *Hist. and Biog. Essays*, v. 1: *Debates on the Grand Remonstrance*.—The following is the text of "The Grand Remonstrance," with that of the Petition preceding it: "Most Gracious Sovereign: Your Majesty's most humble and faithful subjects the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, do with much thankfulness and joy acknowledge the great mercy and favour of God, in giving your Majesty a safe and peaceable return out of Scotland into your kingdom of England, where the pressing dangers and distempers of the State have caused us with much earnestness to desire the comfort of your gracious presence, and likewise the unity and justice of your royal authority, to give more life and power to the dutiful and loyal counsels and endeavours of your Parliament, for the prevention of that eminent ruin and destruction wherein your kingdoms of England and Scotland are threatened. The duty which we owe to your Majesty and our country, cannot but make us very sensible and apprehensive, that the multiplicity, sharpness and malignity of those evils under which we have now many years suffered, are fomented and cherished by a corrupt and ill-affected party, who amongst other their mischievous devices for the alteration of religion and government, have sought by many false scandals and imputations, cunningly insinuated and dispersed amongst the people, to blemish and disgrace our proceedings in this Parliament, and to get themselves a party and faction amongst your subjects, for the better strengthening themselves in their wicked courses, and hindering

those provisions and remedies which might, by the wisdom of your Majesty and counsel of your Parliament, be opposed against them. For preventing whereof, and the better information of your Majesty, your Peers and all other your loyal subjects, we have been necessitated to make a declaration of the state of the kingdom, both before and since the assembly of this Parliament, unto this time, which we do humbly present to your Majesty, without the least intention to lay any blemish upon your royal person, but only to represent how your royal authority and trust have been abused, to the great prejudice and danger of your Majesty, and of all your good subjects. And because we have reason to believe that those malignant parties, whose proceedings evidently appear to be mainly for the advantage and increase of Popery, is composed, set up, and acted by the subtle practice of the Jesuits and other engineers and factors for Rome, and to the great danger of this kingdom, and most grievous affliction of your loyal subjects, have so far prevailed as to corrupt divers of your Bishops and others in prime places of the Church, and also to bring divers of these instruments to be of your Privy Council, and other employments of trust and nearness about your Majesty, the Prince, and the rest of your royal children. And by this means have had such an operation in your counsel and the most important affairs and proceedings of your government, that a most dangerous division and chargeable preparation for war betwixt your kingdoms of England and Scotland, the increase of jealousies betwixt your Majesty and your most obedient subjects, the violent distraction and interruption of this Parliament, the insurrection of the Papists in your kingdom of Ireland, and bloody massacre of your people, have been not only endeavoured and attempted, but in a great measure compassed and effected. For preventing the final accomplishment whereof, your poor subjects are enforced to engage their persons and estates to the maintaining of a very expensive and dangerous war, notwithstanding they have already since the beginning of this Parliament undergone the charge of £150,000 sterling, or thereabouts, for the necessary support and supply of your Majesty in these present and perilous designs. And because all our most faithful endeavours and engagements will be ineffectual for the peace, safety and preservation of your Majesty and your people, if some present, real and effectual course be not taken for suppressing this wicked and malignant party:—We, your most humble and obedient subjects, do with all faithfulness and humility beseech your Majesty, —1. That you will be graciously pleased to concur with the humble desires of your people in a parliamentary way, for the preserving the peace and safety of the kingdom from the malicious designs of the Popish party:—For depriving the Bishops of their votes in Parliament, and abridging their immoderate power usurped over the Clergy, and other your good subjects, which they have perniciously abused to the hazard of religion, and great prejudice and oppression of the laws of the kingdom, and just liberty of your people:—For the taking away such oppressions in religion, Church government and discipline, as have been brought in and fomented by them:—For uniting all such your loyal subjects together as join in the same fundamental truths against the Papists, by removing some oppres-

sions and unnecessary ceremonies by which divers weak consciences have been scrupled, and seem to be divided from the rest, and for the due execution of those good laws which have been made for securing the liberty of your subjects. 2. That your Majesty will likewise be pleased to remove from your council all such as persist to favour and promote any of those pressures and corruptions wherewith your people have been grieved, and that for the future your Majesty will vouchsafe to employ such persons in your great and public affairs, and to take such to be near you in places of trust, as your Parliament may have cause to confide in; that in your princely goodness to your people you will reject and refuse all mediation and solicitation to the contrary, how powerful and near soever. 3. That you will be pleased to forbear to alienate any of the forfeited and escheated lands in Ireland which shall accrue to your Crown by reason of this rebellion, that out of them the Crown may be the better supported, and some satisfaction made to your subjects of this kingdom for the great expenses they are like to undergo [in] this war. Which humble desires of ours being graciously fulfilled by your Majesty, we will, by the blessing and favour of God, most cheerfully undergo the hazard and expenses of this war, and apply ourselves to such other courses and counsels as may support your real estate with honour and plenty at home, with power and reputation abroad, and by our loyal affections, obedience and service, lay a sure and lasting foundation of the greatness and prosperity of your Majesty, and your royal prosperity in future times.

The Commons in this present Parliament assembled, having with much earnestness and faithfulness of affection and zeal to the public good of this kingdom, and His Majesty's honour and service for the space of twelve months, wrestled with great dangers and fears, the pressing miseries and calamities, the various distempers and disorders which had not only assaulted, but even overwhelmed and extinguished the liberty, peace and prosperity of this kingdom, the comfort and hopes of all His Majesty's good subjects, and exceedingly weakened and undermined the foundation and strength of his own royal throne, do yet find an abounding malignity and opposition in those parties and factions who have been the cause of those evils, and do still labour to cast aspersions upon that which hath been done, and to raise many difficulties for the hindrance of that which remains yet undone, and to foment jealousies between the King and Parliament, that so they may deprive him and his people of the fruit of his own gracious intentions, and their humble desires of procuring the public peace, safety and happiness of this realm. For the preventing of those miserable effects which such malicious endeavours may produce, we have thought good to declare the root and the growth of these mischievous designs: the maturity and ripeness to which they have attained before the beginning of the Parliament: the effectual means which have been used for the extirpation of those dangerous evils, and the progress which hath therein been made by His Majesty's goodness and the wisdom of the Parliament: the ways of obstruction and opposition by which that progress hath been interrupted: the courses to be taken for the removing those obstacles, and for the accomplishing of our most dutiful and faithful intentions

and endeavours of restoring and establishing the ancient honour, greatness and security of this Crown and nation. The root of all this mischief we find to be a malignant and pernicious design of subverting the fundamental laws and principles of government, upon which the religion and justice of this kingdom are firmly established. The actors and promoters hereof have been: 1. The Jesuited Papists, who hate the laws, as the obstacles of that change and subversion of religion which they so much long for. 2. The Bishops, and the corrupt part of the Clergy, who cherish formality and superstition as the natural effects and more probable supports of their own ecclesiastical tyranny and usurpation. 3. Such Councillors and Courtiers as for private ends have engaged themselves to further the interests of some foreign princes or states to the prejudice of His Majesty and the State at home. The common principles by which they moulded and governed all their particular counsels and actions were these: First, to maintain continual differences and discontents between the King and the people, upon questions of prerogative and liberty, that so they might have the advantage of siding with him, and under the notions of men addicted to his service, gain to themselves and their parties the places of greatest trust and power in the kingdom. A second, to suppress the purity and power of religion, and such persons as were best affected to it, as being contrary to their own ends, and the greatest impediment to that change which they thought to introduce. A third, to conjoin those parties of the kingdom which were most propitious to their own ends, and to divide those who were most opposite, which consisted in many particular observations. To cherish the Arminian part in those points wherein they agree with the Papists, to multiply and enlarge the difference between the common Protestants and those whom they call Puritans, to introduce and countenance such opinions and ceremonies as are fittest for accommodation with Popery, to increase and maintain ignorance, looseness and profaneness in the people; that of those three parties, Papists, Arminians and Libertines, they might compose a body fit to act such counsels and resolutions as were most conducive to their own ends. A fourth, to disaffect the King to Parliaments by slander and false imputations, and by putting him upon other ways of supply, which in show and appearance were fuller of advantage than the ordinary course of subsidies, though in truth they brought more loss than gain both to the King and people, and have caused the great distractions under which we both suffer. As in all compounded bodies the operations are qualified according to the predominant element, so in this mixed party, the Jesuited counsels, being most active and prevailing, may easily be discovered to have had the greatest sway in all their determinations, and if they be not prevented, are likely to devour the rest, or to turn them into their own nature. In the beginning of His Majesty's reign the party began to revive and flourish again, having been somewhat damped by the breach with Spain in the last year of King James, and by His Majesty's marriage with France; the interests and counsels of that State being not so contrary to the good of religion and the prosperity of this kingdom as those of Spain; and the Papists of England, having been ever more addicted to Spain than France, yet they

still retained a purpose and resolution to weaken the Protestant parties in all parts, and even in France, whereby to make way for the change of religion which they intended at home.

1. The first effect and evidence of their recovery and strength was the dissolution of the Parliament at Oxford, after there had been given two subsidies to His Majesty, and before they received relief in any one grievance many other more miserable effects followed.

2. The loss of the Rochel fleet, by the help of our shipping, set forth and delivered over to the French in opposition to the advice of Parliament, which left that town without defence by sea, and made way, not only to the loss of that important place, but likewise to the loss of all the strength and security of the Protestant religion in France.

3. The diverting of His Majesty's course of wars from the West Indies, which was the most facile and hopeful way for this kingdom to prevail against the Spaniard, to an expensful and unsuccessful attempt upon Cadiz, which was so ordered as if it had rather been intended to make us weary of war than to prosper in it.

4. The precipitate breach with France, by taking their ships to a great value without making recompense to the English, whose goods were thereupon imbarred and confiscated in that kingdom.

5. The peace with Spain without consent of Parliament, contrary to the promise of King James to both Houses, whereby the Palatine's cause was deserted and left to chargeable and hopeless treaties, which for the most part were managed by those who might justly be suspected to be no friends to that cause.

6. The charging of the kingdom with billeted soldiers in all parts of it, and the concomitant design of German horse, that the land might either submit with fear or be enforced with rigour to such arbitrary contributions as should be required of them.

7. The dissolving of the Parliament in the second year of His Majesty's reign, after a declaration of their intent to grant five subsidies.

8. The exacting of the like proportion of five subsidies, after the Parliament dissolved, by commission of loan, and divers gentlemen and others imprisoned for not yielding to pay that loan, whereby many of them contracted such sicknesses as cost them their lives.

9. Great sums of money required and raised by privy seals.

10. An unjust and pernicious attempt to extort great payments from the subject by way of excise, and a commission issued under the seal to that purpose.

11. The Petition of Right, which was granted in full Parliament, blasted, with an illegal declaration to make it destructive to itself, to the power of Parliament, to the liberty of the subject, and to that purpose printed with it, and the Petition made of no use but to show the bold and presumptuous injustice of such ministers as durst break the laws and suppress the liberties of the kingdom, after they had been so solemnly and evidently declared.

12. Another Parliament dissolved 4 Car., the privilege of Parliament broken, by imprisoning divers members of the House, detaining them close prisoners for many months together, without the liberty of using books, pen, ink or paper; denying them all the comforts of life, all means

of preservation of health, not permitting their wives to come unto them even in the time of their sickness.

13. And for the completing of that cruelty, after years spent in such miserable durance, depriving them of the necessary means of spiritual consolation, not suffering them to go abroad to enjoy God's ordinances in God's House, or God's ministers to come to them to minister comfort to them in their private chambers.

14. And to keep them still in this oppressed condition, not admitting them to be bailed according to law, yet vexing them with informations in inferior courts, sentencing and fining some of them for matters done in Parliament; and extorting the payments of those fines from them, enforcing others to put in security of good behaviour before they could be released.

15. The imprisonment of the rest, which refused to be bound, still continued, which might have been perpetual if necessity had not the last year brought another Parliament to relieve them, of whom one died [Sir John Eliot] by the cruelty and harshness of his imprisonment, which would admit of no relaxation, notwithstanding the imminent danger of his life, did sufficiently appear by the declaration of his physician, and his release, or at least his refreshment, was sought by many humble petitions, and his blood still cries either for vengeance or repentance of those Ministers of State, who have at once obstructed the course both of His Majesty's justice and mercy.

16. Upon the dissolution of both these Parliaments, untrue and scandalous declarations were published to asperse their proceedings, and some of their members unjustly; to make them odious, and colour the violence which was used against them; proclamations set out to the same purpose; and to the great dejecting of the hearts of the people, forbidding them even to speak of Parliaments.

17. After the breach of the Parliament in the fourth of His Majesty, injustice, oppression and violence broke in upon us without any restraint or moderation, and yet the first project was the great sums exacted through the whole kingdom for default of knighthood, which seemed to have some colour and shadow of a law, yet if it be rightly examined by that obsolete law which was pretended for it, it will be found to be against all the rules of justice, both in respect of the persons charged, the proportion of the fines demanded, and the absurd and unreasonable manner of their proceedings.

18. Tonnage and Poundage hath been received without colour or pretence of law; many other heavy impositions continued against law, and some so unreasonable that the sum of the charge exceeds the value of the goods.

19. The Book of Rates lately enhanced to a high proportion, and such merchants that would not submit to their illegal and unreasonable payments, were vexed and oppressed above measure; and the ordinary course of justice, the common birthright of the subject of England, wholly obstructed unto them.

20. And although all this was taken upon pretence of guarding the seas, yet a new unheard-of tax of ship-money was devised, and upon the same pretence, by both which there was charged upon the subject near £700,000 some years, and yet the merchants have been left so naked to the violence of the Turkish pirates, that many great

ships of value and thousands of His Majesty's subjects have been taken by them, and do still remain in miserable slavery.

21. The enlargements of forests, contrary to 'Carta de Foresta,' and the composition thereupon.

22. The exactions of coat and conduct money and divers other military charges.

23. The taking away the arms of trained bands of divers counties.

24. The desperate design of engrossing all the gunpowder into one hand, keeping it in the Tower of London, and setting so high a rate upon it that the poorer sort were not able to buy it, nor could any have it without licence, thereby to leave the several parts of the kingdom destitute of their necessary defence, and by selling so dear that which was sold to make an unlawful advantage of it, to the great charge and detriment of the subject.

25. The general destruction of the King's timber, especially that in the Forest of Deane, sold to Papists, which was the best store-house of this kingdom for the maintenance of our shipping.

26. The taking away of men's right, under the colour of the King's title to land, between high and low water marks.

27. The monopolies of soap, salt, wine, leather, sea-coal, and in a manner of all things of most common and necessary use.

28. The restraint of the liberties of the subjects in their habitation, trades and other interests.

29. Their vexation and oppression by purveyors, clerks of the market and saltpetre men.

30. The sale of pretended nuisances, as building in and about London.

31. Conversion of arable into pasture, continuance of pasture, under the name of depopulation, have driven many millions out of the subjects' purses, without any considerable profit to His Majesty.

32. Large quantities of common and several grounds hath been taken from the subject by colour of the Statute of Improvement, and by abuse of the Commission of Sewers, without their consent, and against it.

33. And not only private interest, but also public faith, have been broken in seizing of the money and bullion in the mint, and the whole kingdom like to be robbed at once in that abominable project of brass money.

34. Great numbers of His Majesty's subjects for refusing those unlawful charges, have been vexed with long and expensive suits, some fined and censured, others committed to long and hard imprisonments and confinements, to the loss of health in many, of life in some, and others have had their houses broken up, their goods seized, some have been restrained from their lawful callings.

35. Ships have been interrupted in their voyages, surprised at sea in a hostile manner by projectors, as by a common enemy.

36. Merchants prohibited to unlade their goods in such ports as were for their own advantage, and forced to bring them to those places which were much for the advantage of the monopolisers and projectors.

37. The Court of Star Chamber hath abounded in extravagant censures, not only for the maintenance and improvement of monopolies and other unlawful taxes, but for divers other causes where

there hath been no offence, or very small; whereby His Majesty's subjects have been oppressed by grievous fines, imprisonments, stigmatisings, mutilations, whippings, pillories, gags, confinements, banishments; after so rigid a manner as hath not only deprived men of the society of their friends, exercise of their professions, comfort of books, use of paper or ink, but even violated that near union which God hath established between men and their wives, by forced and constrained separation, whereby they have been bereaved of the comfort and conversation one of another for many years together, without hope of relief, if God had not by His overruling providence given some interruption to the prevailing power, and counsel of those who were the authors and promoters of such peremptory and heady courses.

38. Judges have been put out of their places for refusing to do against their oaths and consciences; others have been so awed that they durst not do their duties, and the better to hold a rod over them, the clause '*Quam diu se bene gesserit*' was left out of their patents, and a new clause '*Duraute bene placito*' inserted.

39. Lawyers have been checked for being faithful to their clients; solicitors and attorneys have been threatened, and some punished, for following lawful suits. And by this means all the approaches to justice were interrupted and forecluded.

40. New oaths have been forced upon the subject against law.

41. New judicatories erected without law. The Council Table have by their orders offered to bind the subjects in their freeholds, estates, suits and actions.

42. The pretended Court of the Earl Marshal was arbitrary and illegal in its being and proceedings.

43. The Chancery, Exchequer Chamber, Court of Wards, and other English Courts, have been grievous in exceeding their jurisdiction.

44. The estate of many families weakened, and some ruined by excessive fines, exacted from them for compositions of wardships.

45. All leases of above a hundred years made to draw on wardship contrary to law.

46. Undue proceedings used in the finding of offices to make the jury find for the King.

47. The Common Law Courts, feeling all men more inclined to seek justice there, where it may be fitted to their own desire, are known frequently to forsake the rules of the Common Law, and straying beyond their bounds, under pretence of equity, to do injustice.

48. Titles of honour, judicial places, sergeantships at law, and other offices have been sold for great sums of money, whereby the common justice of the kingdom hath been much endangered, not only by opening a way of employment in places of great trust, and advantage to men of weak parts, but also by giving occasion to bribery, extortion, partiality, it seldom happening that places ill-gotten are well used.

49. Commissions have been granted for examining the excess of fees, and when great exactions have been discovered, compositions have been made with delinquents, not only for the time past, but likewise for immunity and security in offending for the time to come, which under colour of remedy hath but confirmed and increased the grievance to the subject.

50. The usual course of pricking Sheriffs not observed, but many times Sheriffs made in an extraordinary way, sometimes as a punishment and charge unto them; sometimes such were pricked out as would be instruments to execute whatsoever they would have to be done.

51. The Bishops and the rest of the Clergy did triumph in the suspensions, ex-communications, deprivations, and degradations of divers painful, learned and pious ministers, in the vexation and grievous oppression of great numbers of His Majesty's good subjects.

52. The High Commission grew to such excess of sharpness and severity as was not much less than the Romish Inquisition, and yet in many cases by the Archbishop's power was made much more heavy, being assisted and strengthened by authority of the Council Table.

53. The Bishops and their Courts were as eager in the country; although their jurisdiction could not reach so high in rigour and extremity of punishment, yet were they no less grievous in respect of the generality and multiplicity of vexations, which lighting upon the meaner sort of tradesmen and artificers did impoverish many thousands.

54. And so afflict and trouble others, that great numbers to avoid their miseries departed out of the kingdom, some into New England and other parts of America, others into Holland.

55. Where they have transported their manufactures of cloth, which is not only a loss by diminishing the present stock of the kingdom, but a great mischief by impairing and endangering the loss of that particular trade of clothing, which hath been a plentiful fountain of wealth and honour to this nation.

56. Those were fittest for ecclesiastical preferment, and soonest obtained it, who were most officious in promoting superstition, most virulent in railing against godliness and honesty.

57. The most public and solemn sermons before His Majesty were either to advance prerogative above law, and decry the property of the subject, or full of such kind of invectives.

58. Whereby they might make those odious who sought to maintain the religion, laws and liberties of the kingdom, and such men were sure to be weeded out of the commission of the peace, and out of all other employments of power in the government of the country.

59. Many noble personages were councillors in name, but the power and authority remained in a few of such as were most addicted to this party, whose resolutions and determinations were brought to the table for countenance and execution, and not for debate and deliberation, and no man could offer to oppose them without disgrace and hazard to himself.

60. Nay, all those that did not wholly concur and actively contribute to the furtherance of their designs, though otherwise persons of never so great honour and abilities, were so far from being employed in any place of trust and power, that they were neglected, discountenanced, and upon all occasions injured and oppressed.

61. This faction was grown to that height and entireness of power, that now they began to think of finishing their work, which consisted of these three parts.

62. I. The government must be set free from all restraint of laws concerning our persons and estates.

63. II. There must be a conjunction between Papists and Protestants in doctrine, discipline and ceremonies; only it must not yet be called Popery.

64. III. The Puritans, under which name they include all those that desire to preserve the laws and liberties of the kingdom, and to maintain religion in the power of it, must be either rooted out of the kingdom with force, or driven out with fear.

65. For the effecting of this it was thought necessary to reduce Scotland to such Popish superstitions and innovations as might make them apt to join with England in that great change which was intended.

66. Whereupon new canons and a new liturgy were pressed upon them, and when they refused to admit of them, an army was raised to force them to it, towards which the Clergy and the Papists were very forward in their contribution.

67. The Scots likewise raised an army for their defence.

68. And when both armies were come together, and ready for a bloody encounter, His Majesty's own gracious disposition, and the counsel of the English nobility and dutiful submission of the Scots, did so far prevail against the evil counsel of others, that a pacification was made, and His Majesty returned with peace and much honour to London.

69. The unexpected reconciliation was most acceptable to all the kingdom, except to the malignant party; whereof the Archbishop and the Earl of Strafford being heads, they and their faction begun to inveigh against the peace, and to aggravate the proceedings of the states, which so increased [incensed?] His Majesty, that he forthwith prepared again for war.

70. And such was their confidence, that having corrupted and distempered the whole frame and government of the kingdom, they did now hope to corrupt that which was the only means to restore all to a right frame and temper again.

71. To which end they persuaded His Majesty to call a Parliament, not to seek counsel and advice of them, but to draw countenance and supply from them, and to engage the whole kingdom in their quarrel.

72. And in the meantime continued all their unjust levies of money, resolving either to make the Parliament pliant to their will, and to establish mischief by a law, or else to break it, and with more colour to go on by violence to take what they could not obtain by consent. The ground alleged for the justification of this war was this,

73. That the undutiful demands of the Parliaments in Scotland was a sufficient reason for His Majesty to take arms against them, without hearing the reason of those demands, and thereupon a new army was prepared against them, their ships were seized in all ports both of England and Ireland, and at sea, their petitions rejected, their commissioners refused audience.

74. The whole kingdom most miserably distempered with levies of men and money, and imprisonments of those who denied to submit to those levies.

75. The Earl of Strafford passed into Ireland, caused the Parliament there to declare against the Scots, to give four subsidies towards that war, and to engage themselves, their lives and fortunes, for the prosecution of it, and gave

directions for an army of eight thousand foot and one thousand horse to be levied there, which were for the most part Papists.

76. The Parliament met upon the 13th of April, 1640. The Earl of Strafford and Archbishop of Canterbury, with their party, so prevailed with His Majesty, that the House of Commons was pressed to yield a supply for maintenance of the war with Scotland, before they had provided any relief for the great and pressing grievances of the people, which being against the fundamental privilege and proceeding of Parliament, was yet in humble respect to His Majesty, so far admitted as that they agreed to take the matter of supply into consideration, and two several days it was debated.

77. Twelve subsidies were demanded for the release of ship-money alone, a third day was appointed for conclusion, when the heads of that party begun to fear the people might close with the King, in falsifying his desires of money; but that withal they were like to blast their malicious designs against Scotland, finding them very much indisposed to give any countenance to that war.

78. Thereupon they wickedly advised the King to break off the Parliament and to return to the ways of confusion, in which their own evil intentions were most likely to prosper and succeed.

79. After the Parliament ended the 5th of May, 1640, this party grew so bold as to counsel the King to supply himself out of his subjects' estates by his own power, at his own will, without their consent.

80. The very next day some members of both Houses had their studies and cabinets, yea, their pockets searched: another of them not long after was committed close prisoner for not delivering some petitions which he received by authority of that House.

81. And if harsher courses were intended (as was reported) it is very probable that the sickness of the Earl of Strafford, and the tumultuous rising in Southwark and about Lambeth were the causes that such violent intentions were not brought to execution.

82. A false and scandalous Declaration against the House of Commons was published in His Majesty's name, which yet wrought little effect with the people, but only to manifest the impudence of those who were authors of it.

83. A forced loan of money was attempted in the City of London.

84. The Lord Mayor and Aldermen in their several wards, enjoined to bring in a list of the names of such persons as they judged fit to lend, and of the sums they should lend. And such Aldermen as refused to do so were committed to prison.

85. The Archbishop and the other Bishops and Clergy continued the Convocation, and by a new commission turned it into a provincial Synod, in which, by an unheard-of presumption, they made canons that contain in them many matters contrary to the King's prerogative, to the fundamental laws and statutes of the realm, to the right of Parliaments, to the property and liberty of the subject, and matters tending to sedition and of dangerous consequence, thereby establishing their own usurpations, justifying their altar-worship, and those other superstitious innovations which they formerly introduced without warrant of law.

86. They imposed a new oath upon divers of His Majesty's subjects, both ecclesiastical and lay, for maintenance of their own tyranny, and laid a great tax on the Clergy, for supply of His Majesty, and generally they showed themselves very affectionate to the war with Scotland, which was by some of them styled 'Bellum Episcopale,' and a prayer composed and enjoined to be read in all churches, calling the Scots rebels, to put the two nations in blood and make them irreconcilable.

87. All those pretended canons and constitutions were armed with the several censures of suspension, excommunication, deprivation, by which they would have thrust out all the good ministers, and most of the well-affected people of the kingdom, and left an easy passage to their own design of reconciliation with Rome.

88. The Popish party enjoyed such exemptions from penal laws as amounted to a toleration, besides many other encouragements and Court favours.

89. They had a Secretary of State, Sir Francis Windebanck, a powerful agent for speeding all their desires.

90. A Pope's Nuncio residing here, to act and govern them according to such influences as he received from Rome, and to intercede for them with the most powerful concurrence of the foreign princes of that religion.

91. By his authority the Papists of all sorts, nobility, gentry, and clergy were convoked after the manner of a Parliament.

92. New jurisdictions were erected of Romish Archbishops, taxes levied, another state moulded within this state independent in government, contrary in interest and affection, secretly corrupting the ignorant or negligent professors of our religion, and closely uniting and combining themselves against such as were found in this posture, waiting for an opportunity by force to destroy those whom they could not hope to seduce.

93. For the effecting whereof they were strengthened with arms and munitions, encouraged by superstitious prayers, enjoined by the Nuncio to be weekly made for the prosperity of some great design.

94. And such power had they at Court, that secretly a commission was issued out, or intended to be issued to some great men of that profession, for the levying of soldiers, and to command and employ them according to private instructions, which we doubt were framed for the advantage of those who were the contrivers of them.

95. His Majesty's treasure was consumed, his revenue anticipated.

96. His servants and officers compelled to lend great sums of money.

97. Multitudes were called to the Council Table, who were tired with long attendances there for refusing illegal payments.

98. The prisons were filled with their commitments; many of the Sheriffs summoned into the Star Chamber, and some imprisoned for not being quick enough in levying the ship-money; the people languished under grief and fear, no visible hope being left but in desperation.

99. The nobility began to weary of their silence and patience, and sensible of the duty and trust which belongs to them: and thereupon some of the most ancient of them did petition His Majesty at such a time, when evil counsels were so strong, that they had occasion to ex-

pect more hazard to themselves, than redress of those public evils for which they interceded.

100. Whilst the kingdom was in this agitation and distemper, the Scots, restrained in their trades, impoverished by the loss of many of their ships, bereaved of all possibility of satisfying His Majesty by any naked supplication, entered with a powerful army into the kingdom, and without any hostile act or spoil in the country they passed, more than forcing a passage over the Tyne at Newburn, near Newcastle, possessed themselves of Newcastle, and had a fair opportunity to press on further upon the King's army.

101. But duty and reverence to His Majesty, and brotherly love to the English nation, made them stay there, whereby the King had leisure to entertain better counsels.

102. Wherein God so blessed and directed him that he summoned the Great Council of Peers to meet at York upon the 24th of September, and there declared a Parliament to begin the 3d of November then following.

103. The Scots, the first day of the Great Council, presented an humble Petition to His Majesty, whereupon the Treaty was appointed at Ripon.

104. A present cessation of arms agreed upon, and the full conclusion of all differences referred to the wisdom and care of the Parliament.

105. At our first meeting, all oppositions seemed to vanish, the mischiefs were so evident which those evil counsellors produced, that no man durst stand up to defend them: yet the work itself afforded difficulty enough.

106. The multiplied evils and corruption of fifteen years, strengthened by custom and authority, and the concurrent interest of many powerful delinquents, were now to be brought to judgment and reformation.

107. The King's household was to be provided for:—they had brought him to that want, that he could not supply his ordinary and necessary expenses without the assistance of his people.

108. Two armies were to be paid, which amounted very near to eighty thousand pounds a month.

109. The people were to be tenderly charged, having been formerly exhausted with many burdensome projects.

110. The difficulties seemed to be insuperable, which by the Divine Providence we have overcome. The contrarieties incompatible, which yet in a great measure we have reconciled.

111. Six subsidies have been granted and a Bill of poll-money, which if it be duly levied, may equal six subsidies more, in all £600,000.

112. Besides we have contracted a debt to the Scots of £220,000, yet God hath so blessed the endeavours of this Parliament, that the kingdom is a great gainer by all these charges.

113. The ship-money is abolished, which cost the kingdom about £200,000 a year.

114. The coat and conduct-money, and other military charges are taken away, which in many countries amounted to little less than the ship-money.

115. The monopolies are all suppressed, whereof some few did prejudice the subject, above £1,000,000 yearly.

116. The soap £100,000.

117. The wine £300,000.

118. The leather must needs exceed both, and salt could be no less than that.

119. Besides the inferior monopolies, which, if they could be exactly computed, would make up a great sum.

120. That which is more beneficial than all this is, that the root of these evils is taken away, which was the arbitrary power pretended to be in His Majesty of taxing the subject, or charging their estates without consent in Parliament, which is now declared to be against law by the judgment of both Houses, and likewise by an Act of Parliament.

121. Another step of great advantage is this, the living grievances, the evil counsellors and actors of these mischiefs have been so quelled.

122. By the justice done upon the Earl of Strafford, the flight of the Lord Finch and Secretary Windebank.

123. The accusation and imprisonment of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of Judge Berkeley; and

124. The impeachment of divers other Bishops and Judges, that it is like not only to be an ease to the present times, but a preservation to the future.

125. The discontinuance of Parliaments is prevented by the Bill for a triennial Parliament, and the abrupt dissolution of this Parliament by another Bill, by which it is provided it shall not be dissolved or adjourned without the consent of both Houses.

126. Which two laws well considered may be thought more advantageous than all the former, because they secure a full operation of the present remedy, and afford a perpetual spring of remedies for the future.

127. The Star Chamber.

128. The High Commission.

129. The Courts of the President and Council in the North were so many forges of misery, oppression and violence, and are all taken away, whereby men are more secured in their persons, liberties and estates, than they could be by any law or example for the regulation of those Courts or terror of the Judges.

130. The immoderate power of the Council Table, and the excessive abuse of that power is so ordered and restrained, that we may well hope that no such things as were frequently done by them, to the prejudice of the public liberty, will appear in future times but only in stories, to give us and our posterity more occasion to praise God for His Majesty's goodness, and the faithful endeavours of this Parliament.

131. The canons and power of canon-making are blasted by the votes of both Houses.

132. The exorbitant power of Bishops and their courts are much abated, by some provisions in the Bill against the High Commission Court, the authors of the many innovations in doctrine and ceremonies.

133. The ministers that have been scandalous in their lives, have been so terrified in just complaints and accusations, that we may well hope they will be more modest for the time to come; either inwardly convicted by the sight of their own folly, or outwardly restrained by the fear of punishment.

134. The forests are by a good law reduced to their right bounds.

135. The encroachments and oppressions of the Stannary Courts, the extortions of the clerk of the market.

136. And the compulsion of the subject to receive the Order of Knighthood against his will,

paying of fines for not receiving it, and the vexatious proceedings thereupon for levying of those fines, are by other beneficial laws reformed and prevented.

137. Many excellent laws and provisions are in preparation for removing the inordinate power, vexation and usurpation of Bishops, for reforming the pride and idleness of many of the clergy, for easing the people of unnecessary ceremonies in religion, for censuring and removing unworthy and unprofitable ministers, and for maintaining godly and diligent preachers through the kingdom.

138. Other things of main importance for the good of this kingdom are in proposition, though little could hitherto be done in regard of the many other more pressing businesses, which yet before the end of this Session we hope may receive some progress and perfection.

139. The establishing and ordering the King's revenue, that so the abuse of officers and superfluity of expenses may be cut off, and the necessary disbursements for His Majesty's honour, the defence and government of the kingdom, may be more certainly provided for.

140. The regulating of courts of justice, and abridging both the delays and charges of law-suits.

141. The settling of some good courses for preventing the exportation of gold and silver, and the inequality of exchanges between us and other nations, for the advancing of native commodities, increase of our manufactures, and well balancing of trade, whereby the stock of the kingdom may be increased, or at least kept from impairing, as through neglect hereof it hath done for many years last past.

142. Improving the herring-fishing upon our coasts, which will be of mighty use in the employment of the poor, and a plentiful nursery of mariners for enabling the kingdom in any great action.

143. The oppositions, obstructions and other difficulties wherewith we have been encountered, and which still lie in our way with some strength and much obstinacy, are these: the malignant party whom we have formerly described to be the actors and promoters of all our misery, they have taken heart again.

144. They have been able to prefer some of their own factors and agents to degrees of honour, to places of trust and employment, even during the Parliament.

145. They have endeavoured to work in His Majesty ill impressions and opinions of our proceedings, as if we had altogether done our own work, and not his; and had obtained from him many things very prejudicial to the Crown, both in respect of prerogative and profit.

146. To wipe out this slander we think good only to say thus much: that all that we have done is for His Majesty, his greatness, honour and support, when we yield to give £25,000 a month for the relief of the Northern Counties; this was given to the King, for he was bound to protect his subjects.

147. They were His Majesty's evil counsellors, and their ill instruments that were actors in those grievances which brought in the Scots.

148. And if His Majesty please to force those who were the authors of this war to make satisfaction, as he might justly and easily do, it seems very reasonable that the people might well be

excused from taking upon them this burden, being altogether innocent and free from being any cause of it.

149. When we undertook the charge of the army, which cost above £50,000 a month, was not this given to the King? Was it not His Majesty's army? Were not all the commanders under contract with His Majesty, at higher rates and greater wages than ordinary?

150. And have not we taken upon us to discharge all the brotherly assistance of £300,000, which we gave the Scots? Was it not toward repair of those damages and losses which they received from the King's ships and from his ministers?

151. These three particulars amount to above £1,100,000.

152. Besides, His Majesty hath received by impositions upon merchandise at least £400,000.

153. So that His Majesty hath had out of the subjects' purse since the Parliament began, £1,500,000, and yet these men can be so impudent as to tell His Majesty that we have done nothing for him.

154. As to the second branch of this slander, we acknowledge with much thankfulness that His Majesty hath passed more good Bills to the advantage of the subjects than have been in many ages.

155. But withal we cannot forget that these venomous councils did manifest themselves in some endeavours to hinder these good acts.

156. And for both Houses of Parliament we may with truth and modesty say thus much: that we have ever been careful not to desire anything that should weaken the Crown either in just profit or useful power.

157. The triennial Parliament for the matter of it, doth not extend to so much as by law we ought to have required (there being two statutes still in force for a Parliament to be once a year), and for the manner of it, it is in the King's power that it shall never take effect, if he by a timely summons shall prevent any other way of assembling.

158. In the Bill for continuance of this present Parliament, there seems to be some restraint of the royal power in dissolving of Parliaments, not to take it out of the Crown, but to suspend the execution of it for this time and occasion only: which was so necessary for the King's own security and the public peace, that without it we could not have undertaken any of these great charges, but must have left both the armies to disorder and confusion, and the whole kingdom to blood and rapine.

159. The Star Chamber was much more fruitful in oppression than in profit, the great fines being for the most part given away, and the rest stalled at long times.

160. The fines of the High Commission were in themselves unjust, and seldom or never came into the King's purse. These four Bills are particularly and more specially instanced.

161. In the rest there will not be found so much as a shadow of prejudice to the Crown.

162. They have sought to diminish our reputation with the people, and to bring them out of love with Parliaments.

163. The aspersions which they have attempted this way have been such as these:

164. That we have spent much time and done little, especially in those grievances which concern religion.

165. That the Parliament is a burden to the kingdom by the abundance of protections which hinder justice and trade; and by many subsidies granted much more heavy than any formerly endured.

166. To which there is a ready answer; if the time spent in this Parliament be considered in relation backward to the long growth and deep root of those grievances, which we have removed, to the powerful supports of those delinquents, which we have pursued, to the great necessities and other charges of the commonwealth for which we have provided.

167. Or if it be considered in relation forward to many advantages, which not only the present but future ages are like to reap by the good laws and other proceedings in this Parliament, we doubt not but it will be thought by all indifferent judgments, that our time hath been much better employed than in a far greater proportion of time in many former Parliaments put together; and the charges which have been laid upon the subject, and the other inconveniences which they have borne, will seem very light in respect of the benefit they have and may receive.

168. And for the matter of protections, the Parliament is so sensible of it that therein they intended to give them whatsoever ease may stand with honour and justice, and are in a way of passing a Bill to give them satisfaction.

169. They have sought by many subtle practices to cause jealousies and divisions betwixt us and our brethren of Scotland, by slandering their proceedings and intentions towards us, and by secret endeavours to instigate and incense them and us one against another.

170. They have had such a party of Bishops and Popish lords in the House of Peers, as hath caused much opposition and delay in the prosecution of delinquents, hindered the proceedings of divers good Bills passed in the Commons' House, concerning the reformation of sundry great abuses and corruptions both in Church and State.

171. They have laboured to seduce and corrupt some of the Commons' House to draw them into conspiracies and combinations against the liberty of the Parliament.

172. And by their instruments and agents they have attempted to disaffect and discontent His Majesty's army, and to engage it for the maintenance of their wicked and traitorous designs; the keeping up of Bishops in votes and functions, and by force to compel the Parliament to order, limit and dispose their proceedings in such manner as might best concur with the intentions of this dangerous and potent faction.

173. And when one mischievous design and attempt of theirs to bring on the army against the Parliament and the City of London, hath been discovered and prevented;

174. They presently undertook another of the same damnable nature, with this addition to it, to endeavour to make the Scottish army neutral, whilst the English army, which they had laboured to corrupt and envenom against us by their false and slanderous suggestions, should execute their malice to the subversion of our religion and the dissolution of our government.

175. Thus they have been continually practising to disturb the peace, and plotting the destruction even of all the King's dominions; and have employed their emissaries and agents in

them, all for the promoting their devilish designs, which the vigilancy of those who were well affected hath still discovered and defeated before they were ripe for execution in England and Scotland.

176. Only in Ireland, which was farther off, they have had time and opportunity to mould and prepare their work, and had brought it to that perfection that they had possessed themselves of that whole kingdom, totally subverted the government of it, routed out religion, and destroyed all the Protestants whom the conscience of their duty to God, their King and country, would not have permitted to join with them, if by God's wonderful providence their main enterprise upon the city and castle of Dublin, had not been detected and prevented upon the very eve before it should have been executed.

177. Notwithstanding they have in other parts of that kingdom broken out into open rebellion, surprising towns and castles, committed murders, rapes and other villainies, and shaken off all bonds of obedience to His Majesty and the laws of the realm.

178. And in general have kindled such a fire, as nothing but God's infinite blessing upon the wisdom and endeavours of this State will be able to quench it.

179. And certainly had not God in His great mercy unto this land discovered and confounded their former designs, we had been the prologue to this tragedy in Ireland, and had by this been made the lamentable spectacle of misery and confusion.

180. And now what hope have we but in God, when as the only means of our subsistence and power of reformation is under Him in the Parliament?

181. But what can we the Commons, without the conjunction of the House of Lords, and what conjunction can we expect there, when the Bishops and recusant lords are so numerous and prevalent that they are able to cross and interrupt our best endeavours for reformation, and by that means give advantage to this malignant party to traduce our proceedings?

182. They infuse into the people that we mean to abolish all Church government, and leave every man to his own fancy for the service and worship of God, absolving him of that obedience which he owes under God unto His Majesty, whom we know to be entrusted with the ecclesiastical law as well as with the temporal, to regulate all the members of the Church of England, by such rules of order and discipline as are established by Parliament, which is his great council in all affairs both in Church and State.

183. We confess our intention is, and our endeavours have been, to reduce within bounds that exorbitant power which the prelates have assumed unto themselves, so contrary both to the Word of God and to the laws of the land, to which end we passed the Bill for the removing them from their temporal power and employments, that so the better they might with meekness apply themselves to the discharge of their functions, which Bill themselves opposed, and were the principal instruments of crossing it.

184. And we do here declare that it is far from our purpose or desire to let loose the golden reins of discipline and government in the Church, to leave private persons or particular congregations to take up what form of Divine Service they please, for we hold it requisite that there

should be throughout the whole realm a conformity to that order which the laws enjoin according to the Word of God. And we desire to unburden the consciences of men of needless and superstitious ceremonies, suppress innovations, and take away the monuments of idolatry.

185. And the better to effect the intended reformation, we desire there may be a general synod of the most grave, pious, learned and judicious divines of this island; assisted with some from foreign parts, professing the same religion with us, who may consider of all things necessary for the peace and good government of the Church, and represent the results of their consultations unto the Parliament, to be there allowed of and confirmed, and receive the stamp of authority, thereby to find passage and obedience throughout the kingdom.

186. They have maliciously charged us that we intend to destroy and discourage learning, whereas it is our chiefest care and desire to advance it, and to provide a competent maintenance for conscionable and preaching ministers throughout the kingdom, which will be a great encouragement to scholars, and a certain means whereby the want, meanness and ignorance, to which a great part of the clergy is now subject, will be prevented.

187. And we intended likewise to reform and purge the fountains of learning, the two Universities, that the streams flowing from thence may be clear and pure, and an honour and comfort to the whole land.

188. They have strained to blast our proceedings in Parliament, by wresting the interpretations of our orders from their genuine intention.

189. They tell the people that our meddling with the power of episcopacy hath caused sectaries and conventicles, when idolatrous and Popish ceremonies, introduced into the Church by the command of the Bishops have not only debarred the people from thence, but expelled them from the kingdom.

190. Thus with Elijah, we are called by this malignant party the troublers of the State, and still, while we endeavour to reform their abuses, they make us the authors of those mischiefs we study to prevent.

191. For the perfecting of the work begun, and removing all future impediments, we conceive these courses will be very effectual, seeing the religion of the Papists hath such principles as do certainly tend to the destruction and extirpation of all Protestants, when they shall have opportunity to effect it.

192. It is necessary in the first place to keep them in such condition as that they may not be able to do us any hurt, and for avoiding of such connivance and favour as hath heretofore been shown unto them.

193. That His Majesty be pleased to grant a standing Commission to some choice men named in Parliament, who may take notice of their increase, their counsels and proceedings, and use all due means by execution of the laws to prevent all mischievous designs against the peace and safety of this kingdom.

194. Thus some good course be taken to discover the counterfeit and false conformity of Papists to the Church, by colour whereof persons very much disaffected to the true religion have been admitted into place of greatest authority and trust in the kingdom.

195. For the better preservation of the laws and liberties of the kingdom, that all illegal grievances and exactions be presented and punished at the sessions and assizes.

196. And that Judges and Justices be very careful to give this in charge to the grand jury, and both the Sheriff and Justices to be sworn to the due execution of the Petition of Right and other laws.

197. That His Majesty be humbly petitioned by both Houses to employ such counsellors, ambassadors and other ministers, in managing his business at home and abroad as the Parliament may have cause to confide in, without which we cannot give His Majesty such supplies for support of his own estate, nor such assistance to the Protestant party beyond the sea, as is desired.

198. It may often fall out that the Commons may have just cause to take exceptions at some men for being councillors, and yet not charge those men with crimes, for there be grounds of diffidence which lie not in proof.

199. There are others, which though they may be proved, yet are not legally criminal.

200. To be a known favourer of Papists, or to have been very forward in defending or countenancing some great offenders questioned in Parliament; or to speak contemptuously of either Houses of Parliament or Parliamentary proceedings.

201. Or such as are factors or agents for any foreign prince of another religion; such are justly suspected to get councillors' places, or any other of trust concerning public employment for money; for all these and divers others we may have great reason to be earnest with His Majesty, not to put his great affairs into such hands, though we may be unwilling to proceed against them in any legal way of charge or impeachment.

202. That all Councillors of State may be sworn to observe those laws which concern the subject in his liberty, that they may likewise take an oath not to receive or give reward or pension from any foreign prince, but such as they shall within some reasonable time discover to the Lords of His Majesty's Council.

203. And although they should wickedly forswear themselves, yet it may herein do good to make them known to be false and perjured to those who employ them, and thereby bring them into as little credit with them as with us.

204. That His Majesty may have cause to be in love with good counsel and good men, by shewing him in a humble and dutiful manner how full of advantage it would be to himself, to see his own estate settled in a plentiful condition to support his honour; to see his people united in ways of duty to him, and endeavours of the public good; to see happiness, wealth, peace and safety derived to his own kingdom, and procured to his allies by the influence of his own power and government."

A. D. 1642 (January).—The King's attempt against the Five Members.—On the 3d of January, "the king was betrayed into . . . an indiscretion to which all the ensuing disorders and civil wars ought immediately and directly to be ascribed. This was the impeachment of Lord Kimbolton and the five members. . . . Herbert, attorney-general, appeared in the House of Peers, and, in his majesty's name, entered an accusation of high treason against Lord Kimbolton and five commoners, Hollis, Sir Arthur Hazlerig,

Hambden, Pym, and Strode. The articles were, That they had traitorously endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws and government of the kingdom, to deprive the king of his regal power, and to impose on his subjects an arbitrary and tyrannical authority; that they had endeavoured, by many foul aspersions on his majesty and his government, to alienate the affections of his people, and make him odious to them; that they had attempted to draw his late army to disobedience of his royal commands, and to side with them in their traitorous designs; that they had invited and encouraged a foreign power to invade the kingdom; that they had aimed at subverting the rights and very being of Parliament; that, in order to complete their traitorous designs, they had endeavoured, as far as in them lay, by force and terror, to compel the Parliament to join with them, and to that end had actually raised and countenanced tumults against the king and Parliament; and that they had traitorously conspired to levy, and actually had levied, war against the king. The whole world stood amazed at this important accusation, so suddenly entered upon, without concert, deliberation or reflection. . . . But men had not leisure to wonder at the indiscretion of this measure: their astonishment was excited by new attempts, still more precipitate and imprudent. A sergeant at arms, in the king's name, demanded of the House the five members, and was sent back without any positive answer. Messengers were employed to search for them and arrest them. Their trunks, chambers, and studies, were sealed and locked. The House voted all these acts of violence to be breaches of privilege, and commanded every one to defend the liberty of the members. The king, irritated by all this opposition, resolved next day to come in person to the House, with an intention to demand, perhaps seize, in their presence, the persons whom he had accused. This resolution was discovered to the Countess of Carlisle, sister to Northumberland, a lady of spirit, wit, and intrigue. She privately sent intelligence to the five members; and they had time to withdraw, a moment before the king entered. He was accompanied by his ordinary retinue, to the number of above two hundred, armed as usual, some with halberds, some with walking swords. The king left them at the door, and he himself advanced alone through the hall, while all the members rose to receive him. The speaker withdrew from his chair, and the king took possession of it. The speech which he made was as follows: 'Gentlemen, I am sorry for this occasion of coming to you. Yesterday, I sent a sergeant at arms, to demand some, who, by my order, were accused of high treason. Instead of obedience, I received a message. . . . Therefore am I come to tell you, that I must have these men wheresoever I can find them. Well, since I see all the birds are flown, I do expect that you will send them to me as soon as they return. But I assure you, on the word of a king, I never did intend any force, but shall proceed against them in a fair and legal way, for I never meant any other.' . . . When the king was looking around for the accused members, he asked the speaker, who stood below, whether any of these persons were in the House? The speaker, falling on his knee, prudently replied: 'I have, sir, neither eyes to see, nor tongue to speak, in this place, but as the House is pleased to direct me, whose servant I

am. And I humbly ask pardon, that I cannot give any other answer to what your majesty is pleased to demand of me.' The Commons were in the utmost disorder; and when the king was departing, some members cried aloud so as he might hear them, Privilege! Privilege! and the House immediately adjourned till next day. That evening, the accused members, to show the greater apprehension, removed into the city, which was their fortress. The citizens were the whole night in arms. . . . When the House of Commons met, they affected the greatest dismay; and adjourning themselves for some days, ordered a committee to sit in Merchant-Tailors' hall in the city. . . . The House again met, and after confirming the votes of their committee, instantly adjourned, as if exposed to the most imminent perils from the violence of their enemies. This practice they continued for some time. When the people, by these affected panics, were wrought up to a sufficient degree of rage and terror, it was thought proper, that the accused members should, with a triumphant and military procession, take their seats in the House. The river was covered with boats, and other vessels, laden with small pieces of ordnance, and prepared for fight. Skippon, whom the Parliament had appointed, by their own authority, major-general of the city militia, conducted the members, at the head of this tumultuary army, to Westminster-hall. And when the populace, by land and by water, passed Whitehall, they still asked, with insulting shouts, What has become of the king and his cavaliers? And whither are they fled? The king, apprehensive of danger from the enraged multitude, had retired to Hampton-court, deserted by all the world, and overwhelmed with grief, shame, and remorse for the fatal measures into which he had been hurried."—D. Hume, *Hist. of England*, v. 5, ch. 55, pp. 85-91.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*, ch. 6, sect. 5.—The same, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1603-1642, ch. 103 (v. 10).—J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Pym; Hampden*.—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, 17th Cent., bk. 8, ch. 10 (v. 2).

A. D. 1642 (January–August).—Preparations for war.—The marshalling of forces.—The raising of the King's standard.—"January 10th. The King with his Court quits Whitehall; the Five Members and Parliament proposing to return tomorrow, with the whole City in arms round them. He left Whitehall; never saw it again till he came to lay down his head there. March 9th. The King has sent away his Queen from Dover, 'to be in a place of safety,'—and also to pawn the Crown-jewels in Holland, and get him arms. He returns Northward again, avoiding London. Many messages between the Houses of Parliament and him: 'Will your Majesty grant us Power of the Militia; accept this list of Lord-Lieutenants?' On the 9th of March, still advancing Northward without affirmative response, he has got to Newmarket; where another Message overtakes him, earnestly urges itself upon him: 'Could not your Majesty please to grant us Power of the Militia for a limited time?' 'No, by God!' answers his Majesty, 'not for an hour.'—On the 19th of March he is at York; where his Hull Magazine, gathered for service against the Scots, is lying near; where a great Earl of Newcastle, and other Northern potentates, will help him; where at least London

and its Puritanism, now grown so fierce, is far off. There we will leave him; attempting Hull Magazine, in vain; exchanging messages with his Parliament; messages, missives, printed and written Papers without limit: Law-pleadings of both parties before the great tribunal of the English Nation, each party striving to prove itself right and within the verge of Law: preserved still in acres of typography, once thrillingly alive in every fibre of them; now a mere torpor, readable by few creatures, not memorable by any."—T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, pt. 2, preliminary.—"As early as June 2 a ship had arrived on the North-English coast, bringing the King arms and ammunition from Holland, purchased by the sale of the crown-jewels which the Queen had taken abroad. On the 22d of the same month more than forty of the nobles and others in attendance on the King at York had put down their names for the numbers of armed horse they would furnish respectively for his service. Requisitions in the King's name were also out for supplies of money; and the two Universities, and the Colleges in each, were invited to send in their plate. On the other hand, the Parliament had not been more negligent. There had been contributions or promises from all the chief Parliamentary nobles and others; there was a large loan from the city; and hundreds of thousands, on a smaller scale, were willing to subscribe. And already, through all the shires, the two opposed powers were grappling and jostling with each other in raising levies. On the King's side there were what were called Commissions of Array, or powers granted to certain nobles and others by name to raise troops for the King. On the side of Parliament, in addition to the Volunteering which had been going on in many places (as, for example, in Cambridgeshire, where Oliver Cromwell was forming a troop of Volunteer horse . . .), there was the Militia Ordinance available wherever the persons named in that ordinance were really zealous for Parliament, and able to act personally in the districts assigned them. And so on the 12th of July the Parliament had passed the necessary vote for supplying an army, and had appointed the Earl of Essex to be its commander-in-chief, and the Earl of Bedford to be its second in command as general of horse. It was known, on the other side, that the Earl of Lindsey, in consideration of his past experience of service both on sea and land, was to have the command of the King's army, and that his master of horse was to be the King's nephew, young Prince Rupert, who was expected from the Continent on purpose. Despite all these preparations, however, it was probably not till August had begun that the certainty of Civil War was universally acknowledged. It was on the 9th of that month that the King issued his proclamation 'for suppressing the present Rebellion under the command of Robert, Earl of Essex,' offering pardon to him and others if within six days they made their submission. The Parliamentary answer to this was on the 11th; on which day the Commons resolved, each man separately rising in his place and giving his word, that they would stand by the Earl of Essex with their lives and fortunes to the end. Still, even after that, there were trembling souls here and there who hoped for a reconciliation. Monday the 22d of August put an end to all such fluttering:

—On that day, the King, who had meanwhile left York, and come about a hundred miles farther south, into the very heart of England, . . . made a backward movement as far as the town of Nottingham, where preparations had been made for the great scene that was to follow. . . . This consisted in bringing out the royal standard and setting it up in due form. It was about six o'clock in the evening when it was done. . . . A herald read a proclamation, declaring the cause why the standard had been set up, and summoning all the lieges to assist his Majesty. Those who were present cheered and threw up their hats, and, with a beating of drums and a sounding of trumpets, the ceremony ended. . . . From that evening of the 22d of August, 1642, the Civil War had begun."—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton*, bk. 2, ch. 8 (p. 2).

ALSO IN: John Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Pym; Hampden*.—S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1603-1642, ch. 104-105 (p. 10).

A. D. 1642 (August-September).—The nation choosing sides.—"In wealth, in numbers, and in cohesion the Parliament was stronger than the king. To him there had rallied most of the greater nobles, many of the lesser gentry, some proportion of the richer citizens, the townsmen of the west, and the rural population generally of the west and north of England. For the Parliament stood a strong section of the peers and greater gentry, the great bulk of the lesser gentry, the townsmen of the richer parts of England, the whole eastern and home counties, and lastly, the city of London. But as the Civil War did not sharply divide classes, so neither did it geographically bisect England. Roughly speaking, aristocracy and peasantry, the Church, universities, the world of culture, fashion, and pleasure were loyal: the gentry, the yeomanry, trade, commerce, morality, and law inclined to the Parliament. Broadly divided, the north and west went for the king; the south and east for the Houses; but the lines of demarcation were never exact: cities, castles, and manor-houses long held out in an enemy's county. There is only one permanent limitation. Draw a line from the Wash to the Solent. East of that line the country never yielded to the king; from first to last it never failed the Parliament. Within it are enclosed Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Bedford, Bucks, Herts, Middlesex, Surrey, Kent, Sussex. This was the wealthiest, the most populous, and the most advanced portion of England. With Gloucester, Reading, Bristol, Leicester, and Northampton, it formed the natural home of Puritanism."—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 4.

A. D. 1642 (October-December).—Edgehill—the opening battle of the war.—The Eastern Association.—Immediately after the raising of his standard at Nottingham, the King, "aware at last that he could not rely on the inhabitants of Yorkshire, moved to Shrewsbury, at once to collect the Catholic gentry of Lancashire and Cheshire, to receive the Royalist levies of Wales, and to secure the valley of the Severn. The movement was successful. In a few days his little army was increased fourfold, and he felt himself strong enough to make a direct march towards the capital. Essex had garrisoned Northampton, Coventry and Warwick, and lay himself at Worcester; but the King, waiting for no sieges, left the garrisoned towns unmolested

and passed on towards London, and Essex received peremptory orders to pursue and interpose if possible between the King and London. On the 22nd of October he was close upon the King's rear at Keynton, between Stratford and Banbury. But his army was by no means at its full strength; some regiments had been left to garrison the West, others, under Hampden had not yet joined him. But delay was impossible, and the first battle of the war was fought on the plain at the foot of the north-west slope of Edgehill, over which the royal army descended, turning back on its course to meet Essex. Both parties claimed the victory. In fact it was with the King. The Parliamentary cavalry found themselves wholly unable to withstand the charge of Rupert's cavaliers. Whole regiments turned and fled without striking a blow; but, as usual, want of discipline ruined the royal cause. Rupert's men fell to plundering the Parliamentary baggage, and returned to the field only in time to find that the infantry, under the personal leading of Essex, had reestablished the fight. Night closed the battle [which is sometimes named from Edgehill and sometimes from Keynton]. The King's army withdrew to the vantage-ground of the hills, and Essex, reinforced by Hampden, passed the night upon the field. But the Royalist army was neither beaten nor checked in its advance, while the rottenness of the Parliamentary troops had been disclosed." Some attempts at peace-making followed this doubtful first collision; but their only effect was to embitter the passions on both sides. The King advanced, threatening London, but the citizens of the capital turned out valiantly to oppose him, and he "fell back upon Oxford, which henceforward became the centre of their operations. . . . War was again the only resource, and speedily became universal. . . . There was local fighting over the whole of England. . . . The headquarters of the King were constantly at Oxford, from which, as from a centre, Rupert would suddenly make rapid raids, now in one direction, now in another. Between him and London, about Reading, Aylesbury, and Thame, lay what may be spoken of as the main army of Parliament, under the command of Lord-General Essex. . . . The other two chief scenes of the war were Yorkshire and the West. In Yorkshire the Fairfaxes, Ferdinando Lord Fairfax and his son Sir Thomas, made what head they could against what was known as the Popish army under the command of the Earl, subsequently Marquis of Newcastle, which consisted mainly of the troops of the Northern counties, which had become associated under Newcastle in favour of Charles. Newark, in Nottinghamshire, was early made a royal garrison, and formed the link of connection between the operations in Yorkshire and at Oxford. In the extreme South-west, Lord Stamford, the Parliamentary General, was making a somewhat unsuccessful resistance against Sir Ralph, afterwards Lord Hopton. Wales was wholly Royalist, and one of the chief objects of Charles's generals was to secure the Severn valley, and thus connect the war in Devonshire with the central operations at Oxford. In the Eastern counties matters assumed rather a different form. The principle of forming several counties into an association . . . was adopted by the Parliament, and several such associations were formed, but none of these came to much except that of the

Eastern counties, which was known by way of preeminence as 'The Association.' Its object was to keep the war entirely beyond the borders of the counties of which it consisted. The reason of its success was the genius and energy of Cromwell."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period 2, p. 659*.—"This winter there arise among certain Counties 'Associations' for mutual defence, against Royalism and plunderous Rupertism; a measure cherished by the Parliament, condemned as treasonable by the King. Of which 'Associations,' countable to the number of five or six, we name only one, that of Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Cambridge, Herts; with Lord Gray of Wark for Commander; where and under whom Oliver was now serving. This 'Eastern Association' is alone worth naming. All the other Associations, no man of emphasis being in the midst of them, fell in a few months to pieces; only this of Cromwell subsisted, enlarged itself, grew famous;—and kept its own borders clear of invasion during the whole course of the War."—T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, pt. 2, preliminary*.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Great Civil War, ch. 2-4 (v. 1)*.—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth, ch. 2 (v. 1)*.

A. D. 1643 (May).—Cromwell's Ironsides.—"It was . . . probably, a little before Edgehill, that there took place between Cromwell and Hampden the memorable conversation which fifteen years afterwards the Protector related in a speech to his second Parliament. It is a piece of autobiography so instructive and pathetic that it must be set forth in full in the words of Cromwell himself:—"I was a person who, from my first employment, was suddenly preferred and lifted up from lesser trusts to greater; from my first being Captain of a Troop of Horse. . . . I had a very worthy friend then; and he was a very noble person, and I know his memory was very grateful to all,—Mr. John Hampden. At my first going out into this engagement, I saw our men were beaten at every hand. . . . Your troops, said I, are most of them old decayed serving-men, and tapsters, and such kind of fellows; and, said I, their troops are gentlemen's sons, younger sons and persons of quality: do you think that the spirits of such base mean fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen, that have honour and courage and resolution in them? Truly I did represent to him in this manner conscientiously; and truly I did tell him: You must get men of a spirit: and take it not ill what I say,—I know you will not,—of a spirit that is likely to go on as far as gentlemen will go: or else you will be beaten still. I told him so; I did truly. He was a wise and worthy person; and he did think that I talked a good notion, but an impracticable one. . . . I raised such men as had the fear of God before them, as made some conscience of what they did; and from that day forward, I must say to you, they were never beaten, and wherever they were engaged against the enemy they beat continually. . . . The issue of the whole war lay in that word. It lay with 'such men as had some conscience in what they did.' 'From that day forward they were never beaten.' . . . 'As for Colonel Cromwell,' writes a news-letter of May, 1643, 'he hath 2,000 brave men, well disciplined; no man swears but he pays his twelve-pence; if he be drunk, he is set in the stocks, or worse; if one calls the other round-

head he is cashiered: insomuch that the countries where they come leap for joy of them, and come in and join with them. How happy were it if all the forces were thus disciplined!' These were the men who ultimately decided the war, and established the Commonwealth. On the field of Marston, Rupert gave Cromwell the name of Ironside, and from thence this famous name passed to his troopers. There are two features in their history which we need to note. They were indeed 'such men as had some conscience in their work'; but they were also much more. They were disciplined and trained soldiers. They were the only body of 'regulars' on either side. The instinctive genius of Cromwell from the very first created the strong nucleus of a regular army, which at last in discipline, in skill, in valour, reached the highest perfection ever attained by soldiers either in ancient or modern times. The fervour of Cromwell is continually pressing towards the extension of this 'regular' force. Through all the early disasters, this body of Ironsides kept the cause alive: at Marston it overwhelmed the king: as soon as, by the New Model, this system was extended to the whole army, the Civil War was at an end."—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell, ch. 4*.

ALSO IN: J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Cromwell*.

A. D. 1643 (June—September).—The King calls in the Irish.—"To balance the accession of power which the alliance with Scotland brought to the Parliament, Charles was so unwise, men then said so guilty, as to conclude a peace with the Irish rebels, with the intent that thus those of his forces which had been employed against them, might be set free to join his army in England. No act of the King, not the levying of ship-money, not the crowd of monopolies which enriched the court and impoverished the people, neither the extravagance of Buckingham, the tyranny of Strafford nor the prebacy of Laud, not even the attempted arrest of the five members, raised such a storm of indignation and hatred throughout the kingdom, as did this determination of the King to withdraw (as men said), for the purpose of subduing his subjects, the force which had been raised to avenge the blood of 100,000 Protestant martyrs. . . . To the England of the time this act was nauseous, was exasperating to the highest degree, while to the cause of the King it was fatal; for, from this moment, the condition of the Parliamentary party began to mend."—N. L. Walford, *Parliamentary Generals of the Great Civil War, ch. 2*.—"None of the king's schemes proved so fatal to his cause as these. On their discovery, officer after officer in his own army flung down their commissions, the peers who had fled to Oxford fled back again to London, and the Royalist reaction in the Parliament itself came utterly to an end."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of Eng., ch. 8, sect. 7*.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Great Civil War, ch. 11 (v. 1)*.

A. D. 1643 (July).—Meeting of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.—At the beginning of July, 1643, "London was astir with a new event of great consequence in the course of the national revolution. This was the meeting of the famous Westminster Assembly. The necessity of an ecclesiastical Synod or Convocation, to cooperate with the Parliament, had been long

felt. Among the articles of the Grand Remonstrance of Dec. 1641 had been one desiring a convention of 'a General Synod of the most grave, pious, learned, and judicious divines of this island, assisted by some from foreign parts,' to consider of all things relating to the Church and report thereon to Parliament. It is clear from the wording of this article that it was contemplated that the Synod should contain representatives from the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Indeed, by that time, the establishment of a uniformity of Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship between the Churches of England and Scotland was the fixed idea of those who chiefly desired a Synod. . . . In April, 1642 . . . it was ordered by the House, in pursuance of previous resolutions on the subject, 'that the names of such divines as shall be thought fit to be consulted with concerning the matter of the Church be brought in tomorrow morning,' the understood rule being that the knights and burgesses of each English county should name to the House two divines, and those of each Welsh county one divine, for approval. Accordingly, on the 20th, the names were given in. . . . By the stress of the war the Assembly was postponed. At last, hopeless of a bill that should pass in the regular way by the King's consent, the Houses resorted, in this as in other things, to their peremptory plan of Ordinance by their own authority. On the 13th of May, 1643, an Ordinance for calling an Assembly was introduced in the Commons; which Ordinance, after due going and coming between the two Houses, came to maturity June 12, when it was entered at full length in the Lords' Journals. 'Whereas, amongst the infinite blessings of Almighty God upon this nation,'—so runs the preamble of the Ordinance,—'none is, or can be, more dear to us than the purity of our religion; and for as much as many things yet remain in the discipline, liturgy and government of the Church which necessarily require a more perfect reformation: and whereas it has been declared and resolved, by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that the present Church Government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical officers depending on the hierarchy, is evil and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, and a great impediment to reformation and growth of religion, and very prejudicial to the state and government of this kingdom, and that therefore they are resolved the same shall be taken away, and that such a government shall be settled in the Church as may be agreeable to God's Holy Word, and most apt to procure and preserve the peace of the Church at home, and nearer agreement with the Church of Scotland, and other reformed Churches abroad. . . . Be it therefore ordained, &c.' What is ordained is that 149 persons, enumerated by name in the Ordinance . . . shall meet on the 1st of July next in King Henry VII.'s Chapel at Westminster; . . . 'to confer and treat among themselves of such matters and things, concerning the liturgy, discipline and government of the Church of England . . . as shall be proposed by either or both Houses of Parliament, and no other.' . . . Notwithstanding a Royal Proclamation from Oxford, dated June 22, forbidding the Assembly and threatening consequences, the first meeting duly took place on the day appointed—Saturday, July 1,

1643; and from that day till the 22d of February, 1648-9, or for more than five years and a half, the Westminster Assembly is to be borne in mind as a power or institution in the English realm, existing side by side with the Long Parliament, and in constant conference and cooperation with it. The number of its sittings during these five years and a half was 1,163 in all; which is at the rate of about four sittings every week for the whole time. The earliest years of the Assembly were the most important."—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton*, bk. 3, ch. 3 (p. 2).

ALSO IN: A. F. Mitchell, *The Westminster Assembly*, lect. 4-5.—D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 3, ch. 2 and 4.—See, also, INDEPENDENTS.

A. D. 1643 (July—September).—The Solemn League and Covenant with the Scottish nation.—"Scotland had been hitherto kept aloof from the English quarrel. . . . Up to this time the pride and delicacy of the English patriots withheld them, for obvious reasons, from claiming her assistance. Had it been possible, they would still have desired to engage no distant party in this great domestic struggle; but when the present unexpected crisis arrived . . . these considerations were laid aside, and the chief leaders of the Parliament resolved upon an embassy to the North, to bring the Scottish nation into the field. The conduct of this embassy was a matter of the highest difficulty and danger. The Scots were known to be bigoted to their own persuasions of narrow and exclusive church government, while the greatest men of the English Parliament had proclaimed the sacred maxim that every man who worshipped God according to the dictates of his conscience was entitled to the protection of the State. But these men, Vane, Cromwell, Marten and St. John, though the difficulties of the common cause had brought them into the acknowledged position of leaders and directors of affairs, were in a minority in the House of Commons, and the party who were their superiors in numbers were as bigoted to the most exclusive principles of Presbyterianism as the Scots themselves. Denzil Holles stood at the head of this inferior class of patriots. . . . The most eminent of the Parliamentary nobility, particularly Northumberland, Essex and Manchester belonged also to this body; while the London clergy, and the metropolis itself, were almost entirely Presbyterian. These things considered, there was indeed great reason to apprehend that this party, backed by the Scots, and supported with a Scottish army, would be strong enough to overpower the advocates of free conscience, and 'set up a tyranny not less to be deplored than that of Laud and his hierarchy, which had proved one of the main occasions of bringing on the war.' Yet, opposing to all this danger only their own high purposes and dauntless courage, the smaller party of more consummate statesmen were the first to propose the embassy to Scotland. . . . On the 20th of July, 1643, the commissioners set out from London. They were four; and the man principally confided in among them was Vane [Sir Henry, the younger]. He, indeed, was the individual best qualified to succeed Hampden as a counsellor in the arduous struggle in which the nation was at this time engaged. . . . Immediately on his arrival in Edinburgh the negotiation commenced, and what Vane seems to have anticipated at once occurred. The Scots offered their assistance heartily on the sole condition of

an adhesion to the Scottish religious system on the part of England. After many long and very warm debates, in which Vane held to one firm policy from the first, a solemn covenant was proposed, which Vane insisted should be named a solemn league and covenant, while certain words were inserted in it on his subsequent motion, to which he also adhered with immovable constancy, and which had the effect of leaving open to the great party in England, to whose interests he was devoted, that last liberty of conscience which man should never surrender. . . . The famous article respecting religion ran in these words: 'That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the Reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, according to the Word of God, and the example of the best Reformed churches; and we shall endeavour to bring the churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confessing of faith, form of church government directory for worship and catechizing; that we and our posterity after us, may as brethren live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us. That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of popery, prelacy (that is, church government by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors and commissaries, deans, deans and chapters, archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy).' Vane, by this introduction of 'according to the Word of God,' left the interpretation of that word to the free conscience of every man. On the 17th of August, the solemn league and covenant was voted by the Legislature and the Assembly of the Church at Edinburgh. The king in desperate alarm, sent his commands to the Scotch people not to take such a covenant. In reply, they 'humbly advised his majesty to take the covenant himself.' The surpassing service rendered by Vane on this great occasion to the Parliamentary cause, exposed him to a more violent hatred from the Royalists than he had yet experienced, and Clarendon has used every artifice to depreciate his motives and his sincerity. . . . The solemn league and covenant remained to be adopted in England. The Scottish form of giving it authority was followed as far as possible. It was referred by the two Houses to the Assembly of Divines, which had commenced its sittings on the 1st of the preceding July, being called together to be consulted with by the Parliament for the purpose of settling the government and form of worship of the Church of England. This assembly already referred to, consisted of 121 of the clergy; and a number of lay assessors were joined with them, consisting of ten peers, and twenty members of the House of Commons. All these persons were named by the ordinance of the two Houses of Parliament which gave birth to the assembly. The public taking of the Covenant was solemnized on the 25th of September, each member of either House attesting his adherence by oath first, and then by subscribing his name. The name of Vane, subscribed immediately on his return, appears upon the list next to that of

Cromwell."—J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Vane*.

ALSO IN: J. K. Hosmer, *Life of Young Sir Henry Vane*, ch. 8.—A. F. Mitchell, *The Westminster Assembly*, lect. 5-6.—D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 3, ch. 2.—S. R. Gardiner, *Const. Doc's of the Puritan Rev.*, p. 187.

The following is the text of the Solemn League and Covenant:

"A solemn league and covenant for Reformation and defence of religion, the honour and happiness of the King, and the peace and safety of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland. We noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the Gospel, and commons of all sorts in the kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, by the providence of God living under one King, and being of one reformed religion; having before our eyes the glory of God, and the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the honour and happiness of the King's Majesty and his posterity, and the true public liberty, safety and peace of the kingdoms, wherein every one's private condition is included; and calling to mind the treacherous and bloody plots, conspiracies, attempts and practices of the enemies of God against the true religion and professors thereof in all places, especially in these three kingdoms, ever since the reformation of religion; and how much their rage, power and presumption are of late, and at this time increased and exercised, whereof the deplorable estate of the Church and kingdom of Ireland, the distressed estate of the Church and kingdom of England, and the dangerous estate of the Church and kingdom of Scotland, are present and public testimonies; we have (now at last) after other means of supplication, remonstrance, protestations and sufferings, for the preservation of ourselves and our religion from utter ruin and destruction, according to the commendable practice of these kingdoms in former times, and the example of God's people in other nations, after mature deliberation, resolved and determined to enter into a mutual and solemn league and covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the most high God, do swear, I. That we shall sincerely, really and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour in our several places and callings, the preservation of the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, against our common enemies; the reformation of religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrine, worship, discipline and government, according to the Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches; and we shall endeavour to bring the Churches of God in the three kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of Church government, directory for worship and catechising, that we, and our posterity after us, may, as brethren, live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us. II. That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of Popery, prelacy (that is, Church government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical officers depending on that hierarchy), superstition, heresy, schism, profaneness and whatsoever shall be found to be

contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness lest we partake in other men's sins, and thereby be in danger to receive of their plagues; and that the Lord may be one, and His name one in the three kingdoms. III. We shall with the same sincerity, reality and constancy, in our several vocations, endeavour with our estates and lives mutually to preserve the rights and privileges of the Parliaments, and the liberties of the kingdoms, and to preserve and defend the King's Majesty's person and authority, in the preservation and defence of the true religion and liberties of the kingdoms, that the world may bear witness with our consciences of our loyalty, and that we have no thoughts or intentions to diminish His Majesty's just power and greatness. IV. We shall also with all faithfulness endeavour the discovery of all such as have been or shall be incendiaries, malignants or evil instruments, by hindering the reformation of religion, dividing the King from his people, or one of the kingdoms from another, or making any faction or parties amongst the people, contrary to the league and covenant, that they may be brought to public trial and receive condign punishment, as the degree of their offences shall require or deserve, or the supreme judicatories of both kingdoms respectively, or others having power from them for that effect, shall judge convenient. V. And whereas the happiness of a blessed peace between these kingdoms, denied in former times to our progenitors, is by the good providence of God granted to us, and hath been lately concluded and settled by both Parliaments: we shall each one of us, according to our places and interest, endeavour that they may remain conjoined in a firm peace and union to all posterity, and that justice may be done upon the wilful opposers thereof, in manner expressed in the precedent articles. VI. We shall also, according to our places and callings, in this common cause of religion, liberty and peace of the kingdom, assist and defend all those that enter into this league and covenant, in the maintaining and pursuing thereof; and shall not suffer ourselves, directly or indirectly, by whatsoever combination, persuasion or terror, to be divided and withdrawn from this blessed union and conjunction, whether to make defection to the contrary part, or give ourselves to a detestable indifferency or neutrality in this cause, which so much concerneth the glory of God, the good of the kingdoms, and the honour of the King; but shall all the days of our lives zealously and constantly continue therein, against all opposition, and promote the same according to our power, against all lets and impediments whatsoever; and what we are not able ourselves to suppress or overcome we shall reveal and make known, that it may be timely prevented or removed: all which we shall do as in the sight of God. And because these kingdoms are guilty of many sins and provocations against God, and His Son Jesus Christ, as is too manifest by our present distresses and dangers, the fruits thereof: we profess and declare, before God and the world, our unfeigned desire to be humbled for our own sins, and for the sins of these kingdoms; especially that we have not as we ought valued the inestimable benefit of the Gospel; that we have not laboured for the purity and power thereof; and that we have not endeavoured to receive Christ in our hearts, nor to walk worthy of Him in our lives, which are the causes of other sins and trans-

gressions so much abounding amongst us, and our true and unfeigned purpose, desire and endeavour, for ourselves and all others under our power and charge, both in public and in private, in all duties we owe to God and man, to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation, that the Lord may turn away His wrath and heavy indignation, and establish these Churches and kingdoms in truth and peace. And this covenant we make in the presence of Almighty God, the Searcher of all hearts, with a true intention to perform the same, as we shall answer at that Great Day when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed: most humbly beseeching the Lord to strengthen us by His Holy Spirit for this end, and to bless our desires and proceedings with such success as may be a deliverance and safety to His people, and encouragement to the Christian Churches groaning under or in danger of the yoke of Antichristian tyranny, to join in the same or like association and covenant, to the glory of God, the enlargement of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the peace and tranquillity of Christian kingdoms and commonwealths."

A. D. 1643 (August—September).—*Siege of Gloucester and first Battle of Newbury.*—"When the war had lasted a year, the advantage was decidedly with the Royalists. They were victorious, both in the western and in the northern counties. They had wrested Bristol, the second city in the kingdom, from the Parliament. They had won several battles, and had not sustained a single serious or ignominious defeat. Among the Roundheads, adversity had begun to produce dissension and discontent. The Parliament was kept in alarm, sometimes by plots and sometimes by riots. It was thought necessary to fortify London against the royal army, and to hang some disaffected citizens at their own doors. Several of the most distinguished peers who had hitherto remained at Westminster fled to the court at Oxford; nor can it be doubted that, if the operations of the Cavaliers had, at this season, been directed by a sagacious and powerful mind, Charles would soon have marched in triumph to Whitehall. But the King suffered the auspicious moment to pass away; and it never returned. In August, 1643, he sat down before the city of Gloucester. That city was defended by the inhabitants and by the garrison, with a determination such as had not, since the commencement of the war, been shown by the adherents of the Parliament. The emulation of London was excited. The trainbands of the City volunteered to march wherever their services might be required. A great force was speedily collected, and began to move westward. The siege of Gloucester was raised. The Royalists in every part of the kingdom were disheartened; the spirit of the parliamentary party revived; and the apostate Lords, who had lately fled from Westminster to Oxford, hastened back from Oxford to Westminster."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 1.—After accomplishing the relief of Gloucester, the Parliamentary army, marching back to London, was intercepted at Newbury by the army of the king, and forced to fight a battle, Sept. 20, 1643, in which both parties, as at Edgehill, claimed the victory. The Royalists, however, failed to bar the road to London, as they had undertaken to do, and Essex resumed his march on the following morning.

—"In this unhappy battle was slain the lord viscount Falkland; a person of such prodigious parts of learning and knowledge, of that inimitable sweetness and delight in conversation, of so flowing and obliging a humanity and goodness to mankind, and of that primitive sincerity and integrity of life, that if there were no other brand upon this odious and accursed war than that single loss, it must be most infamous and execrable to all posterity."—Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. 7, sect. 217.—This lamented death on the royal side nearly evened, so to speak, the great, unmeasured calamity which had befallen the better cause three months before, when the high-souled patriot Hampden was slain in a paltry skirmish with Rupert's horse, at Chalgrove Field, not far from the borders of Oxfordshire. Soon after the fight at Newbury, Charles, having occupied Reading, withdrew his army to Oxford and went into winter quarters.—N. L. Walford, *Parliamentary Generals of the Great Civil War*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: Sir E. Cust, *Lives of the Warriors of the Civil Wars*, pt. 2.—S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Great Civil War*, ch. 10 (v. 1).

A. D. 1644 (January).—Battle of Nantwich and siege of Lathom House.—The Irish army brought over by King Charles and landed in Flintshire, in November, 1643, under the command of Lord Byron, invaded Cheshire and laid siege to Nantwich, which was the headquarters of the Parliamentary cause in that region. Young Sir Thomas Fairfax was ordered to collect forces and relieve the town. With great difficulty he succeeded, near the end of January, 1644, in leading 2,500 foot-soldiers and twenty-eight troops of horse, against the besieging army, which numbered 3,000 foot and 1,800 horse. On the 28th of January he attacked and routed the Irish royalists completely. "All the Royalist Colonels, including the subsequently notorious Monk, 1,500 soldiers, six pieces of ordnance, and quantities of arms, were captured." Having accomplished this most important service, Sir Thomas, "to his great annoyance," received orders to lay siege to Lathom House, one of the country seats of the Earl of Derby, which had been fortified and secretly garrisoned, with 300 soldiers. It was held by the high-spirited and dauntless Countess of Derby, in the absence of her husband, who was in the Isle of Man. Sir Thomas Fairfax soon escaped from this ignoble enterprise and left it to be carried on, first, by his cousin, Sir William Fairfax, and afterwards by Col. Rigby. The Countess defended her house for three months, until the approach of Prince Rupert forced the raising of the siege in the following spring. Lathom House was not finally surrendered to the Roundheads until Dec. 6, 1645, when it was demolished.—C. R. Markham, *Life of the Great Lord Fairfax*, ch. 13.

ALSO IN: Mrs. Thompson, *Recollections of Literary Characters and Celebrated Places*, v. 2, ch. 2.—E. Warburton, *Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers*, v. 2, ch. 4.

A. D. 1644 (January–July).—The Scots in England.—The Battle of Marston Moor.—"On the 19th of January, 1644, the Scottish army entered England. Lesley, now earl of Leven, commanded them. . . . In the meantime, the parliament at Westminster formed a council under the title of 'The Committee of

the Two Kingdoms,' consisting of seven Lords, fourteen members of the Commons, and four Scottish Commissioners. Whatever belongs to the executive power as distinguished from the legislative devolved upon this Committee. In the spring of 1644 the parliament had five armies in the field, paid by general or local taxation, and by voluntary contributions. Including the Scottish army there were altogether 56,000 men under arms; the English forces being commanded, as separate armies, by Essex, Waller, Manchester, and Fairfax. Essex and Waller advanced to blockade Oxford. The queen went to Exeter in April, and never saw Charles again. The blockading forces around Oxford had become so strong that resistance appeared to be hopeless. On the night of the 3d of June the king secretly left the city and passed safely between the two hostile armies. There had again been jealousies and disagreements between Essex and Waller. Essex, supported by the council of war, but in opposition to the committee of the two kingdoms, had marched to the west. Waller, meanwhile, went in pursuit of the king into Worcestershire. Charles suddenly returned to Oxford; and then at Copredy Bridge, near Banbury, defeated Waller, who had hastened back to encounter him. Essex was before the walls of Exeter, in which city the queen had given birth to a princess. The king hastened to the west. He was strong enough to meet either of the parliamentary armies thus separated. Meanwhile the combined English and Scottish armies were besieging York. Rupert had just accomplished the relief of Lathom House, which had been defended by the heroic countess of Derby for eighteen weeks, against a detachment of the army of Fairfax. He then marched towards York with 20,000 men. The allied English and Scots retired from Hessey Moor, near York, to Tadcaster. Rupert entered York with 2,000 cavalry. The Earl of Newcastle was in command there. He counselled a prudent delay. The impetuous Rupert said he had the orders of the king for his guidance, and he was resolved to fight. On the 2nd of July, having rested two days in and near York, and enabled the city to be newly provisioned, the royalist army went forth to engage. They met their enemy on Marston Moor. The issue of the encounter would have been more than doubtful, but for Cromwell, who for the first time had headed his Ironsides in a great pitched battle. The right wing of the parliamentary army was scattered. Rupert was chasing and slaying the Scottish cavalry. . . . The charges of Fairfax and Cromwell decided the day. The victory of the parliamentary forces was so complete that the Earl of Newcastle left York, and embarked at Scarborough for the continent. Rupert marched away also, with the wreck of his army, to Chester. Fifteen hundred prisoners, all the artillery, more than 100 banners, remained with the victors; 4,150 bodies lay dead on the plain."—C. Knight, *Crown Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 25.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, pt. 2, letter 8.—B. M. Cordery and J. S. Phillpotts, *King and Commonwealth*, ch. 7.—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*, ch. 12 (v. 1).—E. Warburton, *Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers*, v. 2, ch. 4.

A. D. 1644 (August–September).—Essex's surrender.—The second Battle of Newbury.—

"The great success at Marston, which had given the north to the Parliament, was all undone in the south and west through feebleness and jealousies in the leaders and the wretched policy that directed the war. Detached armies, consisting of a local militia, were aimlessly ordered about by a committee of civilians in London. Disaster followed on disaster. Essex, Waller, and Manchester would neither agree amongst themselves nor obey orders. Essex and Waller had parted before Marston was fought; Manchester had returned from York to protect his own eastern counties. Waller, after his defeat at Copredy, did nothing, and naturally found his army melting away. Essex, perversely advancing into the west, was out-maneuvred by Charles, and ended a campaign of blunders by the surrender of all his infantry [at Fowey, in Cornwall, Sept. 2, 1644]. By September 1644 throughout the whole south-west the Parliament had not an army in the field. But the Committee of the Houses still tolled on with honourable spirit, and at last brought together near Newbury a united army nearly double the strength of the King's. On Sunday, the 29th of October, was fought the second battle of Newbury, as usual in these ill-ordered campaigns, late in the afternoon. An arduous day ended without victory, in spite of the greater numbers of the Parliament's army, though the men fought well, and their officers led them with skill and energy. At night the King was suffered to withdraw his army without loss, and later to carry off his guns and train. The urgent appeals of Cromwell and his officers could not infuse into Manchester energy to win the day, or spirit to pursue the retreating foe."—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: B. M. Cordery and J. S. Phillpotts, *King and Commonwealth*, ch. 7.—S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Great Civil War*, ch. 19 and 21.

A. D. 1644-1645.—The Self-denying Ordinance.—"Cromwell had shown his capacity for organization in the creation of the Ironsides; his military genius had displayed itself at Marston Moor. Newbury first raised him into a political leader. 'Without a more speedy, vigorous and effective prosecution of the war,' he said to the Commons after his quarrel with Manchester, 'casting off all lingering proceedings, like those of soldiers of fortune beyond sea to spin out a war, we shall make the kingdom weary of us, and hate the name of a Parliament.' But under the leaders who at present conducted it a vigorous conduct of the war was hopeless. They were, in Cromwell's plain words, 'afraid to conquer.' They desired not to crush Charles, but to force him back, with as much of his old strength remaining as might be, to the position of a constitutional King. . . . The army, too, as he long ago urged at Edgehill, was not an army to conquer with. Now, as then, he urged that till the whole force was new modeled, and placed under a stricter discipline, 'they must not expect any notable success in anything they went about.' But the first step in such a reorganization must be a change of officers. The army was led and officered by members of the two Houses, and the Self-renouncing [or Self-denying] Ordinance, which was introduced by Cromwell and Vane, declared the tenure of civil or military offices incompatible with a seat in either. In spite of a long and bitter resistance, which was justified at a later time by the political results which fol-

lowed this rupture of the tie which had hitherto bound the army to the Parliament, the drift of public opinion was too strong to be withstood. The passage of the Ordinance brought about the retirement of Essex, Manchester, and Waller; and the new organization of the army went rapidly on under a new commander-in-chief, Sir Thomas Fairfax, the hero of the long contest in Yorkshire, and who had been raised into fame by his victory at Nantwich and his bravery at Marston Moor."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 8, sect. 7.

ALSO IN: W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*, ch. 15 (v. 1).—J. K. Hosmer, *Life of Young Sir Henry Vane*, ch. 11.—J. A. Picton, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 10.—J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Vane*.

A. D. 1645 (January–February).—The attempted Treaty of Uxbridge.—A futile negotiation between the king and Parliament was opened at Uxbridge in January, 1645. "But neither the king nor his advisers entered on it with minds sincerely bent on peace; they, on the one hand, resolute not to swerve from the utmost rigour of a conqueror's terms, without having conquered; and he though more secretly, cherishing illusive hopes of a more triumphant restoration to power than any treaty could be expected to effect. The three leading topics of discussion among the negotiators at Uxbridge were, the church, the militia, and the state of Ireland. Bound by their unhappy covenant, and watched by their Scots colleagues, the English commissioners on the parliament's side demanded the complete establishment of a presbyterian polity, and the substitution of what was called the directory for the Anglican liturgy. Upon this head there was little prospect of a union."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 10, pt. 1.

ALSO IN: Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. 8, sect. 209–252 (v. 3).

A. D. 1645 (January–April).—The New Model of the army.—The passage of the Self-denying Ordinance was followed, or accompanied, by the adoption of the scheme for the so-called New Model of the army. "The New Model was organised as follows: 10 Regiments of Cavalry of 600 men, 6,000; 10 Companies of Dragoons of 100 men, 1,000; 10 Regiments of Infantry of 1,400 men, 14,000: Total, 21,000 men. All officers were to be nominated by Sir Thomas Fairfax, the new General, and (as was insisted upon by the Lords, with the object of excluding the more fanatical Independents) every officer was to sign the covenant within twenty days of his appointment. The cost of this force was estimated at £539,460 per annum, about £1,600,000 of our money. . . . Sir Thomas Fairfax having been appointed Commander-in-Chief by a vote of both Houses on the 1st of April [A. D. 1645], Essex, Manchester and others of the Lords resigned their commissions on the 2nd. . . . The name of Cromwell was of course, with those of other members of the Commons, omitted from the original list of the New Model army; but with a significance which could not have escaped remark, the appointment of lieutenant-general was left vacant, while none doubted by whom that vacancy would be filled."—N. L. Walford, *The Parliamentary Generals of the Great Civil War*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: Sir E. Cust, *Lives of the Warriors of the Civil Wars*, pt. 2: Fairfax.

A. D. 1645 (June).—The Battle of Naseby.—"Early in April, Fairfax with his new army advanced westward to raise the siege of Taunton, which city Goring was besieging. Before that task was completed he received orders to enter on the siege of Oxford. This did not suit his own views or those of the Independents. They had joined their new army upon the implied condition that decisive battles should be fought. It was therefore with great joy that Fairfax received orders to proceed in pursuit of the royal forces, which, having left Worcester, were marching apparently against the Eastern Association, and had just taken Leicester on their way. Before entering on this active service, Fairfax demanded and obtained leave for Cromwell to serve at least for one battle more in the capacity of Lieutenant-General. He came up with the king in the neighbourhood of Harborough. Charles turned back to meet him, and just by the village of Naseby the great battle known by that name was fought. Cromwell had joined the army, amid the rejoicing shouts of the troops, two days before, with the Association horse. Again the victory seems to have been chiefly due to his skill. In detail it is almost a repetition of the battle of Marston Moor."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of England, period 2, p. 675*.—"The old Hamlet of Naseby stands yet, on its old hill-top, very much as it did in Saxon days, on the Northwestern border of Northamptonshire; nearly on a line, and nearly midway, between that Town and Daventry. A peaceable old Hamlet, of perhaps five hundred souls; clay cottages for laborers, but neatly thatched and swept; smith's shop, saddler's shop, beer-shop all in order; forming a kind of square, which leads off, North and South, into two long streets; the old Church with its graves, stands in the centre, the truncated spire finishing itself with a strange old Ball, held up by rods; a 'hollow copper Ball, which came from Boulogne in Henry the Eighth's time,'—which has, like Hudibras's breeches, 'been at the Siege of Bullen.' The ground is upland, moorland, though now growing corn; was not enclosed till the last generation, and is still somewhat bare of wood. It stands nearly in the heart of England; gentle Dulness, taking a turn at etymology, sometimes derives it from 'Navel'; 'Navesby, quasi Navelby, from being, &c.' . . . It was on this high moor-ground, in the centre of England, that King Charles, on the 14th of June, 1645, fought his last Battle; dashed fiercely against the New-Model Army which he had despised till then: and saw himself shivered utterly to ruin thereby. 'Prince Rupert, on the King's right wing, charged up the hill, and carried all before him'; but Lieutenant-General Cromwell charged down hill on the other wing, likewise carrying all before him,—and did not gallop off the field to plunder, he. Cromwell, ordered thither by the Parliament, had arrived from the Association two days before, 'amid shouts from the whole Army': he had the ordering of the Horse this morning. Prince Rupert, on returning from his plunder, finds the King's Infantry a ruin; prepares to charge again with the rallied Cavalry; but the Cavalry too, when it came to the point, 'broke all asunder,'—never to reassemble more. . . . There were taken here a good few 'ladies of quality in carriages';—and above a hundred Irish ladies not of quality, tattered camp-followers 'with long skean-knives about a foot in

length,' which they well knew how to use; upon whom I fear the Ordinance against Papists pressed hard this day. The King's Carriage was also taken, with a Cabinet and many Royal Autographs in it, which when printed made a sad impression against his Majesty,—gave in fact a most melancholy view of the veracity of his Majesty, 'On the word of a King.' All was lost!"—T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, pt. 2, letter 29*.

ALSO IN: Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion, bk. 9, sect. 30-42 (v. 4)*.—E. Warburton, *Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers, v. 3, ch. 1*.

A. D. 1645 (June—December).—Glamorgan's Commissions, and other perfidies of the King disclosed.—"At the battle of Naseby, copies of some letters to the queen, chiefly written about the time of the treaty of Uxbridge, and strangely preserved, fell into the hands of the enemy and were instantly published. No other losses of that fatal day were more injurious to [the king's] cause. . . . He gave her [the queen] power to treat with the English catholics, promising to take away all penal laws against them as soon as God should enable him to do so, in consideration of such powerful assistance as might deserve so great a favour, and enable him to affect it. . . . Suspicions were much aggravated by a second discovery that took place soon afterwards, of a secret treaty between the earl of Glamorgan and the confederate Irish catholics, not merely promising the repeal of the penal laws, but the establishment of their religion in far the greater part of Ireland. The marquis of Ormond, as well as lord Digby, who happened to be at Dublin, loudly exclaimed against Glamorgan's presumption in concluding such a treaty, and committed him to prison on a charge of treason. He produced two commissions from the king, secretly granted without any seal or the knowledge of any minister, containing the fullest powers to treat with the Irish, and promising to fulfil any conditions into which he should enter. The king, informed of this, disavowed Glamorgan. . . . Glamorgan, however, was soon released, and lost no portion of the king's or his family's favour. This transaction has been the subject of much historical controversy. The enemies of Charles, both in his own and later ages, have considered it as a proof of his indifference, at least, to the protestant religion, and of his readiness to accept the assistance of Irish rebels on any conditions. His advocates for a long time denied the authenticity of Glamorgan's commissions. But Dr. Birch demonstrated that they were genuine; and, if his dissertation could have left any doubt, later evidence might be adduced in confirmation."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng., ch. 10 (v. 2)*.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Great Civil War, ch. 39 and 44 (v. 2)*.—T. Carte, *Life of James, Duke of Ormond, bk. 4 (v. 3)*.—J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng., v. 10, ch. 3*.

A. D. 1645 (July—August).—The Clubmen.—"When Fairfax and Cromwell marched into the west [after Naseby fight], they found that in these counties the country-people had begun to assemble in bodies, sometimes 5,000 strong, to resist their oppressors, whether they fought in the name of King or Parliament. They were called clubmen from their arms, and carried banners, with the motto — 'If you offer to plunder

our cattle, Be assured we will give you battle.' The clubmen, however, could not hope to control the movements of the disciplined troops who now appeared against them. After a few fruitless attempts at resistance they dispersed." — B. M. Cordery and J. S. Phillpotts, *King and Commonwealth*, ch. 8. — "The inexpugnable Sir Lewis Dives (a thrasonical person known to the readers of Evelyn), after due battering, was now soon stormed; whereupon, by Letters found on him it became apparent how deeply Royalist this scheme of Clubmen had been: 'Commissions for raising Regiments of Clubmen'; the design to be extended over England at large, 'yea into the Associated Counties': however, it has now come to nothing." — T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, pt. 2, letter 14.

A. D. 1645 (July—September).—The storming of Bridgewater and Bristol. — "The continuance of the civil war for a whole year after the decisive battle of Naseby is a proof of the King's selfishness, and of his utter indifference to the sufferings of the people. All rational hope was gone, and even Rupert advised his uncle to make terms with the Parliament. Yet Charles, while incessantly vacillating as to his plans, persisted in retaining his garrisons, and required his adherents to sacrifice all they possessed in order to prolong a useless struggle for a few months. Bristol, therefore, was to stand a siege, and Charles expected the garrison to hold out, without an object, to the last extremity, entailing misery and ruin on the second commercial city in the kingdom. Rupert was sent to take the command there, and when the army of Sir Thomas Fairfax approached, towards the end of August, he had completed his preparations." Fairfax had marched promptly and rapidly westward, after the battle of Naseby. He had driven Goring from the siege of Taunton, had defeated him in a sharp battle at Langport, taking 1,400 prisoners, and had carried Bridgewater by storm, July 21, capturing 2,000 prisoners, with 36 pieces of artillery and 5,000 stand of arms. On the 21st of August he arrived before Bristol, which Prince Rupert had strongly fortified, and which he held with an effective garrison of 2,300 men. On the morning of the 10th of September it was entered by storm, and on the following day Rupert, who still occupied the most defensible forts, surrendered the whole place. This surrender so enraged the King that he deprived his nephew of all his commissions and sent him a pass to quit the kingdom. But Rupert understood, as the King would not, that fighting was useless — that the royal cause was lost. — C. R. Markham, *Life of the Great Lord Fairfax*, ch. 21-22.

ALSO IN: Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. 9. — W. Hunt, *Bristol*, ch. 7. — E. Warburton, *Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers*, v. 3, ch. 1.

A. D. 1645 (September).—Defeat of Montrose at Philiphaugh. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1644-1645.

A. D. 1646 (March).—Adoption of Presbyterianism by Parliament. — "For the last three years the Assembly of Divines had been sitting almost daily in the Jerusalem Chamber of Westminster Abbey. . . . They were preparing a new Prayer-book, a form of Church Government, a Confession of Faith, and a Catechism; but the real questions at issue were the establishment of

the Presbyterian Church and the toleration of sectarians. The Presbyterians, as we know, desired to establish their own form of Church government by assemblies and synods, without any toleration for non-conformists, whether Catholics, Episcopalians, or sectarians. But though they formed a large majority in the assembly, there was a well-organized opposition of Independents and Erastians, whose union made it no easy matter for the Presbyterians to carry every vote their own way. . . . After the Assembly had sat a year and a half, the Parliament passed an ordinance for putting a directory, prepared by the divines, into force, and taking away the Common Prayer-book (3rd Jan., 1645). The sign of the cross in baptism, the ring in marriage, the wearing of vestments, the keeping of saints' days, were discontinued. The communion table was ordered to be set in the body of the church, about which the people were to stand or sit; the passages of Scripture to be read were left to the minister's choice; no forms of prayer were prescribed. The same year a new directory for ordination of ministers was passed into an ordinance. The Presbyterian assemblies, called presbyteries, were empowered to ordain, and none were allowed to enter the ministry without first taking the covenant (8th Nov., 1645). This was followed by a third ordinance for establishing the Presbyterian system of Church government in England by way of trial for three years. As originally introduced into the House, this ordinance met with great opposition, because it gave power to ministers of refusing the sacrament and turning men out of the Church for scandalous offences. Now, in what, argued the Erastians, did scandalous offences consist? . . . A modified ordinance accordingly was passed; scandalous offences, for which ministers might refuse the sacrament and excommunicate, were specified; assemblies were declared subject to Parliament, and leave was granted to those who thought themselves unjustly sentenced, to appeal right up from one Church assembly after another to the civil power — the Parliament (16th March, 1646). Presbyterians, both in England and Scotland, felt deeply mortified. After all these years' contending, then, just when they thought they were entering on the fruits of their labours, to see the Church still left under the power of the State — the disappointment was intense to a degree we cannot estimate. They looked on the Independents as the enemies of God; this 'lame Erastian Presbytery' as hardly worth the having.

. . . The Assembly of Divines practically came to an end in 1649, when it was changed into a committee for examining candidates for the Presbyterian ministry. It finally broke up without any formal dismissal on the dispersion of the Rump Parliament in March, 1653." — B. M. Cordery and J. S. Phillpotts, *King and Commonwealth*, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Great Civil War*, ch. 40 (v. 2). — A. F. Mitchell, *The Westminster Assembly*, lects. 7, 9, 13. — *Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly*. — See, also, INDEPENDENTS.

A. D. 1646-1647. — The King in the hands of the Scots. — His duplicity and his intrigues. — The Scots surrender him. — "On the morning of May 6th authentic news came that the King had ridden into the Scottish army, and had entrusted to his northern subjects the guardianship

of his royal person. Thereupon the English Parliament at once asserted their right to dispose of their King so long as he was on English soil; and for the present ordered that he be sent to Warwick Castle, an order, however, which had no effect. Newark, impregnable even to Ironsides, was surrendered at last by royal order; and the Scots retreated northwards to Newcastle, carrying their sovereign with them. . . . Meantime the City Presbyterians were petitioning the House to quicken the establishment of the godly and thorough reformation so long promised; and they were supported by letters from the Scottish Parliament, which, in the month of February, 1646, almost peremptorily required that the Solemn League and Covenant should be carried out in the Scottish sense of it. . . . The question as to the disposal of the King's person became accidentally involved in the issues between Presbyterianism and the sects. For if the King had been a man to be trusted, and if he had frankly accepted the army programme of free religion, a free Parliament, and responsible advisers, there is little doubt that he might have kept his crown and his Anglican ritual—at least for his own worship—and might yet have concluded his reign prosperously as the first constitutional King of England. Instead of this, he angered the army by making their most sacred purposes mere cards in a game, to be played or held as he thought most to his own advantage in dealing with the Presbyterian Parliament. On July 11th, 1646, Commissioners from both Houses were appointed to lay certain propositions for peace before the King at Newcastle. These of course involved everything for which the Parliament had contended, and in a form developed and exaggerated by the altered position of affairs. All armed forces were to be absolutely under the control of Parliament for a period of 20 years. Speaking generally, all public acts done by Parliament, or by its authority, were to be confirmed; and all public acts done by the King or his Oxford anti-Parliament, without due authorisation from Westminster, were to be void. . . . On August 10th the Commissioners who had been sent to the King returned to Westminster. . . . The King had given no distinct answer. It was a suspicious circumstance that the Duke of Hamilton had gone into Scotland, especially as Cromwell learned that, in spite of an ostensible order from the King, Montrose's force had not been disbanded. The labyrinthine web of royal intrigue in Ireland was beginning to be discovered. . . . The death of the Earl of Essex on September 14th increased the growing danger of a fatal schism in the victorious party. The Presbyterians had hoped to restore him to the head of the army, and so sheathe or blunt the terrible weapon they had forged and could not wield. They were now left without a man to rival in military authority the commanders whose exploits overwhelmed their employers with a too complete success. Not only were the political and religious opinions of the soldiers a cause of anxiety, but the burden of their sustenance and pay was pressing heavily on the country. . . . No wonder that the City of London, always sensitive as to public security, began to urge upon the Parliament the necessity for diminishing or disbanding the army in England. . . . The Parliament, however, could not deal with the army, for two reasons: First, the negotia-

tions with the Scotch lingered; and next, they could not pay the men. The first difficulty was overcome, at least for the time, by the middle of January, 1647, when a train of wagons carried £200,000 to Newcastle in discharge of the English debt to the Scottish army. But the successful accomplishment of this only increased the remaining difficulty of the Parliament—that of paying their own soldiers. We need not notice the charge made against the Scotch of selling their King further than to say, that it is unfairly based upon only one subordinate feature of a very complicated negotiation. If the King would have taken the Covenant, and guaranteed to them their precious Presbyterian system, his Scottish subjects would have fought for him almost to the last man. The firmness of Charles in declining the Covenant for himself is, no doubt, the most creditable point in his resistance. But his obstinacy in disputing the right of two nations, in their political establishment of religion, to override his convictions by their own, illustrates his entire incapacity to comprehend the new light dawning on the relations of sovereign and people. The Scots did their best for him. They petitioned him, they knelt to him, they preached to him. . . . But to have carried with them an intractable man to form a wedge of division amongst themselves, at the same time that he brought against them the whole power of England, would have been sheer insanity. Accordingly, they made the best bargain they could both for him and themselves; and, taking their wages, they left him with his English subjects, who conducted him to Holdenby House, in Northamptonshire, on the 6th of February, 1647."—J. A. Picton, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 13.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *The First two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution*, ch. 7, sect. 4.—The same, *Hist. of the Great Civil War*, ch. 38-45 (v. 2).—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*, bk. 1, ch. 24-27, and bk. 2, ch. 1-6 (v. 2).—Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. 9, sect. 161-178, and bk. 10 (v. 3).

A. D. 1647 (April-August).—The Army takes things in hand.—"The King was surrendered to Parliament, and all now looking toward peace, the Presbyterians were uppermost, discredit falling upon the Army and its favorers. Many of the Recruiters [i. e., the new members, elected to fill vacancies in the Parliament], who at first had acted with the Independents, inclined now to their opponents. The Presbyterians, feeling that none would dare to question the authority of Parliament, pushed energetically their policy as regards the Army, of sending to Ireland, disbanding, neglecting the payment of arrears, and displacing the old officers. But suddenly there came for them a rude awakening. On April 30, 1647, Skippon, whom all liked, whom the Presbyterians indeed claimed, but who at the same time kept on good terms with the Army and Independents, rose in his place in St. Stephens and produced a letter, brought to him the day before by three private soldiers, in which eight regiments of horse expressly refused to serve in Ireland, declaring that it was a perfidious design to separate the soldiers from the officers whom they loved,—framed by men who, having tasted of power, were degenerating into tyrants. Holles and the Presbyterians were thunder-struck, and laying aside all other business summoned the three soldiers to appear at once. . . . A violent

tumult arose in the House. The Presbyterians declared that the three sturdy Ironsides standing there, with their buff stained from their corselets, ought to be at once committed; to which it was answered, that if there were to be commitment, it should be to the best London tavern, and sack and sugar provided. Cromwell, leaning over toward Ludlow, who sat next to him, and pointing to the Presbyterians, said that those fellows would never leave till the Army pulled them out by the ears. That day it became known that there existed an organization, a sort of Parliament, in the Army, the officers forming an upper council and the representatives of the rank and file a lower council. Two such representatives stood in the lower council for each squadron or troop, known as 'Adjutors,' aiders, or 'Agitators.' This organization had taken upon itself to see that the Army had its rights. . . . At the end of a month, there was still greater occasion for astonishment. Seven hundred horse suddenly left the camp, and appearing without warning, June 2, at Holmby House, where Charles was kept, in charge of Parliamentary commissioners, proposed to assume the custody of the King. A cool, quiet fellow, of rank no higher than that of cornet, led them and was their spokesman, Joyce. 'What is your authority?' asked the King. The cornet simply pointed to the mass of troopers at his back. . . . So bold a step as the seizure of the King made necessary other bold steps on the part of the Army. Scarcely a fortnight had passed, when a demand was made for the exclusion from Parliament of eleven Presbyterians, the men most conspicuous for extreme views. The Army meanwhile hovered, ever ominously, close at hand, to the north and east of the city, paying slight regard to the Parliamentary prohibition to remain at a distance. The eleven members withdrew. . . . But if Parliament was willing to yield, Presbyterian London and the country round about were not, and in July broke out into sheer rebellion. . . . The Speakers of the Lords and Commons, at the head of the strength of the Parliament, fourteen Peers and one hundred Commoners, betook themselves to Fairfax, and on August 2 they threw themselves into the protection of the Army at Hounslow Heath, ten miles distant. A grand review took place. The consummate soldier, Fairfax, had his troops in perfect condition, and they were drawn out 20,000 strong to receive the seceding Parliament. The soldiers rent the air with shouts in their behalf, and all was made ready for a most impressive demonstration. On the 6th of August, Fairfax marched his troops in full array through the city, from Hammersmith to Westminster. Each man had in his hat a wreath of laurel. The Lords and Commons who had taken flight were escorted in the midst of the column; the city officials joined the train. At Westminster the Speakers were ceremoniously reinstalled, and the Houses again put to work, the first business being to thank the General and the veterans who had reconstituted them. The next day, with Skippon in the centre and Cromwell in the rear, the Army marched through the city itself, a heavy tramp of battle-seasoned platoons, at the mere sound of which the warlike ardor of the turbulent youths of the workshops and the rough watermen was completely squelched. Yet the soldiers looked neither to the right nor left; nor by act, word, or gesture

was any offence given."—J. K. Hosmer, *Life of Young Sir Henry Vane*, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: C. R. Markham, *Life of the Great Lord Fairfax*, ch. 24.—T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, pt. 3, letter 26.—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*, bk. 2, ch. 7-11.

A. D. 1647 (August—December).—The King's "Game" with Cromwell and the army, and the ending of it.—After reinstating the Parliament at Westminster, "the army leaders resumed negotiations with the King. The indignation of the soldiers at his delays and intrigues made the task hourly more difficult; but Cromwell . . . clung to the hope of accommodation with a passionate tenacity. His mind, conservative by tradition, and above all practical in temper, saw the political difficulties which would follow on the abolition of Royalty, and in spite of the King's evasions, he persisted in negotiating with him. But Cromwell stood almost alone; the Parliament refused to accept Ireton's proposals as a basis of peace, Charles still evaded, and the army then grew restless and suspicious. There were cries for a wide reform, for the abolition of the House of Peers, for a new House of Commons, and the Adjutors called on the Council of Officers to discuss the question of abolishing Royalty itself. Cromwell was never braver than when he faced the gathering storm, forbade the discussion, adjourned the Council, and sent the officers to their regiments. But the strain was too great to last long, and Charles was still resolute to 'play his game.' He was, in fact, so far from being in earnest in his negotiations with Cromwell and Ireton, that at the moment they were risking their lives for him he was conducting another and equally delusive negotiation with the Parliament. . . . In the midst of his hopes of an accommodation, Cromwell found with astonishment that he had been duped throughout, and that the King had fled [Nov. 11, 1647]. . . . Even Cromwell was powerless to break the spirit which now pervaded the soldiers, and the King's perfidy left him without resource. 'The King is a man of great parts and great understanding,' he said at last, 'but so great a dissembler and so false a man that he is not to be trusted.' By a strange error, Charles had made his way from Hampton Court to the Isle of Wight, perhaps with some hope from the sympathy of Colonel Hammond, the Governor of Carisbrooke Castle, and again found himself a prisoner. Foiled in his effort to put himself at the head of the new civil war, he set himself to organize it from his prison; and while again opening delusive negotiations with the Parliament, he signed a secret treaty with the Scots for the invasion of the realm. The rise of Independency, and the practical suspension of the Covenant, had produced a violent reaction in his favour north of the Tweed. . . . In England the whole of the conservative party, with many of the most conspicuous members of the Long Parliament at its head, was drifting, in its horror of the religious and political changes which seemed impending, toward the King; and the news from Scotland gave the signal for fitful insurrections in almost every quarter."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 8, sect. 8.

ALSO IN: F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of the Eng. Rev. of 1640*, bk. 7-8.—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng., 17th Century*, bk. 10, ch. 4.—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*.—G. Hillier, *Narrative of*

attempted Escapes of Charles I. from Carisbrooke Castle, &c.

A. D. 1648 (April—August).—The Second Civil War.—Defeat of the Scots at Preston.—"The Second Civil War broke out in April, and proved to be a short but formidable affair. The whole of Wales was speedily in insurrection; a strong force of cavaliers were mustering in the north of England; in Essex, Surrey, and the southern counties various outbreaks arose; Berwick, Carlisle, Chester, Pembroke, Colchester, were held for the king; the fleet revolted; and 40,000 men were ordered by the Parliament of Scotland to invade England. Lambert was sent to the north; Fairfax to take Colchester; and Cromwell into Wales, and thence to join Lambert and meet the Scotch. On the 24th of May Cromwell reached Pembroke, but being short of guns, he did not take it till 11th July. The rising in Wales crushed, Cromwell turned northwards, where the northwest was already in revolt, and 20,000 Scots, under the Duke of Hamilton, were advancing into the country. Want of supplies and shoes, and sickness, detained him with his army, some 7,000 strong, 'so extremely harassed with hard service and long marches, that they seemed rather fit for a hospital than a battle.' Having joined Lambert in Yorkshire he fought the battle of Preston on 17th of August. The battle of Preston was one of the most decisive and important victories ever gained by Cromwell, over the most numerous enemy he ever encountered, and the first in which he was in supreme command. . . . Early on the morning of the 17th August, Cromwell, with some 9,000 men, fell upon the army of the Duke of Hamilton unawares, as it proceeded southwards in a long, straggling, unprotected line. The invaders consisted of 17,000 Scots and 7,000 good men from northern counties. The long ill-ordered line was cut in half and rolled back northward and southward, before they even knew that Cromwell was upon them. The great host, cut into sections, fought with desperation from town to town. But for three days it was one long chase and carnage, which ended only with the exhaustion of the victors and their horses. Ten thousand prisoners were taken. 'We have killed we know not what,' writes Cromwell, 'but a very great number; having done execution upon them above thirty miles together, besides what we killed in the two great fights.' His own loss was small, and but one superior officer. . . . The Scottish invaders dispersed, Cromwell hastened to recover Berwick and Carlisle, and to restore the Presbyterian or Whig party in Scotland."—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: J. H. Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, ch. 74 (v. 7).—Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. 11 (v. 4).

A. D. 1648 (September—November).—The Treaty at Newport.—"The unfortunate issue of the Scots expedition under the duke of Hamilton, and of the various insurrections throughout England, quelled by the vigilance and good conduct of Fairfax and Cromwell, is well known. But these formidable manifestations of the public sentiment in favour of peace with the king on honourable conditions, wherein the city of London, ruled by the presbyterian ministers, took a share, compelled the house of commons to retract its measures. They came to a vote, by 165 to

99, that they would not alter the fundamental government by king, lords, and commons; they abandoned their impeachment against seven peers, the most moderate of the upper house and the most obnoxious to the army: they restored the eleven members to their seats; they revoked their resolutions against a personal treaty with the king, and even that which required his assent by certain preliminary articles. In a word the party for distinction's sake called presbyterian, but now rather to be denominated constitutional, regained its ascendancy. This change in the counsels of parliament brought on the treaty of Newport. The treaty of Newport was set on foot and managed by those politicians of the house of lords, who, having long suspected no danger to themselves but from the power of the king, had discovered, somewhat of the latest, that the crown itself was at stake, and that their own privileges were set on the same cast. Nothing was more remote from the intentions of the earl of Northumberland, or lord Say, than to see themselves pushed from their seats by such upstarts as Ireton and Harrison; and their present mortification afforded a proof how men reckoned wise in their generation become the dupes of their own selfish, crafty, and pusillanimous policy. They now grew anxious to see a treaty concluded with the king. Sensible that it was necessary to anticipate, if possible, the return of Cromwell from the north, they implored him to comply at once with all the propositions of parliament, or at least to yield in the first instance as far as he meant to go. They had not, however, mitigated in any degree the rigorous conditions so often proposed; nor did the king during this treaty obtain any reciprocal concession worth mentioning in return for his surrender of almost all that could be demanded."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 10, pt. 2.—The utter faithlessness with which Charles carried on these negotiations, as on all former occasions, was shown at a later day when his correspondence came to light. "After having solemnly promised that all hostilities in Ireland should cease, he secretly wrote to Ormond (Oct. 10): 'Obey my wife's orders, not mine, until I shall let you know I am free from all restraint; nor trouble yourself about my concessions as to Ireland; they will not lead to anything;' and the day on which he had consented to transfer to parliament for twenty years the command of the army (Oct. 9), he wrote to sir William Hopkins: 'To tell you the truth, my great concession this morning was made only with a view to facilitate my approaching escape; without that hope, I should never have yielded in this manner. If I had refused, I could, without much sorrow, have returned to my prison; but as it is, I own it would break my heart, for I have done that which my escape alone can justify.' The parliament, though without any exact information, suspected all this perfidy; even the friends of peace, the men most affected by the king's condition, and most earnest to save him, replied but hesitatingly to the charges of the independents."—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of the Eng. Rev. of 1640*, bk. 8.

ALSO IN: Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. 11, sect. 153–190 (v. 4).—I. Disraeli, *Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles I.*, v. 2, ch. 39–40.

A. D. 1648 (November—December).—The Grand Army Remonstrance and Pride's Purge.—The Long Parliament cut down to the

Rump.—On the 20th of November, 1648, Colonel Ewer and other officers presented to the house of commons a remonstrance from the Army against the negotiations and proposed treaty with the king. This was accompanied by a letter from Fairfax, stating that it had been voted unanimously in the council of officers, and entreating for it the consideration of parliament. The remonstrance recommended an immediate ending of the treaty conferences at Newport, demanded that the king be brought to justice, as the capital source of all grievances, and called upon parliament to enact its own dissolution, with provision for the electing and convening of future annual or biennial parliaments. Ten days passed without attention being given to this army manifesto, the house having twice adjourned its consideration of the document. On the first of December there appeared at Newport a party of horse which quietly took possession of the person of the king, and conveyed him to Hurst Castle, "a fortress in Hampshire, situated at the extreme point of a neck of land, which shoots into the sea towards the isle of Wight." The same day on which this was done, "the commissioners who had treated with the king at Newport made their appearance in the two houses of parliament; and the two following days were occupied by the house of commons in an earnest debate as to the state of the negotiation. Vane was one of the principal speakers against the treaty; and Fiennes, who had hitherto ranked among the independents, spoke for it. At length, after the house had sat all night, it was put and carried, at five in the morning of the 5th, by a majority of 129 to 83, that the king's answers to the propositions of both houses were a ground for them to proceed upon, to the settlement of the peace of the kingdom. On the same day this vote received the concurrence of the house of lords." Meantime, on the 30th of November, the council of the army had voted a second declaration more fully expressive of its views and announcing its intention to draw near to London, for the accomplishment of the purposes of the remonstrance. "On the 2d of December Fairfax marched to London, and quartered his army at Whitehall, St. James's, the Mews, and the villages near the metropolis. . . . On the 5th of December three officers of the army held a meeting with three members of parliament, to arrange the plan by which the sound members might best be separated from those by whom their measures were thwarted, and might peaceably be put in possession of the legislative authority. The next morning a regiment of horse, and another of foot were placed as a guard upon the two houses, Skippon, who commanded the city-militia, having agreed with the council of the army to keep back the guard under his authority which usually performed that duty. A part of the foot were ranged in the Court of Requests, upon the stairs, and in the lobby leading to the house of commons. Colonel Pride was stationed near the door, with a list in his hand of the persons he was commissioned to arrest; and sometimes one of the door-keepers, and at others Lord Grey of Groby, pointed them out to him, as they came up with an intention of passing into the house. Forty-one members were thus arrested. . . . On the following day more members were secured, or denied entrance, amounting, with those of the day before, to about one hundred. At the same

time Cromwel took his seat; and Henry Marten moved that the speaker should return him thanks for his great and eminent services performed in the course of the campaign. The day after, the two houses adjourned to the 12th. During the adjournment many of the members who had been taken into custody by the military were liberated. . . . Besides those who were absolutely secured, or shut out from their seats by the power of the army, there were other members that looked with dislike on the present proceedings, or that considered parliament as being under force, and not free in their deliberations, who voluntarily abstained from being present at their sittings and debates."—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*, bk. 2, ch. 23-24 (v. 2).—"The famous Pride's Purge was accomplished. By military force the Long Parliament was cut down to a fraction of its number, and the career begins of the mighty 'Rump,' so called in the coarse wit of the time because it was 'the sitting part.'"—J. K. Hosmer, *Life of Young Sir Henry Vane*, ch. 13.—"This name [the Rump] was first given to them by Walker, the author of the History of Independency, by way of derision, in allusion to a fowl all devoured but the rump."—D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 4, ch. 1, foot-note.

ALSO IN: C. R. Markham, *Life of the Great Lord Fairfax*, ch. 28.—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton*, bk. 4, ch. 1 and 3 (v. 3).

A. D. 1649 (January).—The trial and execution of the King.—"During the month in which Charles had remained at Windsor [whither he had been brought from Hurst Castle on the 17th of December], there had been proceedings in Parliament of which he was imperfectly informed. On the day he arrived there, it was resolved by the Commons that he should be brought to trial. On the 2nd of January, 1649, it was voted that, in making war against the Parliament, he had been guilty of treason; and a High Court was appointed to try him. One hundred and fifty commissioners were to compose the Court,—peers, members of the Commons, aldermen of London. The ordinance was sent to the Upper House, and was rejected. On the 6th, a fresh ordinance, declaring that the people being, after God, the source of all just power, the representatives of the people are the supreme power in the nation; and that whatsoever is enacted or declared for law by the Commons in Parliament hath the force of a law, and the people are concluded thereby, though the consent of King or Peers be not had thereto. Asserting this power, so utterly opposed either to the ancient constitution of the monarchy, or to the possible working of a republic, there was no hesitation in constituting the High Court of Justice in the name of the Commons alone. The number of members of the Court was now reduced to 135. They had seven preparatory meetings, at which only 58 members attended. 'All men,' says Mrs. Hutchinson, 'were left to their free liberty of acting, neither persuaded nor compelled; and as there were some nominated in the commission who never sat, and others who sat at first but durst not hold on, so all the rest might have declined it if they would, when it is apparent they should have suffered nothing by so doing.' . . . On the 19th of January, major Harrison appeared . . . at Windsor with his troop. There was a coach with six horses in the court-yard, in which the King took his seat; and, once more, he entered London, and

was lodged at St. James's palace. The next day, the High Court of Justice was opened in Westminster-hall. . . . After the names of the members of the court had been called, 69 being present, Bradshaw, the president, ordered the serjeant to bring in the prisoner. Silently the King sat down in the chair prepared for him. He moved not his hat, as he looked sternly and contemptuously around. The sixty-nine rose not from their seats, and remained covered. . . . The clerk reads the charge, and when he is accused therein of being tyrant and traitor, he laughs in the face of the Court. 'Though his tongue usually hesitated, yet it was very free at this time, for he was never discomposed in mind,' writes Warwick. . . . Again and again contending against the authority of the Court, the King was removed, and the sitting was adjourned to the 22nd. On that day the same scene was renewed; and again on the 23rd. A growing sympathy for the monarch became apparent. The cries of 'Justice, justice,' which were heard at first, were now mingled with 'God save the King.' He had refused to plead; but the Court nevertheless employed the 24th and 25th of January in collecting evidence to prove the charge of his levying war against the Parliament. Coke, the solicitor-general, then demanded whether the Court would proceed to pronouncing sentence; and the members adjourned to the Painted Chamber. On the 27th the public sitting was resumed. . . . The Court, Bradshaw then stated, had agreed upon the sentence. Ludlow records that the King 'desired to make one proposition before they proceeded to sentence; which he earnestly pressing, as that which he thought would lead to the reconciling of all parties, and to the peace of the three kingdoms, they permitted him to offer it: the effect of which was, that he might meet the two Houses in the Painted Chamber, to whom he doubted not to offer that which should satisfy and secure all interests.' Ludlow goes on to say, 'Designing, as I have since been informed, to propose his own resignation, and the admission of his son to the throne upon such terms as should have been agreed upon.' The commissioners retired to deliberate, 'and being satisfied, upon debate, that nothing but loss of time would be the consequence of it, they returned into the Court with a negative to his demand.' Bradshaw then delivered a solemn speech to the King. . . . The clerk was lastly commanded to read the sentence, that his head should be severed from his body; 'and the commissioners,' says Ludlow, 'testified their unanimous assent by standing up.' The King attempted to speak; 'but being accounted dead in law, was not permitted.' On the 29th of January, the Court met to sign the sentence of execution, addressed to 'colonel Francis Hacker, colonel Huncks, and lieutenant-colonel Phayr, and to every one of them.' . . . There were some attempts to save him. The Dutch ambassador made vigorous efforts to procure a reprieve, whilst the French and Spanish ambassadors were inert. The ambassadors from the States nevertheless persevered; and early in the day of the 30th obtained some glimmering of hope from Fairfax. 'But we found,' they say in their despatch, 'in front of the house in which we had just spoken with the general, about 200 horsemen; and we learned, as well as on our way as on reaching home, that all the streets, passages, and squares of London were occupied by troops,

so that no one could pass, and that the approaches of the city were covered with cavalry, so as to prevent any one from coming in or going out. . . . The same day, between two and three o'clock, the King was taken to a scaffold covered with black, erected before Whitehall.' To that scaffold before Whitehall, Charles walked, surrounded by soldiers, through the leafless avenues of St. James's Park. It was a bitterly cold morning. . . . His purposed address to the people was delivered only to the hearing of those upon the scaffold, but its purport was that the people mistook the nature of government; for people are free under a government, not by being sharers in it, but by due administration of the laws of it.' His theory of government was a consistent one. He had the misfortune not to understand that the time had been fast passing away for its assertion. The headsman did his office; and a deep groan went up from the surrounding multitude,"—Charles Knight, *Popular Hist. of England*, v. 4, ch. 7.—"In the death-warrant of 29th January 1649, next after the President and Lord Grey, stands the name of Oliver Cromwell. He accepted the responsibility of it, justified, defended it to his dying day. No man in England was more entirely answerable for the deed than he. 'I tell you,' he said to Algernon Sidney, 'we will cut off his head with the crown upon it.' . . . Slowly he had come to know — not only that the man, Charles Stuart, was incurably treacherous, but that any settlement of Parliament with the old Feudal Monarchy was impossible. As the head of the king rolled on the scaffold the old Feudal Monarchy expired for ever. In January 1649 a great mark was set in the course of the national life — the Old Rule behind it, the New Rule before it. Parliamentary government, the consent of the nation, equality of rights, and equity in the law — all date from this great New Departure. The Stuarts indeed returned for one generation, but with the sting of the Old Monarchy gone, and only to disappear almost without a blow. The Church of England returned; but not the Church of Laud or of Charles. The peers returned, but as a meek House of Lords, with their castles razed, their feudal rights and their political power extinct. It is said that the regicides killed Charles I. only to make Charles II. king. It is not so. They killed the Old Monarchy; and the restored monarch was by no means its heir, but a royal Stadtholder or Hereditary President."—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 7.—"Respecting the death of Charles it has been pronounced by Fox, that 'it is much to be doubted whether his trial and execution have not, as much as any other circumstance, served to raise the character of the English nation in the opinion of Europe in general.' And he goes on to speak with considerable favour of the authors of that event. One of the great authorities of the age having so pronounced, an hundred and fifty years after the deed, it may be proper to consider for a little the real merits of the actors, and the act. It is not easy to imagine a greater criminal than the individual against whom the sentence was awarded. . . . Liberty is one of the greatest negative advantages that can fall to the lot of a man; without it we cannot possess any high degree of happiness, or exercise any considerable virtue. Now Charles, to a degree which can scarcely be exceeded, conspired against the liberty of his country. To

assert his own authority without limitation, was the object of all his desires and all his actions, so far as the public was concerned. To accomplish this object he laid aside the use of a parliament. When he was compelled once more to have recourse to this assembly, and found it retrograde to his purposes, he determined to bring up the army, and by that means to put an end to its sittings. Both in Scotland and England, the scheme that he formed for setting aside all opposition, was by force of arms. For that purpose he commenced war against the English parliament, and continued it by every expedient in his power for four years. Conquered, and driven out of the field, he did not for that, for a moment lose sight of his object and his resolution. He sought in every quarter for the materials of a new war; and, after an interval of twenty months, and from the depths of his prison, he found them. To this must be added the most consummate insincerity and duplicity. He could never be reconciled; he could never be disarmed; he could never be convinced. His was a war to the death, and therefore had the utmost aggravation that can belong to a war against the liberty of a nation. . . . The proper lesson taught by the act of the thirtieth of January, was that no person, however high in station, however protected by the prejudices of his contemporaries, must expect to be criminal against the welfare of the state and community, without retribution and punishment. The event however sufficiently proved that the condemnation and execution of Charles did not answer the purposes intended by its authors. It did not conciliate the English nation to republican ideas. It shocked all those persons in the country who did not adhere to the ruling party. This was in some degree owing to the decency with which Charles met his fate. He had always been in manners, formal, sober and specious. . . . The notion was every where prevalent, that a sovereign could not be called to account, could not be arraigned at the bar of his subjects. And the violation of this prejudice, instead of breaking down the wall which separated him from others, gave to his person a sacredness which never before appertained to it. Among his own partisans the death of Charles was treated, and was spoken of, as a sort of deicide. And it may be admitted for a universal rule, that the abrupt violation of a deep-rooted maxim and persuasion of the human mind, produces a reaction, and urges men to hug the maxim closer than ever. I am afraid, that the day that saw Charles perish on the scaffold, rendered the restoration of his family certain."—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of England to the Restoration of Charles II.*, bk. 2, ch. 26 (v. 2).—"The situation, complicated enough already, had been still further complicated by Charles's duplicity. Men who would have been willing to come to terms with him, despaired of any constitutional arrangement in which he was to be a factor; and men who had long been alienated from him were irritated into active hostility. By these he was regarded with increasing intensity as the one disturbing force with which no understanding was possible and no settled order consistent. To remove him out of the way appeared, even to those who had no thought of punishing him for past offences, to be the only possible road to peace for the troubled nation. It seemed that so long as Charles lived deluded nations and deluded parties would be stirred up,

by promises never intended to be fulfilled, to fling themselves, as they had flung themselves in the Second Civil War, against the new order of things which was struggling to establish itself in England."—S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of the Great Civil War, 1642-1649*, ch. 71 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: John Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth*; Henry Marten.—S. R. Gardiner, *Const. Doc's of the Puritan Rev.*, pp. 268-290.

The following is the text of the Act which arraigned the King and constituted the Court by which he was tried: "Whereas it is notorious that Charles Stuart, the now king of England, not content with the many encroachments which his predecessors had made upon the people in their rights and freedom, hath had a wicked design totally to subvert the antient and fundamental laws and liberties of this nation, and in their place to introduce an arbitrary and tyrannical government; and that, besides all other evil ways and means to bring his design to pass, he hath prosecuted it with fire and sword, levied and maintained a civil war in the land, against the parliament and kingdom; whereby this country hath been miserably wasted, the public treasure exhausted, trade decayed, thousands of people murdered, and infinite other mischiefs committed; for all which high and treasonable offences the said Charles Stuart might long since have justly been brought to exemplary and condign punishment: whereas also the parliament, well hoping that the restraint and imprisonment of his person after it had pleased God to deliver him into their hands, would have quieted the distempers of the kingdom, did forbear to proceed judicially against him; but found, by sad experience, that such their remissness served only to encourage him and his accomplices in the continuance of their evil practices and in raising new commotions, rebellions, and invasions: for prevention therefore of the like or greater inconveniences, and to the end no other chief officer or magistrate whatsoever may hereafter presume, traiterously and maliciously, to imagine or contrive the enslaving or destroying of the English nation, and to expect impunity for so doing; be it enacted and ordained by the [Lords] and commons in Parliament assembled, and it is hereby enacted and ordained by the authority thereof, That the earls of Kent, Nottingham, Pembroke, Denbigh, and Mulgrave; the lord Grey of Warke; lord chief justice Rolle of the king's bench, lord chief justice St. John of the common Pleas, and lord chief baron Wylde; the lord Fairfax, lieut. general Cromwell, &c. [in all about 150,] shall be, and are hereby appointed and required to be Commissioners and Judges, for the Hearing, Trying, and Judging of the said Charles Stuart; and the said Commissioners, or any 20 or more of them, shall be, and are hereby authorized and constituted an High Court of Justice, to meet and sit at such convenient times and place as by the said commissioners, or the major part, or 20 or more of them, under their hands and seals, shall be appointed and notified by public Proclamation in the Great Hall, or Palace Yard of Westminster; and to adjourn from time to time, and from place to place, as the said High Court, or the major part thereof, at meeting, shall hold fit; and to take order for the charging of him, the said Charles Stuart, with the Crimes and Treasons above-mentioned, and for receiving his personal Answer thereunto, and for

examination of witnesses upon oath, (which the court hath hereby authority to administer) or otherwise, and taking any other Evidence concerning the same; and thereupon, or in default of such Answer, to proceed to final Sentence according to justice and the merit of the cause; and such final Sentence to execute, or cause to be executed, speedily and impartially.—And the said court is hereby authorized and required to chuse and appoint all such officers, attendants, and other circumstances as they, or the major part of them, shall in any sort judge necessary or useful for the orderly and good managing of the premises; and Thomas lord Fairfax the General, and all officers and soldiers, under his command, and all officers of justice, and other well-affected persons, are hereby authorized and required to be aiding and assisting unto the said court in the due execution of the trust hereby committed unto them; provided that this act, and the authority hereby granted, do continue in force for the space of one month from the date of the making hereof, and no longer.”—*Cobbett's Parliamentary Hist. of England*, v. 3, pp. 1254–1255.

A. D. 1649 (February).—The Commonwealth established.—“England was now a Republic. The change had been virtually made on Thursday, January 4, 1648-9, when the Commons passed their three great Resolutions, declaring (1) that the People of England were, under God, the original of all just power in the State, (2) that the Commons, in Parliament assembled, having been chosen by the People, and representing the People, possessed the supreme power in their name, and (3) that whatever the Commons enacted should have the force of a law, without needing the consent of either King or House of Peers. On Tuesday, the 30th of January, the theory of these Resolutions became more visibly a fact. On the afternoon of that day, while the crowd that had seen the execution in front of Whitehall were still lingering round the scaffold, the Commons passed an Act ‘prohibiting the proclaiming of any person to be King of England or Ireland, or the dominions thereof.’ It was thus declared that Kingship in England had died with Charles. But what of the House of Peers? It was significant that on the same fatal day the Commons revived their three theoretical resolutions of the 4th, and ordered them to be printed. The wretched little rag of a House might then have known its doom. But it took a week more to convince them.” On the 6th of February it was resolved by the House of Commons, “‘That the House of Peers in Parliament is useless and dangerous, and ought to be abolished, and that an Act be brought in to that purpose.’ Next day, Feb. 7, after another long debate, it was further resolved ‘That it hath been found by experience, and this House doth declare, that the office of a King in this realm, and to have the power thereof in any single person, is unnecessary, burdensome, and dangerous to the liberty, safety, and public interest of the People of this nation, and therefore ought to be abolished, and that an Act be brought in to that purpose.’ Not till after some weeks were these Acts deliberately passed after the customary three readings. The delay, however, was matter of mere Parliamentary form. Theoretically a Republic since Jan. 4, 1648-9, and visibly a Republic from the day of Charles's death,

England was a Republic absolutely and in every sense from Feb. 7, 1648-9.” For the administration of the government of the republican Commonwealth, the Commons resolved, on the 7th of February, that a Council of State be erected, to consist of not more than forty persons. On the 13th, Instructions to the intended Council of State were reported and agreed to, “these Instructions conferring almost plenary powers, but limiting the duration of the Council to one year.” On the 14th and 15th forty-one persons were appointed to be members of the Council, Fairfax, Cromwell, Vane, St. John, Whitlocke, Henry Marten, and Colonels Hutchinson and Ludlow being in the number; nine to constitute a quorum, and no permanent President to be chosen.—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton*, v. 4, bk. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 10, ch. 5.—A. Bisset, *Omitted Chapters of Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1649 (February).—The Eikon Basilike.—“A book, published with great secrecy, and in very mysterious circumstances, Feb. 9, 1648-9, exactly ten days after the late King's death, had done much to increase the Royalist enthusiasm. ‘Eikon Basilike: The True Portraicture of His Sacred Majestie in his Solitudes and Sufferings.’—Rom. viii. More than conquerour, &c.—Bona agere et mala pati Regium est. MDCXLVIII’: such was the title-page of this volume (of 269 pages of text, in small octavo), destined by fate, rather than by merit, to be one of the most famous books of the world. . . . The book, so elaborately prepared and heralded, consists of twenty-eight successive chapters, purporting to have been written by the late King, and to be the essence of his spiritual autobiography in the last years of his life. Each chapter, with scarcely an exception, begins with a little narrative, or generally rather with reflections and meditations on some passage of the King's life the narrative of which is supposed to be unnecessary, and ends with a prayer in italics appropriate to the circumstances remembered. . . . Save for a few . . . passages . . . , the pathos of which lies in the situation they represent, the Eikon Basilike is a rather dull performance, in third-rate rhetoric, modulated after the Liturgy, and without incision, point, or the least shred of real information as to facts. But O what a reception it had! Copies of it ran about instantaneously, and were read with sobs and tears. It was in vain that Parliament, March 16, gave orders for seizing the book. It was reprinted at once in various forms, to supply the constant demand—which was not satisfied, it is said, with less than fifty editions within a single year; it became a very Bible in English Royalist households. . . . By means of this book, in fact, acting on the state of sentiment which it fitted, there was established, within a few weeks after the death of Charles I., that marvellous worship of his memory, that passionate recollection of him as the perfect man and the perfect king, the saint, the martyr, the all but Christ on earth again, which persisted till the other day as a positive religious cultus of the English mind, and still lingers in certain quarters.”—D. Masson, *Life and Times of John Milton*, v. 4, bk. 1, ch. 1.—“I struggled through the Eikon Basilike yesterday; one of the paltriest pieces of vapid, shovel-hatted, clear-starched, immaculate falsity and cant I have

ever read. It is to me an amazement how any mortal could ever have taken that for a genuine book of King Charles's. Nothing but a surprised Pharisee, sitting at his ease afar off, could have got up such a set of meditations. It got Parson Gauden [John Gauden, Bishop of Exeter and Worcester, successively, after the Restoration, and who is believed to have been the author of the *Elkon Basilike*] a bishopric."—T. Carlyle, in *Hist. of his Life in London*, by Froude, v. 1, ch. 7, Nov. 26, 1840.

A. D. 1649 (April–May).—Mutiny of the Levellers. See **LEVELLERS**.

A. D. 1649-1650.—Cromwell's campaign in Ireland. See **IRELAND**: A. D. 1649-1650.

A. D. 1650 (July).—Charles II. proclaimed King in Scotland. See **SCOTLAND**: A. D. 1650 (MARCH—JULY).

A. D. 1650 (September).—War with the Scots and Cromwell's victory at Dunbar. See **SCOTLAND**: A. D. 1650 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1651 (September).—The Scots and Charles II. overthrown at Worcester. See **SCOTLAND**: A. D. 1651.

A. D. 1651-1653.—The Army and the Rump. —“‘Now that the King is dead and his son defeated,’ Cromwell said gravely to the Parliament, ‘I think it necessary to come to a settlement.’ But the settlement which had been promised after Naseby was still as distant as ever after Worcester. The bill for dissolving the present Parliament, though Cromwell pressed it in person, was only passed, after bitter opposition, by a majority of two; and even this success had been purchased by a compromise which permitted the House to sit for three years more. Internal affairs were simply at a dead lock. . . . The one remedy for all this was, as the army saw, the assembly of a new and complete Parliament in place of the mere ‘rump’ of the old; but this was the one measure which the House was resolute to avert. Vane spurred it to a new activity. . . . But it was necessary for Vane’s purposes not only to show the energy of the Parliament, but to free it from the control of the army. His aim was to raise in the navy a force devoted to the House, and to eclipse the glories of Dunbar and Worcester by yet greater triumphs at sea. With this view the quarrel with Holland had been carefully nursed. . . . The army hardly needed the warning conveyed by the introduction of a bill for its disbanding to understand the new policy of the Parliament. . . . The army petitioned not only for reform in Church and State, but for an explicit declaration that the House would bring its proceedings to a close. The Petition forced the House to discuss a bill for ‘a New Representative,’ but the discussion soon brought out the resolve of the sitting members to continue as a part of the coming Parliament without re-election. The officers, irritated by such a claim, demanded in conference after conference an immediate dissolution, and the House as resolutely refused. In ominous words Cromwell supported the demands of the army. ‘As for the members of this Parliament, the army begins to take them in disgust. I would it did so with less reason.’ . . . Not only were the existing members to continue as members of the New Parliament, depriving the places they represented of their right of choosing representatives, but they were to constitute a Committee of Revision, to determine the validity of each

election, and the fitness of the members returned. A conference took place [April 19, 1653] between the leaders of the Commons and the officers of the army. . . . The conference was adjourned till the next morning, on an understanding that no decisive step should be taken; but it had no sooner reassembled, than the absence of the leading members confirmed the news that Vane was fast pressing the bill for a new Representative through the House. ‘It is contrary to common honesty,’ Cromwell angrily broke out; and, quitting Whitehall, he summoned a company of musketeers to follow him as far as the door of the House of Commons.”—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 8, sect. 9.

ALSO IN: J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Cromwell*.—J. A. Picton, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 22.

A. D. 1651-1672.—The Navigation Acts and the American colonies. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1651-1672; also, **NAVIGATION LAWS**.

A. D. 1652-1654.—War with the Dutch Republic.—“After the death of William, Prince of Orange, which was attended with the depression of his party and the triumph of the Dutch republicans [see **NETHERLANDS**: A. D. 1647-1650], the Parliament thought that the time was now favourable for cementing a closer confederacy with the states. St. John, chief justice, who was sent over to the Hague, had entertained the idea of forming a kind of coalition between the two republics, which would have rendered their interests totally inseparable; . . . but the states, who were unwilling to form a nearer confederacy with a government whose measures were so obnoxious, and whose situation seemed so precarious, offered only to renew the former alliances with England; and the haughty St. John, disgusted with this disappointment, as well as incensed at many affronts which had been offered him, with impunity, by the retainers of the Palatine and Orange families, and indeed by the populace in general, returned into England and endeavoured to foment a quarrel between the republics. . . . There were several motives which at this time induced the English Parliament to embrace hostile measures. Many of the members thought that a foreign war would serve as a pretence for continuing the same Parliament, and delaying the new model of a representative, with which the nation had so long been flattered. Others hoped that the war would furnish a reason for maintaining, some time longer, that numerous standing army which was so much complained of. On the other hand, some, who dreaded the increasing power of Cromwell, expected that the great expense of naval armaments would prove a motive for diminishing the military establishment. To divert the attention of the public from domestic quarrels towards foreign transactions, seemed, in the present disposition of men’s minds, to be good policy. . . . All these views, enforced by the violent spirit of St. John, who had great influence over Cromwell, determined the Parliament to change the purposed alliance into a furious war against the United Provinces. To cover these hostile intentions, the Parliament, under pretence of providing for the interests of commerce, embraced such measures as they knew would give disgust to the states. They framed the famous act of navigation, which prohibited all nations from importing into England in their bottoms any commodity which was not the growth

and manufacture of their own country. . . . The minds of men in both states were every day more irritated against each other; and it was not long before these humours broke forth into action."—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 60 (v. 5).—"The negotiations . . . were still pending when Blake, meeting Van Tromp's fleet in the Downs, in vain summoned the Dutch Admiral to lower his flag. A battle was the consequence, which led to a declaration of war on the 8th of July (1652). The maritime success of England was chiefly due to the genius of Blake, who having hitherto served upon shore, now turned his whole attention to the navy. A series of bloody fights took place between the two nations. For some time the fortunes of the war seemed undecided. Van Tromp, defeated by Blake, had to yield the command to De Ruyter. De Ruyter in his turn was displaced to give way again to his greater rival. Van Tromp was reinstated in command. A victory over Blake off the Naze (Nov. 28) enabled him to cruise in the Channel with a broom at his mast-head, implying that he had swept the English from the seas. But the year 1653 again saw Blake able to fight a drawn battle of two days' duration between Portland and La Hogue; while at length, on the 2d and 3d of June, a decisive engagement was fought off the North Foreland, in which Monk and Deane, supported by Blake, completely defeated the Dutch Admiral, who, as a last resource, tried in vain to blow up his own ship, and then retreated to the Dutch coast, leaving eleven ships in the hands of the English. In the next month, another victory on the part of Blake, accompanied by the death of the great Dutch Admiral, completed the ruin of the naval power of Holland. The States were driven to treat. In 1654 the treaty was signed, in which Denmark, the Hanseatic towns, and the Swiss provinces were included. . . . The Dutch acknowledged the supremacy of the English flag in the British seas; they consented to the Navigation Act."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.*, period 2, p. 701.

ALSO IN: W. H. Dixon, *Robert Blake, Admiral and General at Sea*, ch. 6-7.—D. Hannay, *Admiral Blake*, ch. 6-7.—J. Campbell, *Naval Hist. of Gt. B.*, ch. 15 (v. 2).—G. Penn, *Memorials of Sir Wm. Penn*, ch. 4.—J. Corbett, *Monk*, ch. 7.—J. Geddes, *Hist. of the Administration of John De Witt*, v. 1, bk. 4-5.—See, also, NAVIGATION LAWS, ENGLISH: A. D. 1651.

A. D. 1653 (April).—Cromwell's expulsion of the Rump.—"In plain black clothes and gray worsted stockings, the Lord-General came in quietly and took his seat [April 20], as Vane was pressing the House to pass the dissolution Bill without delay and without the customary forms. He beckoned to Harrison and told him that the Parliament was ripe for dissolution, and he must do it. 'Sir,' said Harrison, 'the work is very great and dangerous.'—'You say well,' said the general, and thereupon sat still for about a quarter of an hour. Vane sat down, and the Speaker was putting the question for passing the Bill. Then said Cromwell to Harrison again, 'This is the time; I must do it.' He rose up, put off his hat, and spoke. Beginning moderately and respectfully, he presently changed his style, told them of their injustice, delays of justice, self interest, and other faults; charging them not to have a heart to do anything for the public good, to have espoused the corrupt inter-

est of Presbytery and the lawyers, who were the supporters of tyranny and oppression, accusing them of an intention to perpetuate themselves in power. And rising into passion, 'as if he were distracted,' he told them that the Lord had done with them, and had chosen other instruments for the carrying on His work that were worthy. Sir Peter Wentworth rose to complain of such language in Parliament, coming from their own trusted servant. Roused to fury by the interruption, Cromwell left his seat, clapped on his hat, walked up and down the floor of the House, stamping with his feet, and cried out, 'You are no Parliament, I say you are no Parliament. Come, come, we have had enough of this; I will put an end to your prating. Call them in!' Twenty or thirty musketeers under Colonel Worsley marched in onto the floor of the House. The rest of the guard were placed at the door and in the lobby. Vane from his place cried out, 'This is not honest, yea, it is against morality and common honesty.' Cromwell, who evidently regarded Vane as the breaker of the supposed agreement, turned on him with a loud voice, crying, 'O Sir Henry Vane, Sir Henry Vane, the Lord deliver me from Sir Henry Vane.' Then looking upon one of the members, he said, 'There sits a drunkard;' to another he said, 'Some of you are unjust, corrupt persons, and scandalous to the profession of the Gospel.' 'Some are whoremasters,' he said, looking at Wentworth and Marten. Going up to the table, he said, 'What shall we do with this Bauble? Here, take it away!' and gave it to a musketeer. 'Fetch him down,' he cried to Harrison, pointing to the Speaker. Lenthall sat still, and refused to come down unless by force. 'Sir,' said Harrison, 'I will lend you my hand,' and putting his hand within his, the Speaker came down. Algernon Sidney sat still in his place. 'Put him out,' said Cromwell. And Harrison and Worsley put their hands on his shoulders, and he rose and went out. The members went out, fifty-three in all, Cromwell still calling aloud. To Vane he said that he might have prevented this; but that he was a juggler and had not common honesty. 'It is you,' he said, as they passed him, 'that have forced me to do this, for I have sought the Lord night and day, that He would rather slay me than put me on the doing of this work.' He snatched the Bill of dissolution from the hand of the clerk, put it under his cloak, seized on the records, ordered the guard to clear the House of all members, and to have the door locked, and went away to Whitehall. Such is one of the most famous scenes in our history, that which of all other things has most heavily weighed on the fame of Cromwell. In truth it is a matter of no small complexity, which neither constitutional eloquence nor boisterous sarcasm has quite adequately unravelled. . . . In strict constitutional right the House was no more the Parliament than Cromwell was the king. A House of Commons, which had executed the king, abolished the Lords, approved the 'coup d'état' of Pride, and by successive proscriptions had reduced itself to a few score of extreme partisans, had no legal title to the name of Parliament. The junto which held to Vane was not more numerous than the junto which held to Cromwell; they had far less public support; nor had their services to the Cause been so great. In closing the House, the Lord-General had used

his office of Commander-in-Chief to anticipate one 'coup d'état' by another. Had he been ten minutes late, Vane would himself have dissolved the House; snapping a vote which would give his faction a legal ascendancy. Yet, after all, the fact remains that Vane and the remnant of the famous Long Parliament had that 'scintilla juris,' as lawyers call it, that semblance of legal right, which counts for so much in things political."—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: J. K. Hosmer, *Life of Young Sir Henry Vane*, pt. 3, ch. 17.—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of Oliver Cromwell*, bk. 4 (v. 1).—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, 17th century, bk. 11, ch. 5 (v. 3).—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*, v. 3, ch. 27-29.

A. D. 1653 (June—December).—The Barebones, or Little Parliament.—Six weeks after the expulsion of the Rump, Cromwell, in his own name, and upon his own authority, as "Captain-General and Commander-in-Chief," issued (June 6) a summons to one hundred and forty "persons fearing God and of approved fidelity and honesty," chosen and "nominated" by himself, with the advice of his council of officers, requiring them to be and appear at the Council Chamber of Whitehall on the following fourth day of July, to take upon themselves "the great charge and trust" of providing for "the peace, safety, and good government" of the Commonwealth, and to serve, each, "as a Member for the county" from which he was called. "Of all the Parties so summoned, 'only two' did not attend. Disconsolate Bulstrode says: 'Many of this Assembly being persons of fortune and knowledge, it was much wondered by some that they would at this summons, and from such hands, take upon them the Supreme Authority of this Nation; considering how little right Cromwell and his Officers had to give it, or those Gentlemen to take it.' My disconsolate friend, it is a sign that Puritan England in general accepts this action of Cromwell and his Officers, and thanks them for it, in such a case of extremity; saying as audibly as the means permitted: Yea, we did wish it so. Rather mournful to the disconsolate official mind. . . . The undeniable fact is, these men were, as Whitlocke intimates, a quite reputable Assembly; got together by anxious 'consultation of the godly Clergy' and chief Puritan lights in their respective Counties; not without much earnest revision, and solemn consideration in all kinds, on the part of men adequate enough for such a work, and desirous enough to do it well. The List of the Assembly exists; not yet entirely gone dark for mankind. A fair proportion of them still recognizable to mankind. Actual Peers one or two: founders of Peerage Families, two or three, which still exist among us,—Colonel Edward Montague, Colonel Charles Howard, Anthony Ashley Cooper. And better than King's Peers, certain Peers of Nature; whom if not the King and his pasteboard Norroys have had the luck to make Peers of, the living heart of England has since raised to the Peerage and means to keep there,—Colonel Robert Blake the Sea-King, for one. 'Known persons,' I do think; 'of approved integrity, men fearing God'; and perhaps not entirely destitute of sense any one of them! Truly it seems rather a distinguished Parliament,—even though Mr. Praise-god Barbone, 'the Leather merchant in Fleet-street,' be, as all mortals must admit, a member of it. The fault, I hope, is forgivable. Praise-

god, though he deals in leather, and has a name which can be misspelt, one discerns to be the son of pious parents; to be himself a man of piety, of understanding and weight,—and even of considerable private capital, my witty flunkey friends! We will leave Praise-god to do the best he can, I think. . . . In fact, a real Assembly of the Notables in Puritan England; a Parliament, Parliamentum, or Speaking-Apparatus for the now dominant Interest in England, as exact as could well be got,—much more exact, I suppose, than any ballot-box, free hustings or ale-barrel election usually yields. Such is the Assembly called the Little Parliament, and wittily Barebone's Parliament; which meets on the 4th of July. Their witty name survives; but their history is gone all dark."—T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, pt. 7, speech 1.—The "assembly of godly persons" proved, however, to be quite an unmanageable body, containing so large a number of erratic and impracticable reformers that everything substantial among English institutions was threatened with overthrow at their hands. After five months of busy session, Cromwell was happily able to bring about a dissolution of his parliament, by the action of a majority, surrendering back their powers into his hands,—which was done on the 10th of December, 1653.—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of Oliver Cromwell*, bk. 5 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: J. A. Picton, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 23.

A. D. 1653 (December).—The Establishment and Constitution of the Protectorate.—The Instrument of Government.—"What followed the dissolution of the Little Parliament is soon told. The Council of Officers having been summoned by Cromwell as the only power de facto, there were dialogues and deliberations, ending in the clear conclusion that the method of headship in a 'Single Person' for his whole life must now be tried in the Government of the Commonwealth, and that Cromwell must be that 'Single Person.' The title of King was actually proposed; but, as there were objections to that, Protector was chosen as a title familiar in English History and of venerable associations. Accordingly, Cromwell having consented, and all preparations having been made, he was, on Friday, Dec. 16, in a great assembly of civic, judicial and military dignities, solemnly sworn and installed in the Chancery Court, Westminster Hall, as Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland and Ireland. There were some of his adherents hitherto who did not like this new elevation of their hero, and forsook him in consequence, regarding any experiment of the Single Person method in Government as a treason to true Republicanism, and Cromwell's assent to it as unworthy of him. Among these was Harrison. Lambert, on the other hand, had been the main agent in the change, and took a conspicuous part in the installation-ceremony. In fact, pretty generally throughout the country and even among the Presbyterians, the elevation of Cromwell to some kind of sovereignty had come to be regarded as an inevitable necessity of the time, the only possible salvation of the Commonwealth from the anarchy, or wild and experimental idealism, in matters civil and religious, which had been the visible drift at last of the Barebones or Daft Little Parliament. . . . The powers and duties of the Protectorate had been defined, rather elaborately, in a Constitu-

tional Instrument of forty-two Articles, called 'The Government of the Commonwealth' [more commonly known as The Instrument of Government] to which Cromwell had sworn fidelity at his installation."—D. Masson, *Life of John Milton*, v. 4, bk. 4, ch. 1 and 3.

ALSO IN: J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth: Cromwell*.—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng., 17th Century*, bk. 12, ch. 1 (v. 3).—S. R. Gardiner, *Const. Doc's of the Puritan Rev., introd., sect. 4 and pp. 314-324*.—*Cobbett's Parliamentary Hist. of England*, v. 3, pp. 1417-1426.

The following is the text of the Instrument of Government:

THE government of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging.

I. That the supreme legislative authority of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, shall be and reside in one person, and the people assembled in Parliament; the style of which person shall be the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland.

II. That the exercise of the chief magistracy and the administration of the government over the said countries and dominions, and the people thereof, shall be in the Lord Protector, assisted with a council, the number whereof shall not exceed twenty-one, nor be less than thirteen.

III. That all writs, processes, commissions, patents, grants, and other things, which now run in the name and style of the keepers of the liberty of England by authority of Parliament, shall run in the name and style of the Lord Protector, from whom, for the future, shall be derived all magistracy and honours in these three nations; and have the power of pardons (except in case of murders and treason) and benefit of all forfeitures for the public use; and shall govern the said countries and dominions in all things by the advice of the council, and according to these presents and the laws.

IV. That the Lord Protector, the Parliament sitting, shall dispose and order the militia and forces, both by sea and land, for the peace and good of the three nations, by consent of Parliament; and that the Lord Protector, with the advice and consent of the major part of the council, shall dispose and order the militia for the ends aforesaid in the intervals of Parliament.

V. That the Lord Protector, by the advice aforesaid, shall direct in all things concerning the keeping and holding of a good correspondence with foreign kings, princes, and states; and also, with the consent of the major part of the council, have the power of war and peace.

VI. That the laws shall not be altered, suspended, abrogated, or repealed, nor any new law made, nor any tax, charge, or imposition laid upon the people, but by common consent in Parliament, save only as is expressed in the thirtieth article.

VII. That there shall be a Parliament summoned to meet at Westminster upon the third day of September, 1654, and that successively a Parliament shall be summoned once in every third year, to be accounted from the dissolution of the present Parliament.

VIII. That neither the Parliament to be next summoned, nor any successive Parliaments, shall, during the time of five months, to be accounted from the day of their first meeting, be adjourned,

prorogued, or dissolved, without their own consent.

IX. That as well the next as all other successive Parliaments, shall be summoned and elected in manner hereafter expressed; that is to say, the persons to be chosen within England, Wales, the Isles of Jersey, Guernsey, and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, to sit and serve in Parliament, shall be, and not exceed, the number of four hundred. The persons to be chosen within Scotland, to sit and serve in Parliament, shall be, and not exceed, the number of thirty; and the persons to be chosen to sit in Parliament for Ireland shall be, and not exceed, the number of thirty.

X. That the persons to be elected to sit in Parliament from time to time, for the several counties of England, Wales, the Isles of Jersey and Guernsey, and the town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, and all places within the same respectively, shall be according to the proportions and numbers hereafter expressed: that is to say, Bedfordshire, 5; Bedford Town, 1; Berkshire, 5; Abingdon, 1; Reading, 1; Buckinghamshire, 5; Buckingham Town, 1; Aylesbury, 1; Wycomb, 1; Cambridgeshire, 4; Cambridge Town, 1; Cambridge University, 1; Isle of Ely, 2; Cheshire, 4; Chester, 1; Cornwall, 8; Launceston, 1; Truro, 1; Penryn, 1; East Looe and West Looe, 1; Cumberland, 2; Carlisle, 1; Derbyshire, 4; Derby Town, 1; Devonshire, 11; Exeter, 2; Plymouth, 2; Clifton, Dartmouth, Hardness, 1; Totnes, 1; Barnstable, 1; Tiverton, 1; Honiton, 1; Dorsetshire, 6; Dorchester, 1; Weymouth and Melcomb-Regis, 1; Lyme-Regis, 1; Poole, 1; Durham, 2; City of Durham, 1; Essex, 13; Malden, 1; Colchester, 2; Gloucestershire, 5; Gloucester, 2; Tewkesbury, 1; Cirencester, 1; Herefordshire, 4; Hereford, 1; Leominster, 1; Hertfordshire, 5; St. Alban's, 1; Hertford, 1; Huntingdonshire, 3; Huntingdon, 1; Kent, 11; Canterbury, 2; Rochester, 1; Maidstone, 1; Dover, 1; Sandwich, 1; Queenborough, 1; Lancashire, 4; Preston, 1; Lancaster, 1; Liverpool, 1; Manchester, 1; Leicestershire, 4; Leicester, 2; Lincolnshire, 10; Lincoln, 2; Boston, 1; Grantham, 1; Stamford, 1; Great Grimsby, 1; Middlesex, 4; London, 6; Westminster, 2; Monmouthshire, 3; Norfolk, 10; Norwich, 2; Lynn-Regis, 2; Great Yarmouth, 2; Northamptonshire, 6; Peterborough, 1; Northampton, 1; Nottinghamshire, 4; Nottingham, 2; Northumberland, 3; Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1; Berwick, 1; Oxfordshire, 5; Oxford City, 1; Oxford University, 1; Woodstock, 1; Rutlandshire, 2; Shropshire, 4; Shrewsbury, 2; Bridgnorth, 1; Ludlow, 1; Staffordshire, 3; Lichfield, 1; Stafford, 1; Newcastle-under-Lyne, 1; Somersetshire, 11; Bristol, 2; Taunton, 2; Bath, 1; Wells, 1; Bridgewater, 1; Southamptonshire, 8; Winchester, 1; Southampton, 1; Portsmouth, 1; Isle of Wight, 2; Andover, 1; Suffolk, 10; Ipswich, 2; Bury St. Edmunds, 2; Dunwich, 1; Sudbury, 1; Surrey, 6; Southwark, 2; Guildford, 1; Reigate, 1; Sussex, 9; Chichester, 1; Lewes, 1; East Grinstead, 1; Arundel, 1; Rye, 1; Westmoreland, 2; Warwickshire, 4; Coventry, 2; Warwick, 1; Wiltshire, 10; New Sarum, 2; Marlborough, 1; Devizes, 1; Worcestershire, 5; Worcester, 2. YORKSHIRE.—West Riding, 6; East Riding, 4; North Riding, 4; City of York, 2; Kingston-upon-Hull, 1; Beverley, 1; Scarborough, 1; Richmond, 1; Leeds, 1; Halifax, 1. WALES.—Anglesey, 2;

Brecknockshire, 2; Cardiganshire, 2; Carmarthenshire, 2; Carnarvonshire, 2; Denbighshire, 2; Flintshire, 2; Glamorganshire, 2; Cardiff, 1; Merionethshire, 1; Montgomeryshire, 2; Pembrokeshire, 2; Haverfordwest, 1; Radnorshire, 2. The distribution of the persons to be chosen for Scotland and Ireland, and the several counties, cities, and places therein, shall be according to such proportions and number as shall be agreed upon and declared by the Lord Protector and the major part of the council, before the sending forth writs of summons for the next Parliament.

XI. That the summons to Parliament shall be by writ under the Great Seal of England, directed to the sheriffs of the several and respective counties, with such alteration as may suit with the present government to be made by the Lord Protector and his council, which the Chancellor, Keeper, or Commissioners of the Great Seal shall seal, issue, and send abroad by warrant from the Lord Protector. If the Lord Protector shall not give warrant for issuing of writs of summons for the next Parliament, before the first of June, 1654, or for the Triennial Parliaments, before the first day of August in every third year, to be accounted as aforesaid; that then the Chancellor, Keeper, or Commissioners of the Great Seal for the time being, shall, without any warrant or direction, within seven days after the said first day of June, 1654, seal, issue, and send abroad writs of summons (changing therein what is to be changed as aforesaid) to the several and respective sheriffs of England, Scotland, and Ireland, for summoning the Parliament to meet at Westminster, the third day of September next; and shall likewise, within seven days after the said first day of August, in every third year, to be accounted from the dissolution of the precedent Parliament, seal, issue, and send forth abroad several writs of summons (changing therein what is to be changed) as aforesaid, for summoning the Parliament to meet at Westminster the sixth of November in that third year. That the said several and respective sheriffs, shall, within ten days after the receipt of such writ as aforesaid, cause the same to be proclaimed and published in every market-town within his county upon the market-days thereof, between twelve and three of the clock; and shall then also publish and declare the certain day of the week and month, for choosing members to serve in Parliament for the body of the said county, according to the tenor of the said writ, which shall be upon Wednesday five weeks after the date of the writ; and shall likewise declare the place where the election shall be made; for which purpose he shall appoint the most convenient place for the whole county to meet in; and shall send precepts for elections to be made in all and every city, town, borough, or place within his county, where elections are to be made by virtue of these presents, to the Mayor, Sheriff, or other head officer of such city, town, borough, or place, within three days after the receipt of such writ and writs; which the said Mayors, Sheriffs, and officers respectively are to make publication of, and of the certain day for such elections to be made in the said city, town, or place aforesaid, and to cause elections to be made accordingly.

XII. That at the day and place of elections, the Sheriff of each county, and the said Mayors, Sheriffs, Bailiffs, and other head officers within

their cities, towns, boroughs, and places respectively, shall take view of the said elections, and shall make return into the chancery within twenty days after the said elections, of the persons elected by the greater number of electors, under their hands and seals, between him on the one part, and the electors on the other part; wherein shall be contained, that the persons elected shall not have power to alter the government as it is hereby settled in one single person and a Parliament.

XIII. That the Sheriff, who shall wittingly and willingly make any false return, or neglect his duty, shall incur the penalty of 2,000 marks of lawful English money; the one moiety to the Lord Protector, and the other moiety to such person as will sue for the same.

XIV. That all and every person and persons, who have aided, advised, assisted, or abetted in any war against the Parliament, since the first day of January 1641 (unless they have been since in the service of the Parliament, and given signal testimony of their good affection thereunto) shall be disabled and incapable to be elected, or to give any vote in the election of any members to serve in the next Parliament, or in the three succeeding Triennial Parliaments.

XV. That all such, who have advised, assisted, or abetted the rebellion of Ireland, shall be disabled and incapable for ever to be elected, or give any vote in the election of any member to serve in Parliament; as also all such who do or shall profess the Roman Catholic religion.

XVI. That all votes and elections given or made contrary, or not according to these qualifications, shall be null and void; and if any person, who is hereby made incapable, shall give his vote for election of members to serve in Parliament, such person shall lose and forfeit one full year's value of his real estate, and one full third part of his personal estate; one moiety thereof to the Lord Protector, and the other moiety to him or them who shall sue for the same.

XVII. That the persons who shall be elected to serve in Parliament, shall be such (and no other than such) as are persons of known integrity, fearing God, and of good conversation, and being of the age of twenty-one years.

XVIII. That all and every person and persons seized or possessed to his own use, of any estate, real or personal, to the value of £200, and not within the aforesaid exceptions, shall be capable to elect members to serve in Parliament for counties.

XIX. That the Chancellor, Keeper, or Commissioners of the Great Seal, shall be sworn before they enter into their offices, truly and faithfully to issue forth, and send abroad, writs of summons to Parliament, at the times and in the manner before expressed: and in case of neglect or failure to issue and send abroad writs accordingly, he or they shall for every such offence be guilty of high treason, and suffer the pains and penalties thereof.

XX. That in case writs be not issued out, as is before expressed, but that there be a neglect therein, fifteen days after the time wherein the same ought to be issued out by the Chancellor, Keeper, or Commissioners of the Great Seal; that then the Parliament shall, as often as such failure shall happen, assemble and be held at Westminster, in the usual place, at the times prefixed, in manner and by the means hereafter

expressed; that is to say, that the sheriffs of the several and respective counties, sheriffdoms, cities, boroughs, and places aforesaid, within England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, the Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the Mayor and Bailiffs of the borough of Berwick-upon-Tweed, and other places aforesaid respectively, shall at the several courts and places to be appointed as aforesaid, within thirty days after the said fifteen days, cause such members to be chosen for their said several and respective counties, sheriffdoms, universities, cities, boroughs, and places aforesaid, by such persons, and in such manner, as if several and respective writs of summons to Parliament under the Great Seal had issued and been awarded according to the tenor aforesaid; that if the sheriff, or other persons authorized, shall neglect his or their duty herein, that all and every such sheriff and person authorized as aforesaid, so neglecting his or their duty, shall, for every such offence, be guilty of high treason, and shall suffer the pains and penalties thereof.

XXI. That the clerk, called the clerk of the Commonwealth in Chancery for the time being, and all others, who shall afterwards execute that office, to whom the returns shall be made, shall for the next Parliament, and the two succeeding Triennial Parliaments, the next day after such return, certify the names of the several persons so returned, and of the places for which he and they were chosen respectively, unto the Council; who shall peruse the said returns, and examine whether the persons so elected and returned be such as is agreeable to the qualifications, and not disabled to be elected: and that every person and persons being so duly elected, and being approved of by the major part of the Council to be persons not disabled, but qualified as aforesaid, shall be esteemed a member of Parliament, and be admitted to sit in Parliament, and not otherwise.

XXII. That the persons so chosen and assembled in manner aforesaid, or any sixty of them, shall be, and be deemed the Parliament of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and the supreme legislative power to be and reside in the Lord Protector and such Parliament, in manner herein expressed.

XXIII. That the Lord Protector, with the advice of the major part of the Council, shall at any other time than is before expressed, when the necessities of the State shall require it, summon Parliaments in manner before expressed, which shall not be adjourned, prorogued, or dissolved without their own consent, during the first three months of their sitting. And in case of future war with any foreign State, a Parliament shall be forthwith summoned for their advice concerning the same.

XXIV. That all Bills agreed unto by the Parliament, shall be presented to the Lord Protector for his consent; and in case he shall not give his consent thereto within twenty days after they shall be presented to him, or give satisfaction to the Parliament within the time limited, that then, upon declaration of the Parliament that the Lord Protector hath not consented nor given satisfaction, such Bills shall pass into and become laws, although he shall not give his consent thereunto; provided such Bills contain nothing in them contrary to the matters contained in these presents.

XXV. That [Henry Lawrence, esq.; Philip lord visc. Lisle; the majors general Lambert, Desborough, and Skippon; lieut. general Fleetwood; the colonels Edw. Montagu, Philip Jones, and Wm. Sydenham; sir Gilbert Pickering, sir Ch. Wolseley, and sir Anth. Ashley Cooper, Barts., Francis Rouse, esq., Speaker of the late Convention, Walter Strickland, and Rd. Major, esqrs.] — or any seven of them, shall be a Council for the purposes expressed in this writing; and upon the death or other removal of any of them, the Parliament shall nominate six persons of ability, integrity, and fearing God, for every one that is dead or removed; out of which the major part of the Council shall elect two, and present them to the Lord Protector, of which he shall elect one; and in case the Parliament shall not nominate within twenty days after notice given unto them thereof, the major part of the Council shall nominate three as aforesaid to the Lord Protector, who out of them shall supply the vacancy; and until this choice be made, the remaining part of the Council shall execute as fully in all things, as if their number were full. And in case of corruption, or other miscarriage in any of the Council in their trust, the Parliament shall appoint seven of their number, and the Council six, who, together with the Lord Chancellor, Lord Keeper, or Commissioners of the Great Seal for the time being, shall have power to hear and determine such corruption and miscarriage, and to award and inflict punishment, as the nature of the offence shall deserve, which punishment shall not be pardoned or remitted by the Lord Protector; and, in the interval of Parliaments, the major part of the Council, with the consent of the Lord Protector, may, for corruption or other miscarriage as aforesaid, suspend any of their number from the exercise of their trust, if they shall find it just, until the matter shall be heard and examined as aforesaid.

XXVI. That the Lord Protector and the major part of the Council aforesaid may, at any time before the meeting of the next Parliament, add to the Council such persons as they shall think fit, provided the number of the Council be not made thereby to exceed twenty-one, and the quorum to be proportioned accordingly by the Lord Protector and the major part of the Council.

XXVII. That a constant yearly revenue shall be raised, settled, and established for maintaining of 10,000 horse and dragoons, and 20,000 foot, in England, Scotland and Ireland, for the defence and security thereof, and also for a convenient number of ships for guarding of the seas; besides £200,000 per annum for defraying the other necessary charges of administration of justice, and other expenses of the Government, which revenue shall be raised by the customs, and such other ways and means as shall be agreed upon by the Lord Protector and the Council, and shall not be taken away or diminished, nor the way agreed upon for raising the same altered, but by the consent of the Lord Protector and the Parliament.

XXVIII. That the said yearly revenue shall be paid into the public treasury, and shall be issued out for the uses aforesaid.

XXIX. That in case there shall not be cause hereafter to keep up so great a defence both at land or sea, but that there be an abatement made thereof, the money which will be saved thereby

shall remain in bank for the public service, and not be employed to any other use but by consent of Parliament, or, in the intervals of Parliament, by the Lord Protector and major part of the Council.

XXX. That the raising of money for defraying the charge of the present extraordinary forces, both at sea and land, in respect of the present wars, shall be by consent of Parliament, and not otherwise: save only that the Lord Protector, with the consent of the major part of the Council, for preventing the disorders and dangers which might otherwise fall out both by sea and land, shall have power, until the meeting of the first Parliament, to raise money for the purposes aforesaid; and also to make laws and ordinances for the peace and welfare of these nations where it shall be necessary, which shall be binding and in force, until order shall be taken in Parliament concerning the same.

XXXI. That the lands, tenements, rents, royalties, jurisdictions and hereditaments which remain yet unsold or undisposed of, by Act or Ordinance of Parliament, belonging to the Commonwealth (except the forests and chases, and the honours and manors belonging to the same; the lands of the rebels in Ireland, lying in the four counties of Dublin, Cork, Kildare, and Carlow; the lands forfeited by the people of Scotland in the late wars, and also the lands of Papists and delinquents in England who have not yet compounded), shall be vested in the Lord Protector, to hold, to him and his successors, Lords Protectors of these nations, and shall not be alienated but by consent in Parliament. And all debts, fines, issues, amercements, penalties and profits, certain and casual, due to the Keepers of the liberties of England by authority of Parliament, shall be due to the Lord Protector, and be payable into his public receipt, and shall be recovered and prosecuted in his name.

XXXII. That the office of Lord Protector over these nations shall be elective and not hereditary; and upon the death of the Lord Protector, another fit person shall be forthwith elected to succeed him in the Government; which election shall be by the Council, who, immediately upon the death of the Lord Protector, shall assemble in the Chamber where they usually sit in Council; and, having given notice to all their members of the cause of their assembling, shall, being thirteen at least present, proceed to the election; and, before they depart the said Chamber, shall elect a fit person to succeed in the Government, and forthwith cause proclamation thereof to be made in all the three nations as shall be requisite; and the person that they, or the major part of them, shall elect as aforesaid, shall be, and shall be taken to be, Lord Protector over these nations of England, Scotland and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging. Provided that none of the children of the late King, nor any of his line or family, be elected to be Lord Protector or other Chief Magistrate over these nations, or any the dominions thereto belonging. And until the aforesaid election be past, the Council shall take care of the Government, and administer in all things as fully as the Lord Protector, or the Lord Protector and Council are enabled to do.

XXXIII. That Oliver Cromwell, Captain-General of the forces of England, Scotland and Ireland, shall be, and is hereby declared to be, Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of Eng-

land, Scotland and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging, for his life.

XXXIV. That the Chancellor, Keeper or Commissioners of the Great Seal, the Treasurer, Admiral, Chief Governors of Ireland and Scotland, and the Chief Justices of both the Benches, shall be chosen by the approbation of Parliament; and, in the intervals of Parliament, by the approbation of the major part of the Council, to be afterwards approved by the Parliament.

XXXV. That the Christian religion, as contained in the Scriptures, be held forth and recommended as the public profession of these nations; and that, as soon as may be, a provision, less subject to scruple and contention, and more certain than the present, be made for the encouragement and maintenance of able and painful teachers, for the instructing the people, and for discovery and confutation of error, hereby, and whatever is contrary to sound doctrine; and until such provision be made, the present maintenance shall not be taken away or impeached.

XXXVI. That to the public profession held forth none shall be compelled by penalties or otherwise; but that endeavours be used to win them by sound doctrine and the example of a good conversation.

XXXVII. That such as profess faith in God by Jesus Christ (though differing in judgment from the doctrine, worship or discipline publicly held forth) shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in, the profession of the faith and exercise of their religion; so as they abuse not this liberty to the civil injury of others and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts: provided this liberty be not extended to Popery or Prelacy, nor to such as, under the profession of Christ, hold forth and practice licentiousness.

XXXVIII. That all laws, statutes and ordinances, and clauses in any law, statute or ordinance to the contrary of the aforesaid liberty, shall be esteemed as null and void.

XXXIX. That the Acts and Ordinances of Parliament made for the sale or other disposition of the lands, rents and hereditaments of the late King, Queen, and Prince, of Archbishops and Bishops, &c., Deans and Chapters, the lands of delinquents and forest-lands, or any of them, or of any other lands, tenements, rents and hereditaments belonging to the Commonwealth, shall nowise be impeached or made invalid, but shall remain good and firm; and that the securities given by Act and Ordinance of Parliament for any sum or sums of money, by any of the said lands, the excise, or any other public revenue; and also the securities given by the public faith of the nation, and the engagement of the public faith for satisfaction of debts and damages, shall remain firm and good, and not be made void and invalid upon any pretence whatsoever.

XL. That the Articles given to or made with the enemy, and afterwards confirmed by Parliament, shall be performed and made good to the persons concerned therein; and that such appeals as were depending in the last Parliament for relief concerning bills of sale of delinquent's estates, may be heard and determined the next Parliament, anything in this writing or otherwise to the contrary notwithstanding.

XLI. That every successive Lord Protector over these nations shall take and subscribe a

solemn oath, in the presence of the Council, and such others as they shall call to them, that he will seek the peace, quiet and welfare of these nations, cause law and justice to be equally administered; and that he will not violate or infringe the matters and things contained in this writing, and in all other things will, to his power and to the best of his understanding, govern these nations according to the laws, statutes and customs thereof.

XLII. That each person of the Council shall, before they enter upon their trust, take and subscribe an oath, that they will be true and faithful in their trust, according to the best of their knowledge; and that in the election of every successive Lord Protector they shall proceed therein impartially, and do nothing therein for any promise, fear, favour or reward.

A. D. 1654.—Re-conquest of Acadia (Nova Scotia). See NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1621-1668.

A. D. 1654 (April).—Incorporation of Scotland with the Commonwealth. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1654.

A. D. 1654-1658.—The Protector, his Parliaments and his Major-Generals.—The Humble Petition and Advice.—Differing views of the Cromwellian autocracy.—"Oliver addressed his first Protectorate Parliament on Sunday, the 3d of September. . . . Immediately, under the leadership of old Parliamentarians, Haslerig, Scott, Bradshaw, and many other republicans, the House proceeded to debate the Instrument of Government, the constitutional basis of the existing system. By five votes, it decided to discuss 'whether the House should approve of government by a Single Person and a Parliament.' This was of course to set up the principle of making the Executive dependent on the House; a principle, in Oliver's mind, fatal to settlement and order. He acted at once. Calling on the Lord Mayor to secure the city, and disposing of his own guard round Westminster Hall, he summoned the House again on the 9th day. . . . Members were called on to sign a declaration, 'not to alter the government as settled in a Single Person and a Parliament.' Some 300 signed; the minority—about a fourth—refused and retired. . . . The Parliament, in spite of the declaration, set itself from the first to discuss the constitution, to punish heretics, suppress blasphemy, revise the Ordinances of the Council; and they deliberately withheld all supplies for the services and the government. At last they passed an Act for revising the constitution de novo. Not a single bill had been sent up to the Protector for his assent. Oliver, as usual, acted at once. On the expiration of their five lunar months, 22d January 1655, he summoned the House and dissolved it, with a speech full of reproaches."—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 11.—"In 1656, the Protector called a second Parliament. By excluding from it about a hundred members whom he judged to be hostile to his government, he found himself on amicable terms with the new assembly. It presented to him a Humble Petition and Advice, asking that certain changes of the Constitution might be agreed to by mutual consent, and that he should assume the title of King. This title he rejected, and the Humble Petition and Advice was passed in an amended form on May 25, 1657, and at once received the assent of the Protector. On June 26, it was modified in some details by the Additional Petition and Advice. Taking the two together,

the result was to enlarge the power of Parliament and to diminish that of the Council. The Protector, in turn, received the right of appointing his successor, and to name the life-members of 'the other House,' which was now to take the place of the House of Lords. . . . In accordance with the Additional Petition and Advice, the Protector summoned 'certain persons to sit in the other House.' A quarrel between the two Houses broke out, and the Protector [Feb. 4, 1658] dissolved the Parliament in anger."—S. R. Gardiner, *Const. Doc's of the Puritan Revolution*, pp. lxxiii-lxxiv., and 334-350.—"To govern according to law may sometimes be an usurper's wish, but can seldom be in his power. The protector [in 1655] abandoned all thought of it. Dividing the kingdom into districts, he placed at the head of each a major-general as a sort of military magistrate, responsible for the subjection of his prefecture. These were eleven in number, men bitterly hostile to the royalist party, and insolent towards all civil authority. They were employed to secure the payment of a tax of 10 per cent., imposed by Cromwell's arbitrary will on those who had ever sided with the king during the late wars, where their estates exceeded £100 per annum. The major-generals, in their correspondence printed among Thurloe's papers, display a rapacity and oppression beyond their master's. . . . All illusion was now gone as to the pretended benefits of the civil war. It had ended in a despotism, compared to which all the illegal practices of former kings, all that had cost Charles his life and crown, appeared as dust in the balance. For what was ship-money, a general burthen, by the side of the present decimation of a single class, whose offence had long been expiated by a composition and effaced by an act of indemnity? or were the excessive punishments of the star-chamber so odious as the capital executions inflicted without trial by peers, whenever it suited the usurper to erect his high court of justice? . . . I cannot . . . agree in the praises which have been showered upon Cromwell for the just administration of the laws under his dominion. That, between party and party, the ordinary civil rights of men were fairly dealt with, is no extraordinary praise; and it may be admitted that he filled the benches of justice with able lawyers, though not so considerable as those of the reign of Charles II.; but it is manifest that, so far as his own authority was concerned, no hereditary despot, proud in the crimes of a hundred ancestors, could more have spurred at every limitation than this soldier of a commonwealth."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 10, pt. 2.—"Cromwell was, and felt himself to be, a dictator called in by the winning cause in a revolution to restore confidence and secure peace. He was, as he said frequently, 'the Constable set to keep order in the Parish.' Nor was he in any sense a military despot. . . . Never did a ruler invested with absolute power and overwhelming military force more obstinately strive to surround his authority with legal limits and Parliamentary control."—F. Harrison, *Oliver Cromwell*, ch. 11.—"To this condition, then, England was now reduced. After the gallantest fight for liberty that had ever been fought by any nation in the world, she found herself trampled under foot by a military despot. All the vices of old kingly rule were nothing to what was now imposed upon her."—J. Forster, *Statesmen of the Commonwealth*:

Cromwell.—“His [Cromwell’s] wish seems to have been to govern constitutionally, and to substitute the empire of the laws for that of the sword. But he soon found that, hated as he was, both by Royalists and Presbyterians, he could be safe only by being absolute. . . . Those soldiers who would not suffer him to assume the kingly title, stood by him when he ventured on acts of power as high as any English king has ever attempted. The government, therefore, though in form a republic, was in truth a despotism, moderated only by the wisdom, the sobriety and the magnanimity of the despot.”—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1655-1658.—War with Spain, alliance with France.—Acquisition of Dunkirk.—“Though the German war [‘the Thirty Years’ War,’ concluded in 1648 by the Treaty of Westphalia] was over, the struggle between France and Spain was continued with great animosity, each country striving to crush her rival and become the first power in Europe. Both Louis XIV. and Philip IV. of Spain were bidding for the protector’s support. Spain offered the possession of Calais, when taken from France; France the possession of Dunkirk when taken from Spain (1655). Cromwell determined to ally himself with France against Spain. . . . It was in the West Indies that the obstructive policy of Spain came most into collision with the interests of England. Her kings based their claims to the possession of two continents on the bull of Pope Alexander VI., who in 1493 had granted them all lands they should discover from pole to pole, at the distance of 100 leagues west from the Azores and Cape Verd Islands. On the strength of this bull they held that the discovery of an island gave them the right to the group, the discovery of a headland the right to a continent. Though this monstrous claim had quite broken down as far as the North American continent was concerned, the Spaniards, still recognizing ‘no peace beyond the line,’ endeavoured to shut all Europeans but themselves out of any share in the trade or colonization of at least the southern half of the New World. . . . While war was now proclaimed with Spain, a treaty of peace was signed between France and England, Louis XIV. agreeing to banish Charles Stuart and his brothers from French territory (Oct. 24, 1655). This treaty was afterwards changed into a league, offensive and defensive (March 23, 1657), Cromwell undertaking to assist Louis with 6,000 men in besieging Gravelines, Mardyke, and Dunkirk, on condition of receiving the two latter towns when reduced by the allied armies. By the occupation of these towns Cromwell intended to control the trade of the Channel, to hold the Dutch in check, who were then but unwilling friends, and to lessen the danger of invasion from any union of Royalists and Spaniards. The war opened in the year 1657 [Jamaica, however, had already been taken from the Spaniards and St. Domingo attacked], with another triumph by sea.” This was Blake’s last exploit. He attacked and destroyed the Spanish bullion fleet, from Mexico, in the harbor of Santa Cruz, island of Teneriffe, and silenced the forts which guarded it. The great sea-captain died on his voyage home, after striking this blow. The next spring “the siege of Dunkirk was commenced (May, 1658). The Spaniards tried to relieve the town, but were completely defeated in an engagement

called the Battle of the Dunes from the sand hills among which it was fought; the defeat was mainly owing to the courage and discipline of Oliver’s troops, who won for themselves the name of ‘the Immortal Six Thousand.’ . . . Ten days after the battle Dunkirk surrendered, and the French had no choice but to give over to the English ambassador the keys of a town they thought ‘un si bon morceau’ (June 25).”—B. M. Cordery and J. S. Phillpotts, *King and Commonwealth*, ch. 15.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell’s Letters and Speeches*, bk. 9, speech 5 and bk. 10, letters 152-157.—J. Campbell, *Naval Hist. of Gt. B.*, ch. 15 (v. 2).—J. Waylen, *The House of Cromwell and the Story of Dunkirk*, pp. 173-272.—W. H. Dixon, *Robert Blake*, ch. 9-10.—D. Hannay, *Admiral Blake*, ch. 9-11.—See, also, FRANCE: A. D. 1655-1658.

A. D. 1658-1660.—The fall of the Protectorate and Restoration of the Stuarts.—King Charles II.—When Oliver Cromwell died, on the 3d day of September, 1658—the anniversary of his victories at Dunbar and at Worcester—his eldest son Richard, whom he had nominated, it was said, on his death-bed, was proclaimed Protector, and succeeded him “as quietly as any King had ever been succeeded by any Prince of Wales. During five months, the administration of Richard Cromwell went on so tranquilly and regularly that all Europe believed him to be firmly established on the chair of state.” But Richard had none of his father’s genius or personal power, and the discontents and jealousies which the former had rigorously suppressed soon tossed the latter from his unstable throne by their fierce upheaval. He summoned a new Parliament (Jan. 27, 1659), which recognized and confirmed his authority, though containing a powerful opposition, of uncompromising republicans and secret royalists. But the army, which the great Protector had tamed to submissive obedience, was now stirred into mischievous action once more as a political power in the state, subservient to the ambition of Fleetwood and other commanders. Richard Cromwell could not make himself the master of his father’s battalions. “He was used by the army as an instrument for the purpose of dissolving the Parliament [April 22], and was then contemptuously thrown aside. The officers gratified their republican allies by declaring that the expulsion of the Rump had been illegal, and by inviting that assembly to resume its functions. The old Speaker and a quorum of the old members came together [May 9] and were proclaimed, amidst the scarcely stifled derision and execration of the whole nation, the supreme power in the Commonwealth. It was at the same time expressly declared that there should be no first magistrate and no House of Lords. But this state of things could not last. On the day on which the Long Parliament revived, revived also its old quarrel with the army. Again the Rump forgot that it owed its existence to the pleasure of the soldiers, and began to treat them as subjects. Again the doors of the House of Commons were closed by military violence [Oct. 13]; and a provisional government, named by the officers, assumed the direction of affairs.” The troops stationed in Scotland, under Monk, had not been consulted, however, in these transactions, and were evidently out of sympathy with their comrades in England. Monk, who had never meddled with politics before, was now

induced to interfere. He refused to acknowledge the military provisional government, declared himself the champion of the civil power, and marched into England at the head of his 7,000 veterans. His movement was everywhere welcomed and encouraged by popular demonstrations of delight. The army in England lost courage and lost unity, awed and paralyzed by the public feeling at last set free. Monk reached London without opposition, and was the recognized master of the realm. Nobody knew his intentions—himself, perhaps, as little as any—and it was not until after a period of protracted suspense that he declared himself for the convening of a new and free Parliament, in the place of the Rump—which had again resumed its sittings—for the settlement of the state. "The result of the elections was such as might have been expected from the temper of the nation. The new House of Commons consisted, with few exceptions, of persons friendly to the royal family. The Presbyterians formed the majority. . . . The new Parliament, which, having been called without the royal writ, is more accurately described as a Convention, met at Westminster [April 26, 1660]. The Lords repaired to the hall, from which they had, during more than eleven years, been excluded by force. Both Houses instantly invited the King to return to his country. He was proclaimed with pomp never before known. A gallant fleet convoyed him from Holland to the coast of Kent. When he landed [May 25, 1660], the cliffs of Dover were covered by thousands of gazers, among whom scarcely one could be found who was not weeping with delight. The journey to London was a continued triumph."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 1. —The only guarantee with which the careless nation took back their ejected kings of the faithless race of Stuarts was embodied in a Declaration which Charles sent over from "Our Court at Breda" in April, and which was read in Parliament with an effusive display of respect and thankfulness. In this Declaration from Breda, "a general amnesty and liberty of conscience were promised, with such exceptions and limitations only as the Parliament should think fit to make. All delicate questions, among others the proprietorship of confiscated estates, were in like manner referred to the decision of Parliament, thus leaving the King his liberty while diminishing his responsibility; and though fully asserting the ancient rights of the Crown, he announced his intention to associate the two Houses with himself in all great affairs of State."—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of Rich'd Cromwell and the Restoration*, bk. 4 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time*, bk. 2, 1660-61.—Earl of Clarendon, *Hist. of the Rebellion*, bk. 16 (v. 6).—D. Masson, *Life of Milton*, v. 5, bk. 3.—J. Corbett, *Monk*, ch. 9-14.

A. D. 1660-1685.—The Merry Monarch.—"There never were such profligate times in England as under Charles the Second. Whenever you see his portrait, with his swarthy ill-looking face and great nose, you may fancy him in his Court at Whitehall, surrounded by some of the very worst vagabonds in the kingdom (though they were lords and ladies), drinking, gambling, indulging in vicious conversation, and committing every kind of profligate excess. It has been a fashion to call Charles the Second 'The Merry Monarch.' Let me try to give you a general

idea of some of the merry things that were done, in the merry days when this merry gentleman sat upon his merry throne, in merry England. The first merry proceeding was—of course—to declare that he was one of the greatest, the wisest, and the noblest kings that ever shone, like the blessed sun itself, on this benighted earth. The next merry and pleasant piece of business was, for the Parliament, in the humblest manner, to give him one million two hundred thousand pounds a year, and to settle upon him for life that old disputed 'tonnage and poundage' which had been so bravely fought for. Then, General Monk, being made Earl of Albemarle, and a few other Royalists similarly rewarded, the law went to work to see what was to be done to those persons (they were called Regicides) who had been concerned in making a martyr of the late King. Ten of these were merrily executed; that is to say, six of the judges, one of the council, Colonel Hacker and another officer who had commanded the Guards, and Hugh Peters, a preacher who had preached against the martyr with all his heart. These executions were so extremely merry, that every horrible circumstance which Cromwell had abandoned was revived with appalling cruelty. . . . Sir Harry Vane, who had furnished the evidence against Strafford, and was one of the most staunch of the Republicans, was also tried, found guilty, and ordered for execution. . . . These merry scenes were succeeded by another, perhaps even merrier. On the anniversary of the late King's death, the bodies of Oliver Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw, were torn out of their graves in Westminster Abbey, dragged to Tyburn, hanged there on a gallows all day long, and then beheaded. Imagine the head of Oliver Cromwell set upon a pole to be stared at by a brutal crowd, not one of whom would have dared to look the living Oliver in the face for half a moment! Think, after you have read this reign, what England was under Oliver Cromwell who was torn out of his grave, and what it was under this merry monarch who sold it, like a merry Judas, over and over again. Of course, the remains of Oliver's wife and daughter were not to be spared, either, though they had been most excellent women. The base clergy of that time gave up their bodies, which had been buried in the Abbey, and—to the eternal disgrace of England—they were thrown into a pit, together with the mouldering bones of Pym, and of the brave and bold old Admiral Blake. . . . The whole Court was a great flaunting crowd of debauched men and shameless women; and Catherine's merry husband insulted and outraged her in every possible way, until she consented to receive those worthless creatures as her very good friends, and to degrade herself by their companionship. A Mrs. Palmer, whom the King made Lady Castlemaine, and afterwards Duchess of Cleveland, was one of the most powerful of the bad women about the Court, and had great influence with the King nearly all through his reign. Another merry lady named Moll Davies, a dancer at the theatre, was afterwards her rival. So was Nell Gwyn, first an orange girl and then an actress, who really had good in her, and of whom one of the worst things I know is, that actually she does seem to have been fond of the King. The first Duke of St. Albans was this orange girl's child. In like manner the son of a merry waiting-lady, whom the King

created Duchess of Portsmouth, became the Duke of Richmond. Upon the whole it is not so bad a thing to be a commoner. The Merry Monarch was so exceedingly merry among these merry ladies, and some equally merry (and equally infamous) lords and gentlemen, that he soon got through his hundred thousand pounds, and then, by way of raising a little pocket-money, made a merry bargain. He sold Dunkirk to the French King for five millions of livres. When I think of the dignity to which Oliver Cromwell raised England in the eyes of foreign powers, and when I think of the manner in which he gained for England this very Dunkirk, I am much inclined to consider that if the Merry Monarch had been made to follow his father for this action, he would have received his just deserts."—C. Dickens, *Child's Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 35.

A. D. 1661.—Acquisition of Bombay. See INDIA: A. D. 1600-1702.

A. D. 1661.—The Savoy Conference.—"The Restoration had been the joint work of Episcopalian and Presbyterian; would it be possible to reconcile them on this question too [i. e., of the settlement of Church government]? The Presbyterian indeed was willing enough for a compromise, for he had an uneasy feeling that the ground was slipping from beneath his feet. Of Charles's intentions he was still in doubt; but he knew that Clarendon was the sworn friend of the Church. The Churchman on the other hand was eagerly expecting the approaching hour of triumph. It soon appeared that as King and Parliament, so King and Church were inseparable in the English mind; that indeed the return of the King was the restoration of the Church even more than it was the restoration of Parliament. In the face of the present Presbyterian majority however it was necessary to temporise. The former incumbents of Church livings were restored, and the Commons took the Communion according to the rites of the Church; but in other respects the Presbyterians were carefully kept in play; Charles taking his part in the elaborate farce by appointing ten of their leading ministers royal chaplains, and even attending their sermons." In October, 1660, Charles "took the matter more completely into his own hands by issuing a Declaration. Refusing, on the ground of constraint, to admit the validity of the oaths imposed upon him in Scotland, by which he was bound to uphold the Covenant, and not concealing his preference for the Anglican Church, as 'the best fence God hath yet raised against popery in the world,' he asserted that nevertheless, to his own knowledge, the Presbyterians were not enemies to Episcopacy or a set liturgy, and were opposed to the alienation of Church revenues. The Declaration then went on to limit the power of bishops and archdeacons in a degree sufficient to satisfy many of the leading Presbyterians, one of whom, Reynolds, accepted a bishopric. Charles then proposed to choose an equal number of learned divines of both persuasions to discuss alterations in the liturgy; meanwhile no one was to be troubled regarding differences of practice. The majority in the Commons at first welcomed the Declaration, . . . and a bill was accordingly introduced by Sir Matthew Hale to turn the Declaration into a law. But Clarendon at any rate had no intention of thus baulking the Church of her revenge. Anticipating Hale's action, he had in the interval been busy in se-

curing a majority against any compromise. The Declaration had done its work in gaining time, and when the bill was brought in it was rejected by 183 to 157 votes. Parliament was at once (December 24) dissolved. The way was now open for the riot of the Anglican triumph. Even before the new House met the mask was thrown off by the issuing of an order to the justices to restore the full liturgy. The conference indeed took place in the Savoy Palace. It failed, like the Hampton Court Conference of James I., because it was intended to fail. Upon the two important points, the authority of bishops and the liturgy, the Anglicans would not give way an inch. Both parties informed the King that, anxious as they were for agreement, they saw no chance of it. This last attempt at union having fallen through, the Government had their hands free; and their intentions were speedily made plain."

—O. Airy, *The Eng. Restoration and Louis XIV.*, ch. 7.—"The Royal Commission [for the Savoy Conference] bore date the 25th of March. It gave the Commissioners authority to review the Book of Common Prayer, to compare it with the most ancient Liturgies, to take into consideration all things which it contained, to consult respecting the exceptions against it, and by agreement to make such necessary alterations as should afford satisfaction to tender consciences, and restore to the Church unity and peace; the instrument appointed 'the Master's lodgings in the Savoy' as the place of meeting. . . . The Commissioners were summoned to meet upon the 15th of April. . . . The Bill of Uniformity, hereafter to be described, actually passed the House of Commons on the 9th of July, about a fortnight before the Conference broke up. The proceedings of a Royal Commission to review the Prayer Book, and make alterations for the satisfaction of tender consciences were, by this premature act, really treated with mockery, a circumstance which could not but exceedingly offend and annoy the Puritan members, and serve to embitter the language of Baxter as the end of these fruitless sittings approached."—J. Stoughton, *Hist. of Religion in Eng.*, v. 3, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: E. Calamy, *Nonconformists' Memorial*, introd., sect. 3.—W. Orme, *Life and Times of Richard Baxter*, ch. 7.

A. D. 1662.—The sale of Dunkirk.—"Unable to confine himself within the narrow limits of his civil list, with his favorites and mistresses, he [Charles II.] would have sought even in the infernal regions the gold which his subjects measured out to him with too parsimonious a hand. . . . [He] proposed to sell to France Dunkirk and its dependencies, which, he said, cost him too much to keep up. He asked twelve million francs; he fell at last to five millions, and the treaty was signed Oct. 27, 1662. It was time; the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London, informed of the negotiation, had determined to offer Charles II. whatever he wished in behalf of their city not to alienate Dunkirk. Charles dared not retract his word, which would have been, as D'Estrades told him, to break forever with Louis XIV., and on the 2d of December Louis joyfully made his entry into his good city, reconquered by gold instead of the sword."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, trans. by M. L. Booth, ch. 4 (v. 1).

A. D. 1662-1665.—The Act of Uniformity and persecution of the Nonconformists.—The

failure of the Savoy Conference "was the conclusion which had been expected and desired. Charles had already summoned the Convocation, and to that assembly was assigned the task which had failed in the hands of the commissioners at the Savoy. . . . The act of uniformity followed [passed by the Commons July 9, 1661; by the Lords May 8, 1662; receiving the royal assent May 19, 1662], by which it was enacted that the revised Book of Common Prayer, and of Ordination of Ministers, and no other, should be used in all places of public worship; and that all beneficed clergymen should read the service from it within a given time, and, at the close, profess in a set form of words, their 'unfeigned assent and consent to everything contained and prescribed in it.' . . . The act of uniformity may have been necessary for the restoration of the church to its former discipline and doctrine; but if such was the intention of those who framed the declaration from Breda, they were guilty of infidelity to the king and of fraud to the people, by putting into his mouth language which, with the aid of equivocation, they might explain away, and by raising in them expectations which it was never meant to fulfil."—J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 11, ch. 4.—"This rigorous act when it passed, gave the ministers, who could not conform, no longer time than till Bartholomewday, August 24th, 1662, when they were all cast out. . . . This was an action without a precedent: The like to this the Reformed church, nay the Christian world, never saw before. Historians relate, with tragical exclamations, that between three and four score bishops were driven at once into the island of Sardinia by the African vandals; that 200 ministers were banished by Ferdinand, king of Bohemia; and that great havock was, a few years after, made among the ministers of Germany by the Imperial Interim. But these all together fall short of the number ejected by the act of uniformity, which was not less than 2,000. The succeeding hardships of the latter were also by far the greatest. They were not only silenced, but had no room left for any sort of usefulness, and were in a manner buried alive. Far greater tenderness was used towards the Popish clergy ejected at the Reformation. They were suffered to live quietly; but these were oppressed to the utmost, and that even by their brethren who professed the same faith themselves: not only excluded preferments, but turned out into the wide world without any visible way of subsistence. Not so much as a poor vicarage, not an obscure chapel, not a school was left them. Nay, though they offered, as some of them did, to preach gratis, it must not be allowed them. . . . The ejected ministers continued for ten years in a state of silence and obscurity. . . . The act of uniformity took place August the 24th, 1662. On the 26th of December following, the king published a Declaration, expressing his purpose to grant some indulgence or liberty in religion. Some of the Nonconformists were hereupon much encouraged, and waiting privately on the king, had their hopes confirmed, and would have persuaded their brethren to have thanked him for his declaration; but they refused, lest they should make way for the toleration of the Papists, whom they understood the king intended to include in it. . . . Instead of indulgence or comprehension, on the 30th of June, an act against private meetings, called the

Conventicle Act, passed the House of Commons, and soon after was made a law, viz.: "That every person above sixteen years of age, present at any meeting, under pretence of any exercise of religion, in other manner than is the practice of the church of England, where there are five persons more than the household, shall for the first offence, by a justice of peace be recorded, and sent to gaol three months, till he pay £5, and for the second offence six months, till he pay £10, and the third time being convicted by a jury, shall be banished to some of the American plantations, excepting New England or Virginia." . . . In the year 1665 the plague broke out"—and the ejected ministers boldly took possession for the time of the deserted London pulpits. "While God was consuming the people by this judgment, and the Nonconformists were labouring to save their souls, the parliament, which sat at Oxford, was busy in making an act [called the Five Mile Act] to render their case incomparably harder than it was before, by putting upon them a certain oath ['that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatsoever, to take arms against the king,' &c.], which, if they refused, they must not come (unless upon the road) within five miles of any city or corporation, any place that sent burgesses to parliament, any place where they had been ministers, or had preached after the act of oblivion. . . . When this act came out, those ministers who had any maintenance of their own, found out some place of residence in obscure villages, or market-towns, that were not corporations."—E. Calamy, *The Nonconformist's Memorial*, introd., sect. 4-6.

ALSO IN: J. Stoughton, *Hist. of Religion in Eng.*, v. 3, ch. 6-9.—D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 4, ch. 6-7.

A. D. 1663.—The grant of the Carolinas to Monk, Clarendon, Shaftesbury, and others. See NORTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1663-1670.

A. D. 1663.—The King's charter to Rhode Island. See RHODE ISLAND: A. D. 1660-1663.

A. D. 1664.—The conquest of New Netherland (New York). See NEW YORK: A. D. 1664.

A. D. 1664-1665.—The first refractory symptoms in Massachusetts. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1660-1665.

A. D. 1665.—The grant of New Jersey to Carteret and Berkeley. See NEW JERSEY: A. D. 1664-1667.

A. D. 1665-1666.—War with Holland renewed.—The Dutch fleet in the Thames. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1665-1666.

A. D. 1668.—The Triple Alliance with Holland and Sweden against Louis XIV. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1668.

A. D. 1668.—Cession of Acadia (Nova Scotia) to France. See NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1621-1668.

A. D. 1668-1670.—The secret Catholicism and the perfidy of the King.—His begging of bribes from Louis XIV.—His betrayal of Holland.—His breaking of the Triple Alliance.—In 1668, the royal treasury being greatly embarrassed by the king's extravagances, an attempt was made "to reduce the annual expenditure below the amount of the royal income. . . . But this plan of economy accorded not with the royal disposition, nor did it offer any prospect of extinguishing the debt. Charles remembered the promise of pecuniary assistance from France in the beginning of his reign; and, though his pre-

vious efforts to cultivate the friendship of Louis had been defeated by an unpropitious course of events, he resolved to renew the experiment. Immediately after the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, Buckingham opened a negotiation with the duchess of Orleans, the king's sister, in France, and Charles, in his conversations with the French resident, apologised for his conduct in forming the triple alliance, and openly expressed his wish to enter into a closer union, a more intimate friendship, with Louis. . . . About the end of the year the communications between the two princes became more open and confidential; French money, or the promise of French money, was received by the English ministers; the negotiation began to assume a more regular form, and the most solemn assurances of secrecy were given, that their real object might be withheld from the knowledge, or even the suspicion, of the States. In this stage of the proceedings Charles received an important communication from his brother James. Hitherto that prince had been an obedient and zealous son of the Church of England; but Dr. Heylin's History of the Reformation had shaken his religious credulity, and the result of the inquiry was a conviction that it became his duty to reconcile himself with the Church of Rome. He was not blind to the dangers to which such a change would expose him; and he therefore purposed to continue outwardly in communion with the established church, while he attended at the Catholic service in private. But, to his surprise, he learned from Symonds, a jesuit missionary, that no dispensation could authorise such duplicity of conduct: a similar answer was returned to the same question from the pope; and James immediately took his resolution. He communicated to the king in private that he was determined to embrace the Catholic faith; and Charles without hesitation replied that he was of the same mind, and would consult with the duke on the subject in the presence of lord Arundell, lord Arlington, and Arlington's confidential friend, sir Thomas Clifford. . . . The meeting was held in the duke's closet. Charles, with tears in his eyes, lamented the hardship of being compelled to profess a religion which he did not approve, declared his determination to emancipate himself from this restraint, and requested the opinion of those present, as to the most eligible means of effecting his purpose with safety and success. They advised him to communicate his intention to Louis, and to solicit the powerful aid of that monarch. Here occurs a very interesting question,—was Charles sincere or not? . . . He was the most accomplished dissembler in his dominions; nor will it be any injustice to his character to suspect that his real object was to deceive both his brother and the king of France. . . . Now, however, the secret negotiation proceeded with greater activity; and lord Arundell, accompanied by sir Richard Bellings, hastened to the French court. He solicited from Louis the present of a considerable sum, to enable the king to suppress any insurrection which might be provoked by his intended conversion, and offered the co-operation of England in the projected invasion of Holland, on the condition of an annual subsidy during the continuation of hostilities." On the advice of Louis, Charles postponed, for the time being, his intention to enter publicly the Romish church and thus provoke a national revolt; but

his proposals were otherwise accepted, and a secret treaty was concluded at Dover, in May, 1670, through the agency of Charles' sister, Henrietta, the duchess of Orleans, who came over for that purpose. "Of this treaty, . . . though much was afterwards said, little was certainly known. All the parties concerned, both the sovereigns and the negotiators, observed an impenetrable secrecy. What became of the copy transmitted to France is unknown; its counterpart was confided to the custody of sir Thomas Clifford, and is still in the keeping of his descendant, the lord Clifford of Chudleigh. The principal articles were: 1. That the king of England should publicly profess himself a Catholic at such time as should appear to him most expedient, and subsequently to that profession should join with Louis in a war against the Dutch republic at such time as the most Christian king should judge proper. 2. That to enable the king of England to suppress any insurrection which might be occasioned by his conversion, the king of France should grant him an aid of 2,000,000 of livres, by two payments, one at the expiration of three months, the other of six months, after the ratification of the treaty, and should also assist him with an armed force of 6,000 men, if . . . necessary. . . . 4. That if, eventually, any new rights on the Spanish monarchy should accrue to the king of France, the king of England should aid him with all his power in the acquisition of those rights. 5. That both princes should make war on the united provinces, and that neither should conclude peace or truce with them without the advice and consent of his ally."—J. Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, v. 11, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11.—O. Airy, *The Eng. Restoration and Louis XIV.*, ch. 16.—G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time*, bk. 2 (v. 1).

A. D. 1671.—The Cabal.—"It was remarked that the committee of council, established for foreign affairs, was entirely changed; and that Prince Rupert, the Duke of Ormond, Secretary Trevor, and Lord-keeper Bridgeman, men in whose honour the nation had great confidence, were never called to any deliberations. The whole secret was intrusted to five persons, Clifford, Ashley [afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury], Buckingham, Arlington, and Lauderdale. These men were known by the appellation of the Cabal, a word which the initial letters of their names happened to compose. Never was there a more dangerous ministry in England, nor one more noted for pernicious counsels."—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 65 (v. 6).—See, also, CABINET, THE ENGLISH.

A. D. 1672-1673.—The Declaration of Indulgence and the Test Act.—"It would have been impossible to obtain the consent of the party in the Royal Council which represented the old Presbyterians, of Ashley or Lauderdale or the Duke of Buckingham, to the Treaty of Dover. But it was possible to trick them into approval of a war with Holland by playing on their desire for a toleration of the Nonconformists. The announcement of the King's Catholicism was therefore deferred. . . . His ministers outwitted, it only remained for Charles to outwit his Parliament. A large subsidy was demanded for the fleet, under the pretext of upholding the Triple Alliance, and the subsidy was no sooner granted than the two Houses were

adjourned. Fresh supplies were obtained by closing the Exchequer, and suspending—under Clifford's advice—the payment of either principal or interest on loans advanced to the public treasury. The measure spread bankruptcy among half the goldsmiths of London; but it was followed in 1672 by one yet more startling—the Declaration of Indulgence. By virtue of his ecclesiastical powers, the King ordered 'that all manner of penal laws on matters ecclesiastical against whatever sort of Nonconformists or recusants should be from that day suspended,' and gave liberty of public worship to all dissidents save Catholics, who were allowed to practice their religion only in private houses. . . . The Declaration of Indulgence was at once followed by a declaration of war against the Dutch on the part of both England and France. . . . It was necessary in 1673 to appeal to the Commons [for war supplies], but the Commons met in a mood of angry distrust. . . . There was a general suspicion that a plot was on foot for the establishment of Catholicism and despotism, and that the war and the Indulgence were parts of the plot. The change of temper in the Commons was marked by the appearance of what was from that time called the Country party, with Lords Russell and Cavendish and Sir William Coventry at its head—a party which sympathized with the Nonconformists, but looked on it as its first duty to guard against the designs of the Court. As to the Declaration of Indulgence, however, all parties in the House were at one. The Commons resolved 'that penal statutes in matters ecclesiastical cannot be suspended but by consent of Parliament,' and refused supplies till the Declaration was recalled. The King yielded; but the Declaration was no sooner recalled than a Test Act was passed through both Houses without opposition, which required from every one in the civil and military employment of the State the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, a declaration against transubstantiation, and a reception of the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England. Clifford at once counseled resistance, and Buckingham talked flightily about bringing the army to London, but Arlington saw that all hope of carrying the 'great plan' through was at an end, and pressed Charles to yield. . . . Charles sullenly gave way. No measure has ever brought about more startling results. The Duke of York owned himself a Catholic, and resigned his office as Lord High Admiral. . . . Clifford, too, . . . owned to being a Catholic, and . . . laid down his staff of office. Their resignation was followed by that of hundreds of others in the army and the civil service of the Crown. . . . The resignations were held to have proved the existence of the dangers which the Test Act had been passed to meet. From this moment all trust in Charles was at an end."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 9, sect. 3.—"It is very true that the [Test Act] pointed only at Catholics, that it really proposed an anti-Popish test, yet the construction of it, although it did not exclude from office such Dissenters as could occasionally conform, did effectually exclude all who scrupled to do so. Aimed at the Romanists, it struck the Presbyterians. It is clear that, had the Nonconformists and the Catholics joined their forces with those of the Court, in opposing the measure, they might have defeated it; but the first of these classes for the present submitted

to the inconvenience, from the horror which they entertained of Popery, hoping, at the same time, that some relief would be afforded for this personal sacrifice in the cause of a common Protestantism. Thus the passing of an Act, which, until a late period, inflicted a social wrong upon two large sections of the community, is to be attributed to the course pursued by the very parties whose successors became the sufferers."—J. Stoughton, *Hist. of Religion in Eng.*, v. 3, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 4, ch. 8, and v. 5, ch. 1.—J. Collier, *Ecclesiastical Hist. of Gt. Britain*, pt. 2, bk. 9 (v. 8).

A. D. 1672-1674.—Alliance with Louis XIV. of France in war with Holland. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1672-1674.

A. D. 1673.—Loss of New York, retaken by the Dutch. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1673.

A. D. 1674.—Peace with the Dutch.—Treaty of Westminster.—Recovery of New York. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674.

A. D. 1675-1688.—Concessions to France in Newfoundland. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1660-1688.

A. D. 1678-1679.—The Popish Plot.—"There was an uneasy feeling in the nation that it was being betrayed, and just then [August, 1678] a strange story caused a panic throughout all England. A preacher of low character, named Titus Oates, who had gone over to the Jesuits, declared that he knew of a plot among the Catholics to kill the king and set up a Catholic Government. He brought his tale to a magistrate, named Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey, and shortly afterwards [Oct. 17] Godfrey was found murdered in a ditch near St. Pancras Church. The people thought that the Catholics had murdered him to hush up the 'Popish plot,' and when Parliament met a committee was appointed to examine into the matter. Some papers belonging to a Jesuit named Coleman alarmed them, and so great was the panic that an Act was passed shutting out all Catholics, except the Duke of York, from Parliament. After this no Catholic sat in either House for a hundred and fifty years. But worse followed. Oates became popular, and finding tale-bearing successful, he and other informers went on to swear away the lives of a great number of innocent Catholics. The most noted of these was Lord Stafford, an upright and honest peer, who was executed in 1681, declaring his innocence. Charles laughed among his friends at the whole matter, but let it go on, and Shaftesbury, who wished to turn out Lord Danby, did all he could to fan the flame."—A. B. Buckley, *Hist. of Eng. for Beginners*, ch. 19.—"The capital and the whole nation went mad with hatred and fear. The penal laws, which had begun to lose something of their edge, were sharpened anew. Everywhere justices were busied in searching houses and seizing papers. All the gaols were filled with Papists. London had the aspect of a city in a state of siege. The trainbands were under arms all night. Preparations were made for barricading the great thoroughfares. Patrols marched up and down the streets. Cannon were planted round Whitehall. No citizen thought himself safe unless he carried under his coat a small flail loaded with lead to brain the Popish assassins."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 2 (v. 1).—"It being expected that printed Bibles would soon become rare, or locked up in an unknown tongue, many honest people, struck with

the alarm, employed themselves in copying the Bible into short-hand that they might not be destitute of its consolations in the hour of calamity. . . . It was about the year 1679 that the famous King's Head Club was formed, so named from its being held at the King's Head Tavern in Fleet Street. . . . They were terrorists and spread alarm with great effect. It was at this club that silk armour, pistol proof, was recommended as a security against assassination at the hands of the Papists; and the particular kind of life-preserver of that day, called a Protestant flail, was introduced."—G. Roberts, *Life of Monmouth*, ch. 5 (v. 1).—"And now commenced, before the courts of justice and the upper house, a sombre prosecution of the catholic lords Arundel, Petre, Stafford, Powis, Bellasis, the jesuits Coleman, Ireland, Grieve, Pickering, and, in succession, all who were implicated by the indefatigable denunciations of Titus Oates and Bedloe. Unhappily, these courts of justice, desiring, in common with the whole nation, to condemn rather than to examine, wanted neither elements which might, if strictly acted upon, establish legal proof of conspiracy against some of the accused, nor terrible laws to destroy them when found guilty. And it was here that a spectacle, at first imposing, became horrible. No friendly voice arose to save those men who were guilty only of impracticable wishes, of extravagant conceptions. The king, the duke of York, the French ambassador, thoroughly acquainted as they were with the real nature of these imputed crimes, remained silent; they were thoroughly cowed."—A. Carrel, *Hist. of the Counter-Revolution in Eng.*, pt. 1, ch. 4.—"Although, . . . upon a review of this truly shocking transaction, we may be fairly justified . . . in imputing to the greater part of those concerned in it, rather an extraordinary degree of blind credulity than the deliberate wickedness of planning and assisting in the perpetration of legal murders; yet the proceedings on the popish plot must always be considered as an indelible disgrace upon the English nation, in which king, parliament, judges, juries, witnesses, prosecutors, have all their respective, though certainly not equal, shares."—C. J. Fox, *Hist. of the Early Part of the Reign of James II.*, introd. ch.—"In this dreadful scene of wickedness, it is difficult not to assign the pre-eminence of guilt to Anthony Ashley Cooper, earl of Shaftesbury. If he did not first contrive, he certainly availed himself of the revelations of Oates, to work up the nation to the fury which produced the subsequent horrors. . . . In extenuation of the delusion of the populace, something may be offered. The defamation of half a century had made the catholics the objects of protestant odium and distrust: and these had been increased by the accusation, artfully and assiduously fomented, of their having been the authors of the fire of the city of London. The publication, too, of Coleman's letters, certainly announced a considerable activity in the catholics to promote the catholic religion; and contained expressions, easily distorted to the sense, in which the favourers of the belief of the plot wished them to be understood. Danby's correspondence, likewise, which had long been generally known, and was about this time made public, had discovered that Charles was in the pay of France. These, with several other circumstances, had inflamed the imaginations of the public to the very

highest pitch. A dreadful something (and not the less dreadful because its precise nature was altogether unknown), was generally apprehended. . . . For their supposed part in the plot, ten laymen and seven priests, one of whom was seventy, another eighty, years of age, were executed. Seventeen others were condemned, but not executed. Some died in prison, and some were pardoned. On the whole body of catholics the laws were executed with horrible severity."—C. Butler, *Hist. Memoirs of the Eng. Catholics*, ch. 32, sect. 3 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, ch. 89 (v. 3).

A. D. 1679 (May).—The Habeas Corpus Act.—"Arbitrary imprisonment is a grievance which, in some degree, has place in almost every government, except in that of Great Britain; and our absolute security from it we owe chiefly to the present Parliament; a merit which makes some atonement for the faction and violence into which their prejudices had, in other particulars, betrayed them. The great charter had laid the foundation of this valuable part of liberty; the petition of right had renewed and extended it; but some provisions were still wanting to render it complete, and prevent all evasion or delay from ministers and judges. The act of habeas corpus, which passed this session, served these purposes. By this act it was prohibited to send any one to a prison beyond sea. No judge, under severe penalties, must refuse to any prisoner a writ of habeas corpus, by which the gaoler was directed to produce in court the body of the prisoner (whence the writ has its name), and to certify the cause of his detainer and imprisonment. If the gaol lie within twenty miles of the judge, the writ must be obeyed in three days; and so proportionably for greater distances; every prisoner must be indicted the first term after his commitment, and brought to trial in the subsequent term. And no man, after being enlarged by order of court, can be recommitted for the same offence."—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 67 (v. 6).—"The older remedies serving as a safeguard against unlawful imprisonment, were—1. The writ of Mainprise, ensuring the delivery of the accused to a friend of the same, who gave security to answer for his appearance before the court when required, and in token of such undertaking he held him by the hand ('le prit par le main'). 2. The writ 'De odio et atia,' i. e., of hatred and malice, which, though not abolished, has long since been antiquated. . . . It directed the sheriff to make inquisition in the county court whether the imprisonment proceeded from malice or not. . . . 3. The writ 'De homine replegiando,' or replevying a man, that is, delivering him out on security to answer what may be objected against him. A writ is, originally, a royal writing, either an open patent addressed to all to whom it may come, and issued under the great seal; or, 'litteræ clausæ,' a sealed letter addressed to a particular person; such writs were prepared in the royal courts or in the Court of Chancery. The most usual instrument of protection, however, against arbitrary imprisonment is the writ of 'Habeas corpus,' so called from its beginning with the words, 'Habeas corpus ad subjiendum,' which, on account of its universal application and the security it affords, has, insensibly, taken precedence of all others. This is an old writ of the common law, and must

be prayed for in any of the Superior courts of common law. . . . But this writ . . . proved but a feeble, or rather wholly ineffectual protection against the arbitrary power of the sovereign. The right of an English subject to a writ of habeas corpus, and to a release from imprisonment unless sufficient cause be shown for his detention, was fully canvassed in the first years of the reign of Charles I. . . . The parliament endeavoured to prevent such arbitrary imprisonment by passing the 'Petition of Right,' which enacted that no freeman, in any such manner . . . should be imprisoned or detained. Even this act was found unavailing against the malevolent interpretations put by the judges; hence the 16 Charles I., c. 10, was passed, which enacts, that when any person is restrained of his liberty by the king in person, or by the Privy Council, or any member thereof, he shall, on demand of his counsel, have a writ of habeas corpus, and, three days after the writ, shall be brought before the court to determine whether there is ground for further imprisonment, for bail, or for his release. Notwithstanding these provisions, the immunity of English subjects from arbitrary detention was not ultimately established in full practical efficiency until the passing of the statute of Charles II., commonly called the 'Habeas Corpus Act.'—E. Fischel, *The English Constitution*, bk. 1, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: Sir W. Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of Eng.*, bk. 3, ch. 8.—H. J. Stephen, *Commentaries*, bk. 5, ch. 12, sect. 5 (c. 4).

The following is the text of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679:

Whereas great Delays have been used by Sheriffs, Gaolers and other Officers, to whose Custody any of the King's Subjects have been committed, for criminal or supposed criminal Matters, in making Returns of Writs of Habeas Corpus to them directed, by standing out an Alias and Pluries Habeas Corpus, and sometimes more, and by other Shifts, to avoid their yielding Obedience to such Writs, contrary to their Duty, and the known Laws of the Land, whereby many of the King's Subjects have been, and hereafter may be long detained in Prison, in such cases where by Law they areailable, to their great Charges and Vexation.

II. For the Prevention whereof, and the more speedy Relief of all Persons imprisoned for any such Criminal, or supposed Criminal Matters: (2.) Be it Enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority thereof, that whensoever any Person or Persons shall bring any Habeas Corpus directed unto any Sheriff, or Sheriffs, Gaoler, Minister, or other Person whatsoever, for any Person in his or their Custody, and the said Writ shall be served upon the said Officer, or left at the Gaol or Prison, with any of the under Officers, under Keepers, or Deputy of the said Officers or Keepers, that the said Officer or Officers, his or their Under Officers, Under Keepers or Deputies, shall within three Days after the Service thereof, as aforesaid (unless the Commitment aforesaid were for Treason or Felony, plainly and specially expressed in the Warrant of Commitment), upon Payment or Tender of the Charges of bringing the said Prisoner, to be ascertained by the Judge or Court that awarded the same, and endorsed

upon the said Writ, not exceeding Twelve-pence per Mile, and upon Security given by his own Bond, to pay the Charges of carrying back the Prisoner, if he shall be remanded by the Court or Judge, to which he shall be brought, according to the true Intent of this present Act, and that he will not make any Escape by the way, make Return of such Writ. (3.) And bring or cause to be brought the Body of the Party so committed or restrained, unto or before the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of England for the time being, or the Judges or Barons of the said Court from whence the said Writ shall Issue, or unto and before such other Person or Persons before whom the said Writ is made returnable, according to the Command thereof. (4.) And shall then likewise certify the true causes of his Detainer, or Imprisonment, unless the commitment of the said party be in any place beyond the Distance of twenty Miles from the Place or Places where such Court or Person is, or shall be residing; and if beyond the Distance of twenty Miles, and not above One Hundred Miles, then within the Space of Ten Days, and if beyond the Distance of One Hundred Miles, then within the space of Twenty Days, after such Delivery aforesaid, and not longer.

III. And to the Intent that no Sheriff, Gaoler or other Officer may pretend Ignorance of the Import of any such Writ, (2.) Be it enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That all such Writs shall be marked in this manner, Per Statutum Tricesimo Primo Caroli Secundi Regis, and shall be signed by the Person that awards the same. (3.) And if any Person or Persons shall be or stand committed or detained, as aforesaid, for any Crime, unless for Felony or Treason, plainly expressed in the Warrant of Commitment, in the Vacation-time, and out of Term, it shall and may be lawful to and for the Person or Persons so committed or detained (other than Persons convict, or in Execution by legal Process) or any one on his or their Behalf, to appeal, or complain to the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper, or any one of His Majesty's Justices, either of the one Bench, or of the other, or the Barons of the Exchequer of the Degree of the Coif. (4.) And the said Lord Chancellor, Lord Keeper, Justices, or Barons, or any of them, upon View of the Copy or Copies of the Warrant or Warrants of Commitment and Detainer, or otherwise upon Oath made, that such Copy or Copies were denied to be given by such Person or Persons in whose custody the Prisoner or Prisoners is or are detained, are hereby authorized and required, upon Request made in Writing by such Person or Persons, or any on his, her, or their Behalf, attested and subscribed by two Witnesses, who were present at the Delivery of the same, to award and grant an Habeas Corpus under the Seal of such Court, whereof he shall then be one of the Judges, (5.) to be directed to the Officer or Officers in whose Custody the Party so committed or detained shall be, returnable immediate before the said Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper, or such Justice, Baron, or any other Justice or Baron, of the Degree of the Coif, of any of the said Courts. (6.) And upon Service thereof as aforesaid, the Officer or Officers, his or their under Officer or under Officers, under Keeper or under Keepers, or their Deputy, in whose Custody the Party is so committed or detained, shall within the times respectively before limited, bring such Prisoner

or Prisoners before the said Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper, or such Justices, Barons, or one of them, before whom the said Writ is made returnable, and in case of his Absence, before any of them, with the Return of such Writ, and the true Causes of the Commitment and Detainer. (7.) And thereupon within two Days after the Party shall be brought before them the said Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper, or such Justice or Baron, before whom the Prisoner shall be brought as aforesaid, shall discharge the said Prisoner from his Imprisonment, taking his or their Recognizance, with one or more Surety or Sureties, in any Sum, according to their Discretions, having regard to the Quality of the Prisoner, and Nature of the Offence, for his or their Appearance in the Court of King's Bench the Term following, or at the next Assizes, Sessions, or general Gaol-Delivery, of and for such County, City or Place, where the Commitment was, or where the Offence was committed, or in such other Court where the said Offence is properly cognizable, as the Case shall require, and then shall certify the said Writ with the Return thereof, and the said Recognizance or Recognizances into the said Court, where such Appearance is to be made. (8.) Unless it shall appear unto the said Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper, or Justice, or Justices, or Baron or Barons, that the Party so committed is detained upon a legal Process, Order, or Warrant out of some Court that hath Jurisdiction of Criminal Matters, or by some Warrant signed and sealed with the Hand and Seal of any of the said Justices or Barons, or some Justice or Justices of the Peace, for such Matters or Offences, for the which by the Law, the Prisoner is not bailable.

IV. Provided always, and be it enacted, That if any Person shall have wilfully neglected by the Space of two whole Terms after his Imprisonment to pray a Habeas Corpus for his Enlargement, such Person so wilfully neglecting, shall not have any Habeas Corpus to be granted in Vacation-time in Pursuance of this Act.

V. And be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That if any Officer or Officers, his or their under Officer, or under Officers, under Keeper or under Keepers, or Deputy, shall neglect or refuse to make the Returns aforesaid, or to bring the Body or Bodies of the Prisoner or Prisoners, according to the Command of the said Writ, within the respective times aforesaid, or upon Demand made by the Prisoner, or Person in his Behalf, shall refuse to deliver, or within the Space of six Hours after Demand shall not deliver, to the Person so demanding, a true Copy of the Warrant or Warrants of Commitment and Detainer of such Prisoner, which he and they are hereby required to deliver accordingly; all and every the Head Gaolers and Keepers of such Prisons, and such other Person, in whose Custody the Prisoner shall be detained, shall for the first Offence, forfeit to the Prisoner, or Party grieved, the Sum of One Hundred Pounds. (2.) And for the second Offence, the Sum of Two Hundred Pounds, and shall and is hereby made incapable to hold or execute his said Office. (3.) The said Penalties to be recovered by the Prisoner or Party grieved, his Executors or Administrators, against such Offender, his Executors or Administrators, by any Action of Debt, Suit, Bill, Plaint or Information, in any of the King's Courts at Westminster, wherein no Essoin, Protection, Privilege, Injunction, Wager of Law, or stay of Prosecution, by

Non vult ulterius prosequi, or otherwise, shall be admitted or allowed, or any more than one Imparlance. (4.) And any Recovery or Judgment at the Suit of any Party grieved, shall be a sufficient Conviction for the first Offence; and any after Recovery or Judgment at the Suit of a Party grieved, for any Offence after the first Judgment, shall be a sufficient Conviction to bring the Officers or Person within the said Penalty for the Second Offence.

VI. And for the Prevention of unjust Vexation, by reiterated Commitments for the same offence; (2.) Be it enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That no Person or Persons, which shall be delivered or set at large upon any Habeas Corpus, shall at any time hereafter be again imprisoned or committed for the same Offence, by any Person or Persons whatsoever, other than by the legal Order and Process of such Court wherein he or they shall be bound by Recognizance to appear, or other Court having Jurisdiction of the Cause. (3.) And if any other Person or Persons shall knowingly, contrary to this Act, recommit or imprison, or knowingly procure or cause to be recommitted or imprisoned for the same Offence, or pretended Offence, any Person or Persons delivered or set at large as aforesaid, or be knowingly aiding or assisting therein, then he or they shall forfeit to the Prisoner or Party grieved, the Sum of Five Hundred Pounds; any colourable Pretence or Variation in the Warrant or Warrants of Commitment notwithstanding, to be recovered as aforesaid.

VII. Provided always, and be it further enacted, That if any Person or Persons shall be committed for High Treason or Felony, plainly and specially expressed in the Warrant of Commitment, upon his Prayer or Petition in open Court the first Week of the Term, or first Day of the Sessions of Oyer and Terminer, or general Gaol Delivery, to be brought to his Tryal, shall not be indicted sometime in the next Term, Sessions of Oyer and Terminer, or general Gaol-Delivery after such Commitment, it shall and may be lawful to and for the Judges of the Court of King's Bench, and Justices of Oyer and Terminer, or general Gaol-Delivery, and they are hereby required, upon Motion to them made in open Court the last Day of the Term, Sessions or Gaol-Delivery, either by the Prisoner, or any one in his Behalf, to set at Liberty the Prisoner upon Bail, unless it appear to the Judges and Justices upon Oath made, that the Witnesses for the King could not be produced the same Term, Sessions, or general Gaol-Delivery. (2.) And if any Person or Persons committed as aforesaid, upon his Prayer or Petition in open Court, the first Week of the Term, or first Day of the Sessions of Oyer and Terminer, and general Gaol-Delivery, to be brought to his Tryal, shall not be indicted and tried the second Term, Sessions of Oyer and Terminer, or general Gaol-Delivery, after his Commitment, or upon his Tryal shall be acquitted, he shall be discharged from his Imprisonment.

VIII. Provided always, that nothing in this Act shall extend to discharge out of Prison, any Person charged in Debt, or other Action, or with Process in any Civil Cause, but that after he shall be discharged of his Imprisonment for such his criminal Offence, he shall be kept in Custody, according to the Law for such other Suit.

IX. Provided always, and be it enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That if any Person or Persons, Subjects of this Realm, shall be committed to any Prison, or in Custody of any Officer or Officers whatsoever, for any Criminal or supposed Criminal Matter, that the said Person shall not be removed from the said Prison and Custody, into the Custody of any other Officer or Officers. (2.) Unless it be by Habeas Corpus, or some other legal Writ; or where the Prisoner is delivered to the Constable or other inferiour Officer, to carry such Prisoner to some common Gaol. (3.) Or where any Person is sent by Order of any Judge of Assize, or Justice of the Peace, to any common Workhouse, or House of Correction. (4.) Or where the Prisoner is removed from one Prison or Place to another within the same County, in order to his or her Tryal or Discharge in due Course of Law. (5.) Or in case of sudden Fire, or Infection, or other Necessity. (6.) And if any Person or Persons shall after such Commitment aforesaid, make out and sign, or countersign, any Warrant or Warrants for such Removal aforesaid, contrary to this Act, as well he that makes or signs, or countersigns, such Warrant or Warrants, as the Officer or Officers, that obey or execute the same, shall suffer & incur the Pains & Forfeitures in this Act before-mentioned, both for the 1st & 2nd Offence, respectively, to be recover'd in manner aforesaid, by the Party grieved.

X. Provided also, and be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That it shall and may be lawful to and for any Prisoner or Prisoners as aforesaid, to move, and obtain his or their Habeas Corpus, as well out of the High Court of Chancery, or Court of Exchequer, as out of the Courts of King's Bench, or Common Pleas, or either of them. (2.) And if the said Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper, or any Judge or Judges, Baron or Barons for the time being, of the Degree of the Coif, of any of the Courts aforesaid, in the Vacation time, upon view of the Copy or Copies of the Warrant or Warrants of Commitment or Detainer, or upon Oath made that such Copy or Copies were denied as aforesaid, shall deny any Writ of Habeas Corpus by this Act required to be granted, being moved for as aforesaid, they shall severally forfeit to the Prisoner or Party grieved, the Sum of Five Hundred Pounds, to be recovered in manner aforesaid.

XI. And be it declared and enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That an Habeas Corpus according to the true Intent and meaning of this Act, may be directed, and run into any County Palatine, the Cinque Ports, or other privileged Places, within the Kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, or Town of Berwick upon Tweed, and the Isles of Jersey or Guernsey, any Law or Usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

XII. And for preventing illegal Imprisonments in Prisons beyond the Seas; (2.) Be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That no Subject of this Realm that now is, or hereafter shall be, an Inhabitant or Resident of this Kingdom of England, Dominion of Wales, or Town of Berwick upon Tweed, shall or may be sent Prisoner into Scotland, Ireland, Jersey, Guernsey, Tangier, or into Parts, Garrisons, Islands, or Places beyond the Seas, which are, or at any time hereafter shall be within or without the Dominions of his Majesty, his Heirs or Successors. (3.) And that every such Imprisonment is hereby

enacted and adjudged to be illegal. (4.) And that if any of the said Subjects now is, or hereafter shall be so imprisoned, every such Person and Persons so imprisoned, shall and may for every such Imprisonment, maintain by Virtue of this Act, an Action or Actions of False Imprisonment, in any of his Majesty's Courts of Record, against the Person or Persons by whom he or she shall be so committed, detained, imprisoned, sent Prisoner or transported, contrary to the true meaning of this Act, and against all or any Person or Persons, that shall frame, contrive, write, seal or countersign any Warrant or Writing for such Commitment, Detainer, Imprisonment or Transportation, or shall be advising, aiding or assisting in the same, or any of them. (5.) And the Plaintiff in every such Action, shall have judgment to recover his treble Costs, besides Damages; which Damages so to be given, shall not be less than Five Hundred Pounds. (6.) In which Action, no Delay, Stay, or Stop of Proceeding, by Rule, Order or Command, nor no Injunction, Protection, or Privilege whatsoever, nor any more than one Imparlance shall be allowed, excepting such Rule of the Court wherein the Action shall depend, made in open Court, as shall be thought in justice necessary, for special Cause to be expressed in the said Rule. (7.) And the Person or Persons who shall knowingly frame, contrive, write, seal or countersign any Warrant for such Commitment, Detainer, or Transportation, or shall so commit, detain, imprison, or transport any Person or Persons contrary to this Act, or be any ways advising, aiding or assisting therein, being lawfully convicted thereof, shall be disabled from thenceforth to bear any Office of Trust or Profit within the said Realm of England, Dominion of Wales, or Town of Berwick upon Tweed, or any of the Islands, Territories or Dominions thereunto belonging. (8.) And shall incur and sustain the Pains, Penalties, and Forfeitures, limited, ordained, and Provided in and by the Statute of Provision and Premunire made in the Sixteenth Year of King Richard the Second. (9.) And be incapable of any Pardon from the King, his Heirs or Successors, of the said Forfeitures, Losses, or Disabilities, or any of them.

XIII. Provided always, That nothing in this Act shall extend to give Benefit to any Person who shall by Contract in Writing, agree with any Merchant or Owner, of any Plantation, or other Person whatsoever, to be transported to any part beyond the Seas, and receive Earnest upon such Agreement, altho' that afterwards such Person shall renounce such Contract.

XIV. Provided always, and be it enacted, That if any Person or Persons, lawfully convicted of any Felony, shall in open Court pray to be transported beyond the Seas, and the Court shall think fit to leave him or them in Prison for that Purpose, such Person or Persons may be transported into any Parts beyond the Seas; This Act, or any thing therein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

XV. Provided also, and be it enacted, That nothing herein contained, shall be deemed, construed, or taken to extend to the Imprisonment of any Person before the first Day of June, One Thousand Six Hundred Seventy and Nine, or to any thing advised, procured, or otherwise done, relating to such Imprisonment; Any thing herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

XVI. Provided also, That if any Person or Persons, at any time resiant in this Realm, shall have committed any Capital Offence in Scotland or Ireland, or any of the Islands, or foreign Plantations of the King, his Heirs or Successors, where he or she ought to be tryed for such Offence, such Person or Persons may be sent to such Place, there to receive such Tryal, in such manner as the same might have been used before the making this Act; Any thing herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

XVII. Provided also, and be it enacted, That no Person or Persons, shall be sued, impleaded, molested or troubled for any Offence against this Act, unless the Party offending be sued or impleaded for the same within two Years at the most after such time wherein the Offence shall be committed, in Case the Party grieved shall not be then in Prison; and if he shall be in Prison, then within the space of two Years after the Decease of the Person imprisoned, or his, or her Delivery out of Prison, which shall first happen.

XVIII. And to the Intent no Person may avoid his Tryal at the Assizes, or general Gaol Delivery, by procuring his Removal before the Assizes at such time as he cannot be brought back to receive his Tryal there; (2.) Be it enacted, That after the Assizes proclaimed for that County where the Prisoner is detained, no Person shall be removed from the Common Gaol upon any Habeas Corpus granted in pursuance of this Act, but upon any such Habeas Corpus shall be brought before the Judge of Assize in open Court, who is thereupon to do what to Justice shall appertain.

XIX. Provided nevertheless, That after the Assizes are ended, any Person or Persons detained may have his or her Habeas Corpus, according to the Direction and Intention of this Act.

XX. And be it also enacted by the Authority aforesaid, That if any Information, Suit or Action, shall be brought or exhibited against any Person or Persons, for any Offence committed or to be committed against the Form of this Law, it shall be lawful for such Defendants to plead the general Issue, that they are not guilty, or that they owe nothing, and to give such special Matter in Evidence to the Jury, that shall try the same, which Matter being pleaded, had been good and sufficient matter in Law to have discharged the said Defendant or Defendants against the said Information, Suit or Action, and the said Matter shall be then as available to him or them, to all Intents and Purposes, as if he or they had sufficiently pleaded, set forth, or alleged the same Matter in Bar, or Discharge of such Information, Suit or Action.

XXI. And because many times Persons charged with Petty-Treason or Felony, or as Accessories thereunto, are committed upon Suspicion only, whereupon they are bailable or not, according as the Circumstances making out that Suspicion are more or less weighty, which are best known to the Justices of Peace that committed the Persons, and have the Examinations before them, or to other Justices of the Peace in the County; (2.) Be it therefore enacted, That where any Person shall appear to be committed by any Judge, or Justice of the Peace, and charged as accessory before the Fact, to any Petty-Treason or Felony, or upon Suspicion thereof, or with Suspicion of Petty-Treason or Felony, which Petty-Treason or

Felony, shall be plainly and specially expressed in the Warrant of Commitment, that such Person shall not be removed or bailed by Virtue of this Act, or in any other manner than they might have been before the making of this Act.

A. D. 1679 (June).—The Meal-tub Plot.—“Dangerfield, a subtle and dexterous man, who had gone through all the shapes and practices of roguery, and in particular was a false coiner, undertook now to coin a plot for the ends of the papists. He . . . got into all companies, and mixed with the hottest men of the town, and studied to engage others with himself to swear that they had been invited to accept of commissions, and that a new form of government was to be set up, and that the king and the royal family were to be sent away. He was carried with this story, first to the duke, and then to the king, and had a weekly allowance of money, and was very kindly used by many of that side; so that a whisper run about town, that some extraordinary thing would quickly break out: and he having some correspondence with one colonel Mansel, he made up a bundle of seditious but ill contrived letters, and laid them in a dark corner of his room: and then some searchers were sent from the custom house to look for some forbidden goods, which they heard were in Mansel's chamber. There were no goods found: but as it was laid, they found that bundle of letters: and upon that a great noise was made of a discovery: but upon inquiry it appeared the letters were counterfeited, and the forger of them was suspected; so they searched into all Dangerfield's haunts, and in one of them they found a paper that contained the scheme of this whole fiction, which, because it was found in a meal-tub, came to be called the meal-tub plot. . . . This was a great disgrace to the popish party, and the king suffered much by the countenance he had given him.”—G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time*, bk. 3, 1679.

A. D. 1679-1681.—The Exclusion Bill.—“Though the duke of York was not charged with participation in the darkest schemes of the popish conspirators, it was evident that his succession was the great aim of their endeavours, and evident also that he had been engaged in the more real and undeniable intrigues of Coleman. His accession to the throne, long viewed with just apprehension, now seemed to threaten such perils to every part of the constitution as ought not supinely to be waited for, if any means could be devised to obviate them. This gave rise to the bold measure of the exclusion bill, too bold, indeed, for the spirit of the country, and the rock on which English liberty was nearly shipwrecked. In the long parliament, full as it was of pensioners and creatures of court influence, nothing so vigorous would have been successful. . . . But the zeal they showed against Danby induced the king to put an end [Jan. 24, 1679] to this parliament of seventeen years' duration; an event long ardently desired by the popular party, who foresaw their ascendancy in the new elections. The next house of commons accordingly came together with an ardour not yet quenched by corruption; and after reviving the impeachments commenced by their predecessors, and carrying a measure long in agitation, a test which shut the catholic peers out of parliament, went upon the exclusion bill [the second reading of which was carried, May 21, 1679, by 207 to 128].

Their dissolution put a stop to this; and in the next parliament the lords rejected it [after the commons had passed the bill, without a division, Oct., 1680]. . . . The bill of exclusion . . . provided that the imperial crown of England should descend to and be enjoyed by such person or persons successively during the life of the duke of York as would have inherited or enjoyed the same in case he were naturally dead. . . . But a large part of the opposition had unfortunately other objects in view." Under the contaminating influence of the earl of Shaftesbury, "they broke away more and more from the line of national opinion, till a fatal reaction involved themselves in ruin, and exposed the cause of public liberty to its most imminent peril. The countenance and support of Shaftesbury brought forward that unconstitutional and most impolitic scheme of the duke of Monmouth's succession [James, duke of Monmouth, was the acknowledged natural son of king Charles, by Lucy Walters, his mistress while in exile at the Hague.] There could hardly be a greater insult to a nation used to respect its hereditary line of kings, than to set up the bastard of a prostitute, without the least pretence of personal excellence or public services, against a princess of known virtue and attachment to the protestant religion. And the effrontery of this attempt was aggravated by the libels eagerly circulated to dupe the credulous populace into a belief of Monmouth's legitimacy."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: A. Carrel, *Hist. of the Counter-Revolution in Eng.*, pt. 2, ch. 1.—G. Roberts, *Life of Monmouth*, ch. 4-8 (v. 1).—G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time*, bk. 3, 1679-81.—Sir W. Temple, *Memoirs*, pt. 3 (*Works*, v. 2).

A. D. 1680.—Whigs and Tories acquire their respective names.—"Factions indeed were at this time [A. D. 1680] extremely animated against each other. The very names by which each party denominated its antagonist discover the virulence and rancour which prevailed. For besides petitioner and abhorrer, appellations which were soon forgotten, this year is remarkable for being the epoch of the well-known epithets of Whig and Tory, by which, and sometimes without any material difference, this island has been so long divided. The court party reproached their antagonists with their affinity to the fanatical conventiclers in Scotland, who were known by the name of Whigs: the country party found a resemblance between the courtiers and the popish banditti in Ireland, to whom the appellation of Tory was affixed: and after this manner these foolish terms of reproach came into public and general use."—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 68 (v. 6).—"The definition of the nickname Tory, as it originally arose, is given in 'A New Ballad' (Narcissus Luttrell's Collection):—

The word Tory's of Irish Extraction,

'Tis a Legacy that they have left here

They came here in their brogues,

And have acted like Rogues,

In endeavouring to learn us to swear."

—J. Grego, *Hist. of Parliamentary Elections*, p. 36.

ALSO IN: G. W. Cooke, *Hist. of Party*, v. 1, ch. 2.—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 2.—For the origin of the name of the Whig party, see WHIGS (WHIGGAMORS); also, RAPPAREES.

A. D. 1681-1683.—The Tory reaction and the downfall of the Whigs.—The Rye-house Plot.—"Shaftesbury's course rested wholly on the belief that the penury of the Treasury left Charles at his mercy, and that a refusal of supplies must wring from the King his assent to the exclusion. But the gold of France had freed the King from his thralldom. He had used the Parliament [of 1681] simply to exhibit himself as a sovereign whose patience and conciliatory temper was rewarded with insult and violence; and now that he saw his end accomplished, he suddenly dissolved the Houses in April, and appealed in a Royal declaration to the justice of the nation at large. The appeal was met by an almost universal burst of loyalty. The Church rallied to the King; his declaration was read from every pulpit; and the Universities solemnly decided that 'no religion, no law, no fault, no forfeiture' could avail to bar the sacred right of hereditary succession. . . . The Duke of York returned in triumph to St. James's. . . . Monmouth, who had resumed his progresses through the country as a means of checking the tide of reaction, was at once arrested. . . . Shaftesbury, alive to the new danger, plunged desperately into conspiracies with a handful of adventurers as desperate as himself, hid himself in the City, where he boasted that ten thousand 'brisk boys' were ready to appear at his call, and urged his friends to rise in arms. But their delays drove him to flight. . . . The flight of Shaftesbury proclaimed the triumph of the King. His wonderful sagacity had told him when the struggle was over and further resistance useless. But the Whig leaders, who had delayed to answer the Earl's call, still nursed projects of rising in arms, and the more desperate spirits who had clustered around him as he lay hidden in the City took refuge in plots of assassination, and in a plan for murdering Charles and his brother as they passed the Rye-house [a Hertfordshire farm house, so-called] on their road from London to Newmarket. Both the conspiracies were betrayed, and, though they were wholly distinct from one another, the cruel ingenuity of the Crown lawyers blended them into one. Lord Essex, the last of an ill-fated race, saved himself from a traitor's death by suicide in the Tower. Lord Russell, convicted on a charge of sharing in the Rye-house Plot, was beheaded in Lincoln Inn Fields. The same fate awaited Algernon Sidney. Monmouth fled in terror over sea, and his flight was followed by a series of prosecutions for sedition directed against his followers. In 1683 the Constitutional opposition which had held Charles so long in check lay crushed at his feet. . . . On the very day when the crowd around Russell's scaffold were dipping their handkerchiefs in his blood, as in the blood of a martyr, the University of Oxford solemnly declared that the doctrine of passive obedience, even to the worst of rulers, was a part of religion." During the brief remainder of his reign Charles was a prudently absolute monarch, governing without a Parliament, coolly ignoring the Triennial Act, and treating on occasions the Test Act, as well as other laws obnoxious to him, with contempt. He died unexpectedly, early in February, 1685, and his brother, the Duke of York, succeeded to the throne, as James II., with no resistance, but with much feeling opposed to him.—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 9, sect. 5-6.

ALSO IN: G. Roberts, *Life of Monmouth*, ch. 8-10 (v. 1).—D. Hume, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 68-69 (v. 6).—G. W. Cooke, *Hist. of Party*, v. 1, ch. 6-11.

A. D. 1685.—Accession of James II.

A. D. 1685 (February).—The new King proclaims his religion.—“The King [James II.] early put the loyalty of his Protestant friends to the proof. While he was a subject, he had been in the habit of hearing mass with closed doors in a small oratory which had been fitted up for his wife. He now ordered the doors to be thrown open, in order that all who came to pay their duty to him might see the ceremony. When the host was elevated there was a strange confusion in the antechamber. The Roman Catholics fell on their knees: the Protestants hurried out of the room. Soon a new pulpit was erected in the palace; and, during Lent, a series of sermons was preached there by Popish divines.”—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 4 (v. 2).

A. D. 1685 (May—July).—Monmouth's Rebellion.—“The Parliament which assembled on the 22nd of May . . . was almost entirely Tory. The failure of the Rye-House Plot had produced a reaction, which for a time entirely annihilated the Whig influence. . . . The apparent triumph of the King and the Tory party was completed by the disastrous failure of the insurrection planned by their adversaries. A knot of exiled malcontents, some Scotch, some English, had collected in Holland. Among them was Monmouth and the Earl of Argyle, son of that Marquis of Argyle who had taken so prominent a part on the Presbyterian side in the Scotch troubles of Charles I.'s reign. Monmouth had kept aloof from politics till, on the accession of James, he was induced to join the exiles at Amsterdam, whither Argyle, a strong Presbyterian, but a man of lofty and moderate views, also repaired. National jealousy prevented any union between the exiles, and two expeditions were determined on,—the one under Argyle, who hoped to find an army ready to his hand among his clansmen in the West of Scotland, the other under Monmouth in the West of England. Argyle's expedition set sail on the 2nd of May [1685]. . . . Argyle's invasion was ruined by the limited authority intrusted to him, and by the jealousy and insubordination of his fellow leaders. . . . His army disbanded. He was himself taken in Renfrewshire, and, after an exhibition of admirable constancy, was beheaded. . . . A week before the final dispersion of Argyle's troops, Monmouth had landed in England [at Lyme, June 11]. He was well received in the West. He had not been twenty-four hours in England before he found himself at the head of 1,500 men; but though popular among the common people, he received no support from the upper classes. Even the strongest Whigs disbelieved the story of his legitimacy, and thought his attempt ill-timed and fraught with danger. . . . Meanwhile Monmouth had advanced to Taunton, had been there received with enthusiasm, and, vainly thinking to attract the nobility, had assumed the title of King. Nor was his reception at Bridgewater less flattering. But difficulties already began to gather round him; he was in such want of arms, that, although rustic implements were converted into pikes, he was still obliged to send away many volunteers; the militia were closing in upon him in all directions;

Bristol had been seized by the Duke of Beaufort, and the regular army under Feversham and Churchill were approaching.” After feebly attempting several movements, against Bristol and into Wiltshire, Monmouth lost heart and fell back to Bridgewater. “The Royalist army was close behind him, and on the fifth of July encamped about three miles from Bridgewater, on the plain of Sedgemoor.” Monmouth was advised to undertake a night surprise, and did so in the early morning of the 6th. “The night was not unfitting for such an enterprise, for the mist was so thick that at a few paces nothing could be seen. Three great ditches by which the moor was drained lay between the armies; of the third of these, strangely enough, Monmouth knew nothing.” The unexpected discovery of this third ditch, known as “the Bussex Rhine,” which his cavalry could not cross, and behind which the enemy rallied, was the ruin of the enterprise. “Monmouth saw that the day was lost, and with the love of life which was one of the characteristics of his soft nature, he turned and fled. Even after his flight the battle was kept up bravely. At length the arrival of the King's artillery put an end to any further struggle. The defeat was followed by all the terrible scenes which mark a suppressed insurrection. . . . Monmouth and Grey pursued their flight into the New Forest, and were there apprehended in the neighbourhood of Ringwood.” Monmouth petitioned abjectly for his life, but in vain. He was executed on the 15th of July. “The failure of this insurrection was followed by the most terrible cruelties. Feversham returned to London, to be flattered by the King and laughed at by the Court for his military exploits. He left Colonel Kirke in command at Bridgewater. This man had learned, as commander at Tangier, all the worst arts of cruel despotism. His soldiery in bitter pleasantry were called Kirke's ‘Lambs,’ from the emblem of their regiment. It is impossible to say how many suffered at the hands of this man and his brutal troops; 100 captives are said by some to have been put to death the week after the battle. But this military revenge did not satisfy the Court.”—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.*, period 2, pp. 764-768.—“The number of Monmouth's men killed is computed by some at 2,000, by others at 300; a disparity, however, which may be easily reconciled by supposing that the one account takes in those who were killed in battle, while the other comprehends the wretched fugitives who were massacred in ditches, cornfields, and other hiding places, the following day.”—C. J. Fox, *Hist. of the Early Part of the Reign of James II.*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: G. Roberts, *Life of Monmouth*, ch. 13-28 (v. 1-2).

A. D. 1685 (September).—The Bloody Assizes.—“Early in September, Jeffreys [Sir George Jeffreys, Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench], accompanied by four other judges, set out on that circuit of which the memory will last as long as our race and language. . . . At Winchester the Chief Justice first opened his commission. Hampshire had not been the theatre of war; but many of the vanquished rebels had, like their leader, fled thither.” Two among these had been found concealed in the house of Lady Alice Lisle, a widow of eminent nobility of character, and Jeffreys' first proceeding was to arraign Lady Alice for the technical

treason of the concealment. She was tried with extraordinary brutality of manner on the part of the judge; the jury was bullied into a verdict of guilty, and the innocent woman was condemned by the fiend on the bench to be burned alive. By great exertion of many people, the sentence was commuted from burning to beheading. No mercy beyond this could be obtained from Jeffreys or his fit master, the king. "In Hampshire Alice Lisle was the only victim: but, on the day following her execution, Jeffreys reached Dorchester, the principal town of the county in which Monmouth had landed, and the judicial massacre began. The court was hung, by order of the Chief Justice, with scarlet; and this innovation seemed to the multitude to indicate a bloody purpose. . . . More than 300 prisoners were to be tried. The work seemed heavy; but Jeffreys had a contrivance for making it light. He let it be understood that the only chance of obtaining pardon or respite was to plead guilty. Twenty-nine persons, who put themselves on their country and were convicted, were ordered to be tied up without delay. The remaining prisoners pleaded guilty by scores. Two hundred and ninety-two received sentence of death. The whole number hanged in Dorsetshire amounted to seventy-four. From Dorchester Jeffreys proceeded to Exeter. The civil war had barely grazed the frontier of Devonshire. Here, therefore, comparatively few persons were capitally punished. Somersetshire, the chief seat of the rebellion, had been reserved for the last and most fearful vengeance. In this county two hundred and thirty-three prisoners were in a few days hanged, drawn and quartered. At every spot where two roads met, on every market place, on the green of every large village which had furnished Monmouth with soldiers, ironed corpses clattering in the wind, or heads and quarters stuck on poles, poisoned the air, and made the traveller sick with horror. . . . The Chief Justice was all himself. His spirits rose higher and higher as the work went on. He laughed, shouted, joked, and swore in such a way that many thought him drunk from morning to night. . . . Jeffreys boasted that he had hanged more traitors than all his predecessors together since the Conquest. . . . Yet those rebels who were doomed to death were less to be pitied than some of the survivors. Several prisoners to whom Jeffreys was unable to bring home the charge of high treason were convicted of misdemeanours and were sentenced to scourging not less terrible than that which Oates had undergone. . . . The number of prisoners whom Jeffreys transported was eight hundred and forty-one. These men, more wretched than their associates who suffered death, were distributed into gangs, and bestowed on persons who enjoyed favour at court. The conditions of the gift were that the convicts should be carried beyond sea as slaves, that they should not be emancipated for ten years, and that the place of their banishment should be some West Indian island. . . . It was estimated by Jeffreys that, on an average, each of them, after all charges were paid, would be worth from ten to fifteen pounds. There was therefore much angry competition for grants. . . . And now Jeffreys had done his work, and returned to claim his reward. He arrived at Windsor from the West, leaving carnage, mourning and terror behind him. The hatred with which he was regarded by the

people of Somersetshire has no parallel in our history. . . . But at the court Jeffreys was cordially welcomed. He was a judge after his master's own heart. James had watched the circuit with interest and delight. . . . At a later period, when all men of all parties spoke with horror of the Bloody Assizes, the wicked Judge and the wicked King attempted to vindicate themselves by throwing the blame on each other."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: Sir James Mackintosh, *Hist. of the Revolution in Eng.*, ch. 1.—Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, ch. 100 (c. 3).—G. Roberts, *Life of Monmouth*, ch. 29–31 (v. 2).—See, also, TAUNTON: A. D. 1685.

A. D. 1685–1686.—Faithless and tyrannical measures against the New England colonies. See CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1685–1687; and MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1671–1686.

A. D. 1685–1689.—The Despotism of James II. in Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1681–1689.

A. D. 1686.—The Court of High Commission revived.—"James conceived the design of employing his authority as head of the Church of England as a means of subjecting that church to his pleasure, if not of finally destroying it. It is hard to conceive how he could reconcile to his religion the exercise of supremacy in an heretical sect, and thus sanction by his example the usurpations of the Tudors on the rights of the Catholic Church. . . . He, indeed, considered the ecclesiastical supremacy as placed in his hands by Providence to enable him to betray the Protestant establishment. 'God,' said he to Barillon, 'has permitted that all the laws made to establish Protestantism now serve as a foundation for my measures to re-establish true religion, and give me a right to exercise a more extensive power than other Catholic princes possess in the ecclesiastical affairs of their dominions.' He found legal advisers ready with paltry expedients for evading the two statutes of 1641 and 1660 [abolishing, and re-affirming the abolition of the Court of High Commission], under the futile pretext that they forbade only a court vested with such powers of corporal punishment as had been exercised by the old Court of High Commission; and in conformity to their pernicious counsel, he issued, in July, a commission to certain ministers, prelates, and judges, to act as a Court of Commissioners in Ecclesiastical Causes. The first purpose of this court was to enforce directions to preachers, issued by the King, enjoining them to abstain from preaching on controverted questions."—Sir James Mackintosh, *Hist. of the Revolution in Eng.*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, v. 5, ch. 3.

A. D. 1686.—The consolidation of New England under a royal Governor-General. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1686.

A. D. 1687.—Riddance of the Test Act by royal dispensing power.—"The abolition of the tests was a thing resolved upon in the catholic council, and for this a sanction of some kind or other was required, as they dared not yet proceed upon the royal will alone. Chance, or the machinations of the catholics, created an affair which brought the question of the tests under another form before the court of king's bench. This court had not the power to abolish the Test Act, but it might consider whether the

king had the right of exempting particular subjects from the formalities. . . . The king . . . closeted himself with the judges one by one, dismissed some, and got those who replaced them, 'ignorant men,' says an historian, 'and scandalously incompetent,' to acknowledge his dispensing power. . . . The judges of the king's bench, after a trial, . . . declared, almost in the very language used by the crown counsel:—1. That the kings of England are sovereign princes; 2. That the laws of England are the king's laws; 3. That therefore it is an inseparable prerogative in the kings of England to dispense with penal laws in particular cases, and upon particular necessary reasons; 4. That of those reasons, and those necessities, the king himself is sole judge; and finally, which is consequent upon all, 5. That this is not a trust invested in, or granted to the king by the people, but the ancient remains of the sovereign power and prerogative of the kings of England, which never yet was taken from them, nor can be. The case thus decided, the king thought he might rely upon the respect always felt by the English people for the decisions of the higher courts, to exempt all his catholic subjects from the obligations of the test. And upon this, it became no longer a question merely of preserving in their commissions and offices those whose dismissal had been demanded by parliament. . . . To obtain or to retain certain employments, it was necessary to be of the same religion with the king. Papists replaced in the army and in the administration all those who had pronounced at all energetically for the maintenance of the tests. Abjurations, somewhat out of credit during the last session of parliament, again resumed favour."—A. Carrel, *Hist. of the Counter-Revolution in Eng.*, ch. 3.

Also IN: J. Stoughton, *Hist. of Religion in Eng.*, v. 4, ch. 4.

A. D. 1687-1688.—Declarations of Indulgence.—**Trial of the Seven Bishops.**—"Under pretence of toleration for Dissenters, James endeavoured, under another form, to remove obstacles from Romanists. He announced an Indulgence. He began in Scotland by issuing on the 12th of February, 1687, in Edinburgh, a Proclamation granting relief to scrupulous consciences. Hereby he professed to relieve the Presbyterians, but the relief of them amounted to nothing; to the Romanists it was complete. . . . On the 18th of March, 1687, he announced to the English Privy Council his intention to prorogue Parliament, and to grant upon his own authority entire liberty of conscience to all his subjects. Accordingly on the 4th of April he published his Indulgence, declaring his desire to see all his subjects become members of the Church of Rome, and his resolution (since that was impracticable) to protect them in the free exercise of their religion; also promising to protect the Established Church; then he annulled a number of Acts of Parliament, suspended all penal laws against Nonconformists, authorised Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters to perform worship publicly, and abrogated all Acts of Parliament imposing any religious test for civil or military offices. This declaration was then notoriously illegal and unconstitutional. James now issued a second and third declaration for Scotland, and courted the Dissenters in England, but with small encouragement. . . . On the 27th of April, 1688,

James issued a second Declaration of Indulgence for England. . . . On the 4th of May, by an order in Council, he directed his Declaration of the 27th of April to be publicly read during divine service in all Churches and Chapels, by the officiating ministers, on two successive Sundays—namely, on the 20th and 27th of May in London, and on the 3d and 10th of June in the country; and desired the Bishops to circulate this Declaration through their dioceses. Hitherto the Bishops and Clergy had held the doctrine of passive obedience to the sovereign, however bad in character or in his measures—now they were placed by the King himself in a dilemma. Here was a violation of existing law, and an intentional injury to their Church, if not a plan for the substitution of another. The Nonconformists, whom James pretended to serve, coincided with and supported the Church. A decided course must be taken. The London Clergy met and resolved not to read the Declaration. On the 12th of May, at Lambeth Palace, the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Prelates assembled. They resolved that the Declaration ought not to be read. On Friday, the 18th of May, a second meeting of the Prelates and eminent divines was held at Lambeth Palace. A petition to the King was drawn up by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his own handwriting, disclaiming all disloyalty and all intolerance, . . . but stating that Parliament had decided that the King could not dispense with Statutes in matters ecclesiastical—that the Declaration was therefore illegal—and could not be solemnly published by the petitioners in the House of God and during divine service. This paper was signed by Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, Turner of Ely, Lake of Chichester, Ken of Bath and Wells, White of Peterborough, and Trelawny of Bristol. It was approved by Compton, Bishop of London, but not signed, because he was under suspension. The Archbishop had long been forbidden to appear at Court, therefore could not present it. On Friday evening the six Bishops who had signed were introduced by Sunderland to the King, who read the document and pronounced it libellous [and seditious and rebellious], and the Bishops retired. On Sunday, the 20th of May, the first day appointed, the Declaration was read in London only in four Churches out of one hundred. The Dissenters and Church Laymen sided with the Clergy. On the following Sunday the Declaration was treated in the same manner in London, and on Sunday, the 3d of June, was disregarded by Bishops and Clergy in all parts of England. James, by the advice of Jeffreys, ordered the Archbishop and Bishops to be indicted for a seditious libel. They were, on the 8th of June, conveyed to the Tower amidst the most enthusiastic demonstrations of respect and affection from all classes. The same night the Queen was said to have given birth to a son; but the national opinion was that some trick had been played. On the 29th of June the trial of the seven Bishops came on before the Court of King's Bench. . . . The Jury, who, after remaining together all night (one being stubborn) pronounced a verdict of not guilty on the morning of the 30th June, 1688."—W. H. Torriano, *William the Third*, ch. 2.—"The court met at nine o'clock. The nobility and gentry covered the benches, and an immense concourse of people filled the Hall, and blocked up the adjoining

streets. Sir Robert Langley, the foreman of the jury, being, according to established form, asked whether the accused were guilty or not guilty, pronounced the verdict 'Not guilty.' No sooner were these words uttered than a loud huzza arose from the audience in the court. It was instantly echoed from without by a shout of joy, which sounded like a crack of the ancient and massy roof of Westminster Hall. It passed with electrical rapidity from voice to voice along the infinite multitude who waited in the streets. It reached the Temple in a few minutes. . . . 'The acclamations,' says Sir John Reresby, 'were a very rebellion in noise.' In no long time they ran to the camp at Hounslow, and were repeated with an ominous voice by the soldiers in the hearing of the King, who, on being told that they were for the acquittal of the bishops, said, with an ambiguity probably arising from confusion, 'So much the worse for them.'—Sir J. Mackintosh, *Hist. of the Revolution in Eng. in 1688*, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: A. Strickland, *Lives of the Seven Bishops*.—R. Southey, *Bk. of the Church*, ch. 18.—G. G. Perry, *Hist. of the Ch. of Eng.*, ch. 30 (v. 2).

A. D. 1688 (July).—William and Mary of Orange the hope of the nation.—"The wiser among English statesmen had fixed their hopes steadily on the succession of Mary, the elder daughter and heiress of James. The tyranny of her father's reign made this succession the hope of the people at large. But to Europe the importance of the change, whenever it should come about, lay not so much in the succession of Mary as in the new power which such an event would give to her husband, William, Prince of Orange. We have come, in fact, to a moment when the struggle of England against the aggression of its King blends with the larger struggle of Europe against the aggression of Lewis XIV."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 9, sect. 7.—"William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of the republic of the United Provinces, was, before the birth of the Prince of Wales, first prince of the blood royal of England [as son of Princess Mary, daughter of Charles I., and, therefore, nephew as well as son-in-law of James II.]; and his consort, the Lady Mary, the eldest daughter of the King, was, at that period, presumptive heiress to the crown."—Sir J. Mackintosh, *Hist. of the Revolution in Eng.*, ch. 10.

A. D. 1688 (July—November).—Invitation to William of Orange and his acceptance of it.—"In July, in almost exact coincidence of time with the Queen's accouchement [generally doubted and suspected], came the memorable trial of the Seven Bishops, which gave the first demonstration of the full force of that popular animosity which James's rule had provoked. Some months before, however, Edward Russell, nephew of the Earl of Bedford, and cousin of Algernon Sidney's fellow-victim, had sought the Hague with proposals to William [Prince of Orange] to make an armed descent upon England, as vindicator of English liberties and the Protestant religion. William had cautiously required a signed invitation from at least a few representative statesmen before committing himself to such an enterprise, and on the day of the acquittal of the Seven Bishops a paper, signed in cipher by Lords Shrewsbury, Devonshire, Danby, and Lumley, by Compton, Bishop of Northampton, by Edward Russell, and by Henry Sidney, brother of Alger-

non, was conveyed by Admiral Herbert to the Hague. William was now furnished with the required security for English assistance in the projected undertaking, but the task before him was still one of extreme difficulty. . . . On the 10th of October, matters now being ripe for such a step, William, in conjunction with some of his English advisers, put forth his famous declaration. Starting with a preamble to the effect that the observance of laws is necessary to the happiness of states, the instrument proceeds to enumerate fifteen particulars in which the laws of England had been set at naught. The most important of these were—(1) the exercise of the dispensing power; (2) the corruption, coercion, and packing of the judicial bench; (3) the violation of the test laws by the appointment of papists to offices (particularly judicial and military offices, and the administration of Ireland), and generally the arbitrary and illegal measures resorted to by James for the propagation of the Catholic religion; (4) the establishment and action of the Court of High Commission; (5) the infringement of some municipal charters, and the procuring of the surrender of others; (6) interference with elections by turning out of all employment such as refused to vote as they were required; and (7) the grave suspicion which had arisen that the Prince of Wales was not born of the Queen, which as yet nothing had been done to remove. Having set forth these grievances, the Prince's manifesto went on to recite the close interest which he and his consort had in this matter as next in succession to the crown, and the earnest solicitations which had been made to him by many lords spiritual and temporal, and other English subjects of all ranks, to interpose, and concluded by affirming in a very distinct and solemn manner that the sole object of the expedition then preparing was to obtain the assembling of a free and lawful Parliament, to which the Prince pledged himself to refer all questions concerning the due execution of the laws, and the maintenance of the Protestant religion, and the conclusion of an agreement between the Church of England and the Dissenters, as also the inquiry into the birth of the 'pretended Prince of Wales'; and that this object being attained, the Prince would, as soon as the state of the nation should permit of it, send home his foreign forces. About a week after, on the 16th of October, all things being now in readiness, the Prince took solemn leave of the States-General. . . . On the 19th William and his armament set sail from Helvoetsluis, but was met on the following day by a violent storm which forced him to put back on the 21st. On the 1st of November the fleet put to sea a second time. . . . By noon of the 5th of November, the Prince's fleet was wafted safely into Torbay."—H. D. Traill, *William the Third*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time*, 1688 (v. 3).—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, 17th Cent., bk. 18, ch. 1-4 (v. 4).—Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, ch. 106-107: Somers (v. 4).—T. P. Courtenay, *Life of Danby (Lardner's Cab. Cyclop.)*, pp. 315-324.

A. D. 1688 (November—December).—The Revolution.—Ignominious flight of James.—"The declaration published by the prince [on landing] consisted of sixteen articles. It enumerated those proceedings of the government since the accession of the king, which were

regarded as in the greatest degree opposed to the liberty of the subject and to the safety of the Protestant religion. . . . To provide some effectual remedy against these and similar evils, was the only design of the enterprise in which the prince, in compliance with earnest solicitations from many lords, both spiritual and temporal, from numbers among the gentry and all ranks of people, had now embarked. . . . Addresses were also published to the army and navy. . . . The immediate effect of these appeals did not correspond with the expectations of William and his followers. On the 8th of November the people of Exeter received the prince with quiet submission. The memory of Monmouth's expedition was still fresh and terrible through the west. On the 12th, lord Cornbury, son of the earl of Clarendon, went over, with some officers, and about a hundred of his regiment, to the prince; and most of the officers, with a larger body of the privates belonging to the regiment commanded by the duke of St. Alban's, followed their example. Of three regiments, however, quartered near Salisbury, the majority could not be induced to desert the service of the king. . . . Every day now brought with it new accessions to the standard of the prince, and tidings of movements in different parts of the kingdom in his favour; while James was as constantly reminded, by one desertion after another, that he lived in an atmosphere of treachery, with scarcely a man or woman about him to be trusted. The defection of the lords Churchill and Drumlanerie, and of the dukes of Grafton and Ormond, was followed by that of prince George and the princess Anne. Prince George joined the invader at Sherburne; the princess made her escape from Whitehall at night, under the guardianship of the bishop of London, and found an asylum among the adherents of the prince of Orange who were in arms in Northamptonshire. By this time Bristol and Plymouth, Hull, York, and Newcastle, were among the places of strength which had been seized by the partisans of the prince. His standard had also been unfurled with success in the counties of Derby, Nottingham, York, and Cheshire. . . . Even in Oxford, several of the heads of colleges concurred in sending Dr. Finch, warden of All Souls' College, to invite the prince from Dorsetshire to their city, assuring him of their willingness to receive him, and to melt down their plate for his service, if it should be needed. So desperate had the affairs of James now become, that some of his advisers urged his leaving the kingdom, and negotiating with safety to his person from a distance; but from that course he was dissuaded by Halifax and Godolphin. In compliance with the advice of an assembly of peers, James issued a proclamation on the 13th of November, stating that writs had been signed to convene a parliament on the 15th of January; that a pardon of all offences should previously pass the great seal; and that commissioners should proceed immediately to the head-quarters of the prince of Orange, to negotiate on the present state of affairs. The commissioners chosen by the king were Halifax, Nottingham, and Godolphin; but William evaded for some days the conference which they solicited. In the meantime a forged proclamation in the name of the prince was made public in London, denouncing the Catholics of the metropolis as plotting the destruction of life and property on

the largest possible scale. . . . No one doubted the authenticity of this document, and the ferment and disorder which it spread through the city filled the king with the greatest apprehension for the safety of himself and family. On the morning of the 9th of December, the queen and the infant prince of Wales were lodged on board a yacht at Gravesend, and commenced a safe voyage to Calais. James pledged himself to follow within 24 hours. In the course of that day the royal commissioners sent a report of their proceedings to Whitehall. The demands of the prince were, that a parliament should be assembled; that all persons holding public trusts in violation of the Test-laws should relinquish them; that the city should have command of the Tower; that the fleet, and the places of strength through the kingdom should be placed in the hands of Protestants; that the expense of the Dutch armament should be defrayed, in part, from the English Treasury; and that the king and the prince, and their respective forces, should remain at an equal distance from London during the sitting of parliament. James read these articles with some surprise, observing that they were much more moderate than he had expected. But his pledge had been given to the queen; the city was still in great agitation; and private letters, intimating that his person was not beyond the reach of danger, suggested that his interests might possibly be better served by his absence than by his presence. Hence his purpose to leave the kingdom remained unaltered. At three o'clock on the following morning the king left Whitehall with sir Edward Hales, disguising himself as an attendant. The vessel provided to convey him to France was a miserable fishing-boat. It descended the river without interruption until it came near to Feversham, where some fishermen, suspecting Hales and the king to be Catholics, probably priests endeavouring to make their escape in disguise, took them from the vessel. . . . The arrest of the monarch at Feversham on Wednesday was followed by an order of the privy council, commanding that his carriage and the royal guards should be sent to reconduct him to the capital. . . . After some consultation the king was informed that the public interests required his immediate withdrawal to some distance from Westminster, and Hampton Court was named. James expressed a preference for Rochester, and his wishes in that respect were complied with. The day on which the king withdrew to Rochester William took up his residence in St. James's. The king chose his retreat, deeming it probable that it might be expedient for him to make a second effort to reach the continent. . . . His guards left him so much at liberty, that no impediment to his departure was likely to arise; and on the last day of this memorable year—only a week after his removal from Whitehall, James embarked secretly at Rochester, and with a favourable breeze safely reached the French coast."—R. Vaughan, *Hist. of England under the House of Stuart*, v. 2, pp. 914–918.

ALSO IN: Lord Macanlay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 9–10 (v. 2).—H. D. Traill, *William the Third*, ch. 4.—*Continuation of Sir J. Mackintosh's Hist. of the Rev. in 1688*, ch. 16–17.—Sir J. Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Gt. Britain and Ireland*, pt. 1, bk. 6–7 (v. 2).

A. D. 1689 (January–February).—The settlement of the Crown on William and Mary.—The Declaration of Rights.—"The convention

met on the 22nd of January. Their first care was to address the prince to take the administration of affairs and disposal of the revenue into his hands, in order to give a kind of parliamentary sanction to the power he already exercised. On the 28th of January the commons, after a debate in which the friends of the late king made but a faint opposition, came to their great vote: That king James II., having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of this kingdom, by breaking the original contract between king and people, and by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons having violated the fundamental laws, and having withdrawn himself out of the kingdom, has abdicated the government, and that the throne is thereby vacant. They resolved unanimously the next day, That it hath been found by experience inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this protestant kingdom to be governed by a popish prince. This vote was a remarkable triumph of the whig party, who had contended for the exclusion bill. . . . The lords agreed with equal unanimity to this vote; which, though it was expressed only as an abstract proposition, led by a practical inference to the whole change that the whigs had in view. But upon the former resolution several important divisions took place." The lords were unwilling to commit themselves to the two propositions, that James had "abdicated" the government by his desertion of it, and that the throne had thereby become "vacant." They yielded at length, however, and adopted the resolution as the commons had passed it. They "followed this up by a resolution, that the prince and princess of Orange shall be declared king and queen of England, and all the dominions thereunto belonging. But the commons, with a noble patriotism, delayed to concur in this hasty settlement of the crown, till they should have completed the declaration of those fundamental rights and liberties for the sake of which alone they had gone forward with this great revolution. That declaration, being at once an exposition of the misgovernment which had compelled them to dethrone the late king, and of the conditions upon which they elected his successors, was incorporated in the final resolution to which both houses came on the 13th of February, extending the limitation of the crown as far as the state of affairs required: That William and Mary, prince and princess of Orange, be, and be declared, king and queen of England, France and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, to hold the crown and dignity of the said kingdoms and dominions to them, the said prince and princess, during their lives, and the life of the survivor of them; and that the sole and full exercise of the regal power be only in, and executed by, the said prince of Orange, in the names of the said prince and princess, during their joint lives; and after their decease the said crown and royal dignity of the said kingdoms and dominions to be to the heirs of the body of the said princess; for default of such issue, to the princess Anne of Denmark [younger daughter of James II.], and the heirs of her body; and for default of such issue, to the heirs of the body of the said prince of Orange. . . . The Declaration of Rights presented to the prince of Orange by the marquis of Halifax, as speaker of the lords, in the presence of both houses, on the 18th of February, consists of three parts: a recital of the illegal and arbi-

trary acts committed by the late king, and of their consequent vote of abdication; a declaration, nearly following the words of the former part, that such enumerated acts are illegal; and a resolution, that the throne shall be filled by the prince and princess of Orange, according to the limitations mentioned. . . . This declaration was, some months afterwards [in October], confirmed by a regular act of the legislature in the bill of rights [see below: 1689 (OCTOBER)]."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 14-15 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 10 (v. 2).—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, 17th Cent., bk. 19, ch. 2-3 (v. 4).—R. Gneist, *Hist. of Eng. Const.*, ch. 42 (v. 2).

A. D. 1689 (April–August).—The Church and the Revolution.—The Toleration Act.—The Non-jurors.—"The men who had been most helpful in bringing about the late changes were not all of the same way of thinking in religion; many of them belonged to the Church of England; many were Dissenters. It seemed, therefore, a fitting time to grant the Dissenters some relief from the harsh laws passed against them in Charles II.'s reign. Protestant Dissenters, save those who denied the Trinity, were no longer forbidden to have places of worship and services of their own, if they would only swear to be loyal to the king, and that his power was as lawful in Church as in State matters. The law that gave them this is called the Toleration Act. Men's notions were still, however, very narrow; care was taken that the Roman Catholics should get no benefit from this law. Even a Protestant Dissenter might not yet lawfully be a member of either House of Parliament, or take a post in the king's service; for the Test Acts were left untouched. King William, who was a Presbyterian in his own land, wanted very much to see the Dissenters won back to the Church of England. To bring this about, he wished the Church to alter those things in the Prayer Book which kept Dissenters from joining with her. But most of the clergy would not have any change; and because these were the stronger party in Convocation—as the Parliament of the Church is called—William could get nothing done. At the same time a rent, which at first seemed likely to be serious, was made in the Church itself. There was a strong feeling among the clergy in favour of the banished king. So a law was made by which every man who held a preferment in the Church, or either of the Universities, had to swear to be true to King William and Queen Mary, or had to give up his preferment. Most of the clergy were very unwilling to obey this law; but only 400 were found stout-hearted enough to give up their livings rather than do what they thought to be a wicked thing. These were called 'non-jurors,' or men who would not swear. Among them were five out of the seven Bishops who had withstood James II. only a year before. The sect of non-jurors, who looked upon themselves as the only true Churchmen, did not spread. But it did not die out altogether until seventy years ago [i. e., early in the 19th century]. It was at this time that the names High-Church and Low-Church first came into use."—J. Rowley, *The Settlement of the Constitution*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: J. Stoughton, *Hist. of Religion in Eng.*, v. 5, ch. 4-11.—T. Lathbury, *Hist. of the Non-jurors*.

A. D. 1689 (May).—War declared against France.—The Grand Alliance. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689–1690.

A. D. 1689 (October).—The Bill of Rights.—The following is the text of the Bill of Rights, passed by Parliament at its sitting in October, 1689: Whereas the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, assembled at Westminster, lawfully, fully, and freely representing all the estates of the people of this realm, did upon the Thirteenth day of February, in the year of our Lord One Thousand Six Hundred Eighty-eight [o. s.], present unto their Majesties, then called and known by the names and style of William and Mary, Prince and Princess of Orange, being present in their proper persons, a certain Declaration in writing, made by the said Lords and Commons, in the words following, viz.: “Whereas the late King James II., by the assistance of divers evil counsellors, judges, and ministers employed by him, did endeavour to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion, and the laws and liberties of this kingdom: 1. By assuming and exercising a power of dispensing with and suspending of laws, and the execution of laws, without consent of Parliament. 2. By committing and prosecuting divers worthy prelates for humbly petitioning to be excused from concurring to the said assumed power. 3. By issuing and causing to be executed a commission under the Great Seal for erecting a court, called the Court of Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes. 4. By levying money for and to the use of the Crown by pretence of prerogative, for other time and in other manner than the same was granted by Parliament. 5. By raising and keeping a standing army within this kingdom in time of peace, without consent of Parliament, and quartering soldiers contrary to law. 6. By causing several good subjects, being Protestants, to be disarmed, at the same time when Papists were both armed and employed contrary to law. 7. By violating the freedom of election of members to serve in Parliament. 8. By prosecutions in the Court of King’s Bench for matters and causes cognisable only in Parliament, and by divers other arbitrary and illegal causes. 9. And whereas of late years, partial, corrupt, and unqualified persons have been returned, and served on juries in trials, and particularly divers jurors in trials for high treason, which were not freeholders. 10. And excessive bail hath been required of persons committed in criminal cases, to elude the benefit of the laws made for the liberty of the subjects. 11. And excessive fines have been imposed; and illegal and cruel punishments inflicted. 12. And several grants and promises made of fines and forfeitures before any conviction or judgment against the persons upon whom the same were to be levied. All which are utterly and directly contrary to the known laws and statutes, and freedom of this realm. And whereas the said late King James II. having abdicated the government, and the throne being thereby vacant, his Highness the Prince of Orange (whom it hath pleased Almighty God to make the glorious instrument of delivering this kingdom from Popery and arbitrary power) did (by the advice of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and divers principal persons of the Commons) cause letters to be written to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, being Protestants, and other letters to the several counties, cities, universities, boroughs,

and cinque ports, for the choosing of such persons to represent them as were of right to be sent to Parliament, to meet and sit at Westminster upon the two-and-twentieth day of January, in this year One Thousand Six Hundred Eighty and Eight, in order to such an establishment, as that their religion, laws, and liberties might not again be in danger of being subverted; upon which letters elections have been accordingly made. And thereupon the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, pursuant to their respective letters and elections, being now assembled in a full and free representation of this nation, taking into their most serious consideration the best means for attaining the ends aforesaid, do in the first place (as their ancestors in like case have usually done) for the vindicating and asserting their ancient rights and liberties, declare: 1. That the pretended power of suspending of laws, or the execution of laws, by regal authority, without consent of Parliament, is illegal. 2. That the pretended power of dispensing with laws, or the execution of laws by regal authority, as it hath been assumed and exercised of late, is illegal. 3. That the commission for erecting the late Court of Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes, and all other commissions and courts of like nature, are illegal and pernicious. 4. That levying money for or to the use of the Crown by pretence and prerogative, without grant of Parliament, for longer time or in other manner than the same is or shall be granted, is illegal. 5. That it is the right of the subjects to petition the King, and all commitments and prosecutions for such petitioning are illegal. 6. That the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with consent of Parliament, is against law. 7. That the subjects which are Protestants may have arms for their defence suitable to their conditions, and as allowed by law. 8. That election of members of Parliament ought to be free. 9. That the freedom of speech, and debates or proceedings in Parliament, ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament. 10. That excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed; nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. 11. That jurors ought to be duly impanelled and returned, and jurors which pass upon men in trials for high treason ought to be freeholders. 12. That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons before conviction are illegal and void. 13. And that for redress of all grievances, and for the amending, strengthening, and preserving of the laws, Parliament ought to be held frequently. And they do claim, demand, and insist upon all and singular the premises, as their undoubted rights and liberties; and that no declarations, judgments, doings or proceedings, to the prejudice of the people in any of the said premises, ought in any wise to be drawn hereafter into consequence or example. To which demand of their rights they are particularly encouraged by the declaration of his Highness the Prince of Orange, as being the only means for obtaining a full redress and remedy therein. Having therefore an entire confidence that his said Highness the Prince of Orange will perfect the deliverance so far advanced by him, and will still preserve them from the violation of their rights, which they have here asserted, and from all other attempts upon their religion, rights, and

liberties: II. The said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, assembled at Westminster, do resolve, that William and Mary, Prince and Princess of Orange, be, and be declared, King and Queen of England, France, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, to hold the crown and royal dignity of the said kingdoms and dominions to them the said Prince and Princess during their lives, and the life of the survivor of them; and that the sole and full exercise of the regal power be only in, and executed by, the said Prince of Orange, in the names of the said Prince and Princess, during their joint lives; and after their deceases, the said crown and royal dignity of the said kingdoms and dominions to be to the heirs of the body of the said Princess; and for default of such issue to the Princess Anne of Denmark, and the heirs of her body; and for default of such issue to the heirs of the body of the said Prince of Orange. And the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, do pray the said Prince and Princess to accept the same accordingly. III. And that the oaths hereafter mentioned be taken by all persons of whom the oaths of allegiance and supremacy might be required by law instead of them; and that the said oaths of allegiance and supremacy be abrogated. 'I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, That I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary: So help me God.' 'I, A. B., do swear, That I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical that damnable doctrine and position, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare, that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm: So help me God.'" IV. Upon which their said Majesties did accept the crown and royal dignity of the kingdoms of England, France, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, according to the resolution and desire of the said Lords and Commons contained in the said declaration. V. And thereupon their Majesties were pleased, that the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, being the two Houses of Parliament, should continue to sit, and with their Majesties' royal concurrence make effectual provision for the settlement of the religion, laws and liberties of this kingdom, so that the same for the future might not be in danger again of being subverted; to which the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, did agree and proceed to act accordingly. VI. Now in pursuance of the premises, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in Parliament assembled, for the ratifying, confirming, and establishing the said declaration, and the articles, clauses, matters, and things therein contained, by the force of a law made in due form by authority of Parliament, do pray that it may be declared and enacted, That all and singular the rights and liberties asserted and claimed in the said declaration are the true, ancient, and indubitable rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom, and so shall be esteemed, allowed, adjudged, deemed, and taken to be, and that all and every the particulars aforesaid shall be firmly and strictly holden and observed, as they are ex-

pressed in the said declaration; and all officers and ministers whatsoever shall serve their Majesties and their successors according to the same in all times to come. VII. And the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, seriously considering how it hath pleased Almighty God, in his marvellous providence, and merciful goodness to this nation, to provide and preserve their said Majesties' royal persons most happily to reign over us upon the throne of their ancestors, for which they render unto Him from the bottom of their hearts their humblest thanks and praises, do truly, firmly, assuredly, and in the sincerity of their hearts, think, and do hereby recognise, acknowledge, and declare, that King James II. having abdicated the Government, and their Majesties having accepted the Crown and royal dignity as aforesaid, their said Majesties did become, were, are, and of right ought to be, by the laws of this realm, our sovereign liege Lord and Lady, King and Queen of England, France, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, in and to whose princely persons the royal state, crown, and dignity of the said realms, with all honours, styles, titles, regalities, prerogatives, powers, jurisdictions, and authorities to the same belonging and appertaining, are most fully, right-fully, and entirely invested and incorporated, united, and annexed. VIII. And for preventing all questions and divisions in this realm, by reason of any pretended titles to the Crown, and for preserving a certainty in the succession thereof, in and upon which the unity, peace, tranquillity, and safety of this nation doth, under God, wholly consist and depend, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, do beseech their Majesties that it may be enacted, established, and declared, that the Crown and regal government of the said kingdoms and dominions, with all and singular the premises thereunto belonging and appertaining, shall be and continue to their said Majesties, and the survivor of them, during their lives, and the life of the survivor of them. And that the entire, perfect, and full exercise of the regal power and government be only in, and executed by, his Majesty, in the names of both their Majesties, during their joint lives; and after their deceases the said Crown and premises shall be and remain to the heirs of the body of her Majesty: and for default of such issue, to her Royal Highness the Princess Anne of Denmark, and the heirs of her body; and for default of such issue, to the heirs of the body of his said Majesty: And thereunto the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, do, in the name of all the people aforesaid, most humbly and faithfully submit themselves, their heirs and posterities, for ever: and do faithfully promise, that they will stand to, maintain, and defend their said Majesties, and also the limitation and succession of the Crown herein specified and contained, to the utmost of their powers, with their lives and estates, against all persons whatsoever that shall attempt anything to the contrary. IX. And whereas it hath been found by experience, that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a Popish prince, or by any king or queen marrying a Papist, the said Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, do further pray that it may be enacted, That all and every person and persons that is, are, or shall be reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the See or Church of

Rome, or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the Crown and Government of this realm, and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, or any part of the same, or to have, use, or exercise, any regal power, authority, or jurisdiction within the same; and in all and every such case or cases the people of these realms shall be and are hereby absolved of their allegiance, and the said Crown and government shall from time to time descend to, and be enjoyed by, such person or persons, being Protestants, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same, in case the said person or persons so reconciled, holding communion, or professing, or marrying, as aforesaid, were naturally dead. **X.** And that every King and Queen of this realm, who at any time hereafter shall come to and succeed in the Imperial Crown of this kingdom, shall, on the first day of the meeting of the first Parliament, next after his or her coming to the Crown, sitting in his or her throne in the House of Peers, in the presence of the Lords and Commons therein assembled, or at his or her coronation, before such person or persons who shall administer the coronation oath to him or her, at the time of his or her taking the said oath (which shall first happen), make, subscribe, and audibly repeat the declaration mentioned in the statute made in the thirteenth year of the reign of King Charles II., intituled "An Act for the more effectual preserving the King's person and Government, by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament." But if it shall happen that such King or Queen, upon his or her succession to the Crown of this realm, shall be under the age of twelve years, then every such King or Queen shall make, subscribe, and audibly repeat the said declaration at his or her coronation, or the first day of meeting of the first Parliament as aforesaid, which shall first happen after such King or Queen shall have attained the said age of twelve years. **XI.** All which their Majesties are contented and pleased shall be declared, enacted, and established by authority of this present Parliament, and shall stand, remain, and be the law of this realm for ever; and the same are by their said Majesties, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, declared, enacted, or established accordingly. **XII.** And be it further declared and enacted by the authority aforesaid, That from and after this present session of Parliament, no dispensation by "non obstante" of or to any statute, or any part thereof, shall be allowed, but that the same shall be held void and of no effect, except a dispensation be allowed of in such statute, and except in such cases as shall be specially provided for by one or more bill or bills to be passed during this present session of Parliament. **XIII.** Provided that no charter, or grant, or pardon granted before the three-and-twentieth day of October, in the year of our Lord one thousand six hundred eighty-nine, shall be any ways impeached or invalidated by this Act, but that the same shall be and remain of the same force and effect in law, and no other, than as if this Act had never been made.

A. D. 1689-1696.—The war of the League of Augsburg, or the Grand Alliance against Louis XIV. (called in American history "King

William's War"). See FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690; 1689-1691; 1692; 1693 (JULY); 1694; 1695-1696.—Also, CANADA: A. D. 1689-1690; 1692-1697; and NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1694-1697.

A. D. 1690 (June).—The Battle of Beachy Head.—The great peril of the kingdom.—"In June, 1690, whilst William was in Ireland, the French sent a fleet, under Tourville, to threaten England. He left Brest and entered the British Channel. Herbert (then Earl of Torrington) commanded the English fleet lying in the Downs, and sailed to Saint Helens, where he was joined by the Dutch fleet under Evertsen. On the 26th of June the English and French fleets were close to each other, and an important engagement was expected, when unexpectedly Torrington abandoned the Isle of Wight and retreated towards the Straits of Dover. . . . The Queen and her Council, receiving this intelligence, sent to Torrington peremptory orders to fight. Torrington received these orders on the 29th June. Next day he bore down on the French fleet in order of battle. He had less than 60 ships of the line, whilst the French had 80. He placed the Dutch in the van, and during the whole fight rendered them little or no assistance. He gave the signal to engage, which was immediately obeyed by Evertsen, who fought with the most splendid courage, but at length, being unsupported, his second in command and many other officers of high rank having fallen, and his ships being fearfully shattered, Evertsen was obliged to draw off his contingent from the unequal battle. Torrington destroyed some of these injured ships, took the remainder in tow, and sailed along the coast of Kent for the Thames. When in that river he pulled up all the buoys to prevent pursuit. . . . Upon his return to London he was sent to the Tower, and in December was tried at Sheerness by court-martial, and on the third day was acquitted; but William refused to see him, and ordered him to be dismissed from the navy."—W. H. Torriano, *William the Third*, ch. 24.—"There has scarcely ever been so sad a day in London as that on which the news of the Battle of Beachy Head arrived. The shame was insupportable; the peril was imminent. . . . At any moment London might be appalled by news that 20,000 French veterans were in Kent. It was notorious that, in every part of the kingdom, the Jacobites had been, during some months, making preparations for a rising. All the regular troops who could be assembled for the defence of the island did not amount to more than 10,000 men. It may be doubted whether our country has ever passed through a more alarming crisis than that of the first week of July 1690."—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 15 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: J. Campbell, *Naval Hist. of Gt. Brit.*, ch. 18 (v. 2).

A. D. 1690-1691.—Defeat of James and the Jacobites in Ireland. See IRELAND: A. D. 1689-1691.

A. D. 1692.—The new charter to Massachusetts as a royal province. See MASSACHUSETTS: A. D. 1689-1692.

A. D. 1692.—Attempted invasion from France.—Battle of La Hogue.—"The diversion in Ireland having failed, Louis wished to make an effort to attack England without and within. James II., who had turned to so little advantage the first aid granted by the King of France saw therefore in preparation a much more powerful

assistance, and obtained what had been refused him after the days of the Boyne and Beachy-Head,—an army to invade England. News received from that country explained this change in the conduct of Louis. The opinion of James at Versailles was no better than in the past; but England was believed to be on the eve of counter-revolution, which it would be sufficient to aid with a vigorous and sudden blow. . . . Many eminent personages, among the Whigs as well as among the Tories, among others the Duke of Marlborough (Churchill), had opened a secret correspondence with the royal exile at Saint-Germain. James had secret adherents in the English fleet which he had so long commanded before reigning, and believed himself able to count on Rear-Admiral Carter, and even on Admiral Russell. Louis gave himself up to excessive confidence in the result of these plots, and arranged his plan of naval operations accordingly. An army of 30,000 men, with 500 transports, was assembled on the coast of Normandy, the greater part at La Hogue and Cherbourg, the rest at Havre: this was composed of all the Irish troops, a number of Anglo-Scotch refugees, and a corps of French troops. Marshal de Bellefonds commanded under King James. Tourville was to set out from Brest in the middle of April with fifty ships of the line, enter the Channel, attack the English fleet before it could be reinforced by the Dutch, and thus secure the invasion. Express orders were sent to him to engage the enemy 'whatever might be his numbers.' It was believed that half of the English fleet would go over to the side of the allies of its king. The landing effected, Tourville was to return to Brest, to rally there the squadron of Toulon, sixteen vessels strong, and the rest of our large ships, then to hold the Channel during the whole campaign. They had reckoned without the elements, which, hitherto hostile to the enemies of France, this time turned against her." The French fleets were detained by contrary winds and by incomplete preparations. Tourville was not reinforced, as he expected to be, by the squadrons of Toulon and Rochefort. Before he found it possible to sail from Brest, the Jacobite plot had been discovered in England, the government was on its guard, and the Dutch and English fleets had made their junction. Still, the French admiral was under orders which left him no discretion, and he went out to seek the enemy. "May 29, at daybreak, between the Capes of La Hogue and Barfleur, Tourville found himself in presence of the allied fleet, the most powerful that had ever appeared on the sea. He had been joined by seven ships from the squadron of Rochefort, and numbered 44 vessels against 99, 78 of which carried over 50 guns, and, for the most part, were much larger than a majority of the French. The English had 63 ships and [4,540] guns; the Dutch, 36 ships and 2,614 guns; in all, 7,154 guns; the French counted only 3,114. The allied fleet numbered nearly 42,000 men; the French fleet less than 20,000." Notwithstanding this great inferiority of numbers and strength, it was the French fleet which made the attack, bearing down under full sail "on the immense mass of the enemy." The attempt was almost hopeless; and yet, when night fell, after a day of tremendous battle, Tourville had not yet lost a ship; but his line of battle had been broken, and no chance of success remained. "May 30, at break of day, Tourville rallied around him 35 vessels. The other

nine had strayed, five towards La Hogue, four towards the English coast, whence they regained Brest. If there had been a naval port at La Hogue or at Cherbourg, as Colbert and Vauban had desired, the French fleet would have preserved its laurels! There was no place of retreat on all that coast. The fleet of the enemy advanced in full force. It was impossible to renew the prodigious effort of the day before." In this emergency, Tourville made a daring attempt to escape with his fleet through the dangerous channel called the Race of Alderney, which separates the Channel Islands from the Normandy coast. Twenty-two vessels made the passage safely and found a place of refuge at St. Malo; thirteen were too late for the tide and failed. Most of these were destroyed, during the next few days, by the English and Dutch at Cherbourg and in the bay of La Hogue,—in the presence and under the guns of King James' army of invasion. "James II. had reason to say that 'his unlucky star' everywhere shed a malign influence around him; but this influence was only that of his blindness and incapacity. Such was that disaster of La Hogue, which has left among us such a fatal renown, and the name of which resounds in our history like another Agincourt or Cressy. Historians have gone so far as to ascribe to this the destruction of the French navy. . . . La Hogue was only a reprisal for Beachy-Head. The French did not lose in it a vessel more than the allies had lost two years before, and the 15 vessels destroyed were soon replaced."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV. (tr. by M. L. Booth), v. 2, ch. 2.*

ALSO IN: Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng., ch. 18 (v. 4).*—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng., 17th Century, bk. 20, ch. 4 (v. 5).*—Sir J. Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Gt. Britain and Ireland, pt. 2, bk. 7 (v. 3).*

A. D. 1695.—Expiration of censorship law.—Appearance of first newspapers. See PRINTING AND THE PRESS: A. D. 1695.

A. D. 1696-1749.—Measures of commercial and industrial restriction in the American colonies. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1696-1749; and TRADE, MODERN.

A. D. 1697.—The Peace of Ryswick.—Recognition of William III. by France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1697.

A. D. 1698.—The founding of Calcutta. See INDIA: A. D. 1600-1702.

A. D. 1698-1700.—The question of the Spanish Succession. See SPAIN: A. D. 1698-1700. 17th Century.—Commercial Progress. See TRADE, MODERN.

A. D. 1701.—The Act of Settlement.—The source of the sovereignty of the House of Hanover or Brunswick.—"William and Mary had no children; and in 1700 the young Duke of Gloucester, the only child of Anne that lived beyond infancy, died. There was now no hope of there being anyone to inherit the crown by the Bill of Rights after the death of William and of Anne. In 1701, therefore, Parliament settled the crown on the Electress Sophia of Hanover, and her heirs. Sophia was one of the children of that Elizabeth, daughter of James I., who in 1613 had married the Palsgrave Frederick. She was chosen to come after William and Anne because she was the nearest to the Stuart line who was a Protestant. The law that did this is called the Act of Settlement; it gives Queen Victoria her title to the throne. Parliament in passing it tried

to make the nation's liberties still safer. It was now made impossible (1) for any foreigner to sit in Parliament or to hold an office under the Crown; (2) for the king to go to war in defence of countries that did not belong to England, unless Parliament gave him leave; or (3) to pardon anyone so that the Commons might not be able to impeach him."—J. Rowley, *The Settlement of the Constitution*, bk. 1, ch. 5.—"Though the choice was truly free in the hands of parliament, and no pretext of absolute right could be advanced on any side, there was no question that the princess Sophia was the fittest object of the nation's preference. She was indeed very far removed from any hereditary title. Besides the pretended prince of Wales, and his sister, whose legitimacy no one disputed, there stood in her way the duchess of Savoy, daughter of Henrietta duchess of Orleans, and several of the Palatine family. These last had abjured the reformed faith, of which their ancestors had been the strenuous assertors; but it seemed not improbable that some one might return to it. . . . According to the tenor and intention of the act of settlement, all prior claims of inheritance, save that of the issue of king William and the princess Anne, being set aside and annulled, the princess Sophia became the source of a new royal line. The throne of England and Ireland, by virtue of the paramount will of parliament, stands entailed upon the heirs of her body, being protestants. In them the right is as truly hereditary as it ever was in the Plantagenets or the Tudors. But they derive it not from those ancient families. The blood indeed of Cerdic and of the Conqueror flows in the veins of his present majesty [George IV.]. Our Edwards and Henries illustrate the almost unrivalled splendour and antiquity of the house of Brunswick. But they have transmitted no more right to the allegiance of England than Boniface of Este or Henry the Lion. That rests wholly on the act of settlement, and resolves itself into the sovereignty of the legislature."—H. Hallam, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 15 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: Sir A. Halliday, *Annals of the House of Hanover*, bk. 10 (v. 2).—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1714.

A. D. 1701-1702.—The rousing of the nation to war with France.—When Louis XIV. procured and accepted for his grandson the bequest of the Spanish crown, throwing over the Partition Treaty, "William had the intolerable chagrin of discovering not only that he had been befooled, but that his English subjects had no sympathy with him or animosity against the royal swindler who had tricked him. 'The blindness of the people here,' he writes sadly to the Pensionary Heinsius, 'is incredible. For though the affair is not public, yet it was no sooner said that the King of Spain's will was in favour of the Duke of Anjou, that it was the general opinion that it was better for England that France should accept the will than fulfil the Treaty of Partition.' . . . William dreaded the idea of a Bourbon reigning at Madrid, but he saw no very grave objection, as the two treaties showed, to Naples and Sicily passing into French hands. With his English subjects the exact converse was the case. They strongly deprecated the assignment of the Mediterranean possessions of the Spaniard to the Dauphin; but they were undisturbed by the sight of the Duke of Anjou seating

himself on the Spanish throne. . . . But just as, under a discharge from an electric battery, two repugnant chemical compounds will sometimes rush into sudden combination, so at this juncture the King and the nation were instantaneously united by the shock of a gross affront. The hand that liberated the uniting fluid was that of the Christian king. On the 16th of September 1701 James II. breathed his last at St. Germain, and, obedient to one of those impulses, half-chivalrous, half-arrogant, which so often determined his policy, Louis XIV. declared his recognition of the Prince of Wales as de jure King of England. No more timely and effective assistance to the policy of its de facto king could possibly have been rendered. Its effect upon English public opinion was instantaneous; and when William returned from Holland on the 4th of November, he found the country in the temper in which he could most have wished it to be." Dissolving the Parliament in which his plans had long been factiously opposed, he summoned a new one, which met on the last day of the year 1701. "Opposition in Parliament—in the country it was already inaudible—was completely silenced. The two Houses sent up addresses assuring the King of their firm resolve to defend the succession against the pretended Prince of Wales and all other pretenders whatsoever. . . . Nor did the goodwill of Parliament expend itself in words. The Commons accepted without a word of protest the four treaties constituting the new Grand Alliance. . . . The votes of supply were passed unanimously." But scarcely had the nation and the King arrived at this agreement with one another than the latter was snatched from his labors. On the 21st of February, 1702, William received an injury, through the stumbling of his horse, which his frail and diseased body could not bear. His death would not have been long delayed in any event, but it was hastened by this accident, and occurred on the 8th of March following. He was succeeded by Anne, the sister of his deceased queen, Mary, and second daughter of the deposed Stuart king, James II.—H. D. Traill, *William the Third*, ch. 14-15.

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, 17th Century, bk. 21, ch. 7-10 (v. 5).—See, also, SPAIN: A. D. 1701-1702.

A. D. 1702.—Accession of Queen Anne.

A. D. 1702.—Union of rival East India Companies. See INDIA: A. D. 1600-1702.

A. D. 1702.—The War of the Spanish Succession. See SPAIN: A. D. 1702; and NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702-1704.

A. D. 1702.—First daily newspaper. See PRINTING AND PRESS: A. D. 1622-1702.

A. D. 1702-1711.—The War of the Spanish Succession in America (called "Queen Anne's War"). See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702-1710; CANADA: A. D. 1711-1713.

A. D. 1702-1714.—The Age of Anne in literature.—"That which was once called the Augustan age of English literature was specially marked by the growing development of a distinct literary class. It was a period of transition from the early system of the patronage of authors to the later system of their professional independence. Patronage was being changed into influence. The system of subscription, by which Pope made his fortune, was a kind of joint-stock patronage. The noble did not support the poet, but induced his friends to subscribe. The noble

moreover, made another discovery. He found that he could dispense a cheaper and more effective patronage than of old by patronising at the public expense. During the reign of Queen Anne, the author of a successful poem or an effective pamphlet might look forward to a comfortable place. The author had not to wear the livery, but to become the political follower, of the great man. Gradually a separation took place. The minister found it better to have a regular corps of politicians and scribblers in his pay than occasionally to recruit his ranks by enlisting men of literary taste. And, on the other hand, authors, by slow degrees, struggled into a more independent position as their public increased. In the earlier part of the century, however, we find a class of fairly cultivated people, sufficiently numerous to form a literary audience, and yet not so numerous as to split into entirely distinct fractions. The old religious and political warfare has softened; the statesman loses his place, but not his head; and though there is plenty of bitterness, there is little violence. We have thus a brilliant society of statesmen, authors, clergymen, and lawyers, forming social clubs, meeting at coffee-houses, talking scandal and politics, and intensely interested in the new social phenomena which emerge as the old order decays; more excitable, perhaps, than their fathers, but less desperately in earnest, and waging a constant pamphleteering warfare upon politics, literature, and theology, which is yet consistent with a certain degree of friendly intercourse. The essayist, the critic, and the novelist appear for the first time in their modern shape; and the journalist is slowly gaining some authority as the wielder of a political force. The whole character of contemporary literature, in short, is moulded by the social conditions of the class for which and by which it was written, still more distinctly than by the ideas current in contemporary speculation. . . . Pope is the typical representative of the poetical spirit of the day. He may or may not be regarded as the intellectual superior of Swift or Addison; and the most widely differing opinions may be formed of the intrinsic merits of his poetry. The mere fact, however, that his poetical dynasty was supreme to the end of the century proved that, in some sense, he is a most characteristic product. Nor is it hard to see the main sources of his power. Pope had at least two great poetical qualities. He was amongst the most keenly sensitive of men, and he had an almost unique felicity of expression, which has enabled him to coin more proverbs than any writer since Shakespeare. Sensitive, it may be said, is a polite word for morbid, and his felicity of phrase was more adapted to coin epigrams than poetry. The controversy is here irrelevant. Pope, whether, as I should say, a true poet, or, as some have said, only the most sparkling of rhymesters, reflects the thoughts of his day with a curious completeness. . . . There is, however, another wide province of literature in which writers of the eighteenth century did work original in character and of permanent value. If the seventeenth century is the great age of dramatists and theologians, the eighteenth century was the age in which the critic, the essayist, the satirist, the novelist, and the moralist first appeared, or reached the highest mark. Criticism, though still in its infancy, first became an independent art with Addison. Addison and his various colleagues

set the first example of that kind of social essay which is still popular. Satire had been practised in the preceding century, and in the hands of Dryden had become a formidable political weapon; but the social satire of which Pope was, and remains, the chief master, began with the century, and may be said to have expired with it, in spite of the efforts of Byron and Gifford. De Foe, Richardson, Fielding, and Smollett developed the modern novel out of very crude rudiments; and two of the greatest men of the century, Swift and Johnson, may be best described as practical moralists in a vein peculiar to the time. . . . The English novel, as the word is now understood, begins with De Foe. Though, like all other products of mind or body, it was developed out of previously existing material, and is related to the great family of stories with which men have amused themselves in all ages, it is, perhaps, as nearly an original creation as anything can be. The legends of saints which amused the middle ages, or the chivalrous romances which were popular throughout the seventeenth century, had become too unreal to amuse living human beings. De Foe made the discovery that a history might be equally interesting if the recorded events had never happened." —L. Stephen, *Hist. of Eng. Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, ch. 12, sect. 23-56 (v. 2).—"This so-called classic age of ours has long ceased to be regarded with that complacency which led the most flourishing part of it to adopt the epithet 'Augustan.' It will scarcely be denied by its greatest admirer, if he be a man of wide reading, that it cannot be ranked with the poorest of the five great ages of literature. Deficient in the highest intellectual beauty, in the qualities which awaken the fullest critical enthusiasm, the eighteenth century will be enjoyed more thoroughly by those who make it their special study than by those who skim the entire surface of literature. It has, although on the grand scale condemned as second-rate, a remarkable fulness and sustained richness which endear it to specialists. If it be compared, for instance, with the real Augustan age in Rome, or with the Spanish period of literary supremacy, it may claim to hold its own against these rivals in spite of their superior rank, because of its more copious interest. If it has neither a Horace nor a Calderon, it has a great extent and variety of writers just below these in merit, and far more numerous than what Rome or Spain can show during those blossoming periods. It is, moreover, fertile at far more points than either of these schools. This sustained and variegated success, at a comparatively low level of effort, strikes one as characteristic of an age more remarkable for persistent vitality than for rapid and brilliant growth. The Elizabethan *vidua vis* is absent, the Georgian glow has not yet dawned, but there is a suffused prosaic light of intelligence, of cultivated form, over the whole picture, and during the first half of the period, at least, this is bright enough to be very attractive. Perhaps, in closing, the distinguishing mark of eighteenth-century literature may be indicated as its mastery of prose as a vehicle for general thought."—E. Gosse, *The Study of Eighteenth-Century Literature* (New Princeton Rev., July, 1888, p. 21).

A. D. 1703.—The Methuen Treaty with Portugal. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1703; and SPAIN: A. D. 1703-1704.

A. D. 1703.—The Aylesbury election case.—"Ashby, a burgess of Aylesbury, sued the returning officer for maliciously refusing his vote. Three judges of the King's Bench decided, against the opinion of Chief Justice Holt, that the verdict which a jury had given in favor of Ashby must be set aside, as the action was not maintainable. The plaintiff went to the House of Lords upon a writ of error, and there the judgment was reversed by a large majority of Peers. The Lower House maintained that 'the qualification of an elector is not cognizable elsewhere than before the Commons of England'; that Ashby was guilty of a breach of privilege; and that all persons who should in future commence such an action, and all attorneys and counsel conducting the same, are also guilty of a high breach of privilege. The Lords, led by Somers, then came to counter-resolutions. . . . The prorogation of Parliament put an end to the quarrel in that Session; but in the next it was renewed with increased violence. The judgment against the Returning Officer was followed up by Ashby levying his damages. Other Aylesbury men brought new actions. The Commons imprisoned the Aylesbury electors. The Lords took strong measures that affected, or appeared to affect, the privileges of the Commons. The Queen finally stopped the contest by a prorogation; and the quarrel expired when the Parliament expired under the Triennial Act. Lord Somers 'established the doctrine which has been acted on ever since, that an action lies against a Returning Officer for maliciously refusing the vote of an elector.'"—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 5, ch. 17.

ALSO IN: Lord Campbell, *Lives of the Lord Chancellors: Somers*, ch. 110 (v. 4).

A. D. 1704-1707.—Marlborough's campaigns in the War of the Spanish Succession.—Campaigns in Spain. See GERMANY: A. D. 1704; SPAIN: A. D. 1703-1704, to 1707; NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1705, and 1706-1707.

A. D. 1707.—The Union with Scotland. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1707.

A. D. 1707-1708.—Hostility to the Union in Scotland.—Spread of Jacobitism. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1707-1708.

A. D. 1708-1709.—The War of the Spanish Succession: Oudenarde and Malplaquet. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1708-1709; and SPAIN: A. D. 1707-1710.

A. D. 1709.—The Barrier Treaty with Holland.—"The influence of the Whig party in the affairs of government in England, always irksome to the Queen, had now begun visibly to decline; and the partiality she was suspected of entertaining for her brother, with her known dislike of the house of Hanover, inspired them with alarm, lest the Tories might seek still further to propitiate her favour, by altering, in his favour, the line of succession, as at present established. They had, accordingly, made it one of the preliminaries of the proposed treaty of peace, that the Protestant succession, in England, should be secured by a general guarantee, and now sought to repair, as far as possible, the failure caused by the unsuccessful termination of the conferences, by entering into a treaty to that effect with the States. The Marquis Townshend, accordingly, repaired for this purpose to the Hague, when the States consented to enter into an engagement to maintain the present suc-

cession to the crown, with their whole force, and to make the recognition of that succession, and the expulsion of the Pretender from France, an indispensable preliminary to any peace with that kingdom. In return for this important guarantee, England was to secure to the States a barrier, formed of the towns of Nieuport, Furnes and the fort of Knokke, Menin, Lille, Ryssel, Tournay, Condé, and Valenciennes, Maubeuge, Charleroi, Namur, Lier, Halle, and some forts, besides the citadels of Ghent and Dendermonde. It was afterwards asserted, in excuse for the dereliction from that treaty on the part of England, that Townshend had gone beyond his instructions; but it is quite certain that it was ratified without hesitation by the queen, whatever may have been her secret feelings regarding it."—C. M. Davies, *Hist. of Holland*, pt. 3, ch. 11 (v. 3).

A. D. 1710-1712.—Opposition to the war.—Trial of Sacheverell.—Fall of the Whigs and Marlborough.—"A 'deluge of blood' such as that of Malplaquet increased the growing weariness of the war, and the rejection of the French offers was unjustly attributed to a desire on the part of Marlborough of lengthening out a contest which brought him profit and power. The expulsion of Harley and St. John [Bolingbroke] from the Ministry had given the Tories leaders of a more vigorous stamp, and St. John brought into play a new engine of political attack whose powers soon made themselves felt. In the Examiner, and in a crowd of pamphlets and periodicals which followed in its train, the humor of Prior, the bitter irony of Swift, and St. John's own brilliant sophistry spent themselves on the abuse of the war and of its general. . . . A sudden storm of popular passion showed the way in which public opinion responded to these efforts. A High-Church divine, Dr. Sacheverell, maintained the doctrine of non-resistance [the doctrine, that is, of passive obedience and non-resistance to government, implying a condemnation of the Revolution of 1688 and of the Revolution settlement], in a sermon at St. Paul's, with a boldness which deserved prosecution; but in spite of the warning of Marlborough and of Somers the Whig Ministers resolved on his impeachment. His trial in 1710 at once widened into a great party struggle, and the popular enthusiasm in Sacheverell's favor showed the gathering hatred of the Whigs and the war. . . . A small majority of the peers found him guilty, but the light sentence they inflicted was in effect an acquittal, and bonfires and illuminations over the whole country welcomed it as a Tory triumph. The turn of popular feeling freed Anne at once from the pressure beneath which she had bent; and the skill of Harley, whose cousin, Mrs. Masham, had succeeded the Duchess of Marlborough in the Queen's favor, was employed in bringing about the fall both of Marlborough and the Whig Ministers. . . . The return of a Tory House of Commons sealed his [Marlborough's] fate. His wife was dismissed from court. A masterly plan for a march into the heart of France in the opening of 1711 was foiled by the withdrawal of a part of his forces, and the negotiations which had for some time been conducted between the French and English Ministers without his knowledge marched rapidly to a close. . . . At the opening of 1712 the Whig majority of the House of Lords was swamped by the

creation of twelve Tory peers. Marlborough was dismissed from his command, charged with peculation, and condemned as guilty by a vote of the House of Commons. He at once withdrew from England, and with his withdrawal all opposition to the peace was at an end."—J. R. Green, *Short Hist. of the Eng. People*, sect. 9, ch. 9.—Added to other reasons for opposition to the war, the death of the Emperor Joseph I., which occurred in April, 1711, had entirely reversed the situation in Europe out of which the war proceeded. The Archduke Charles, whom the allies had been striving to place on the Spanish throne, was now certain to be elected Emperor. He received the imperial crown, in fact, in December, 1711. By this change of fortune, therefore, he became a more objectionable claimant of the Spanish crown than Louis XIV.'s grandson had been. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1711.—Earl Stanhope, *Hist. of Eng., Reign of Anne*, ch. 12-15.—"Round the fall of Marlborough has gathered the interest attaching to the earliest political crisis at all resembling those of quite recent times. It is at this moment that Party Government in the modern sense actually commenced. William the Third with military instinct had always been reluctant to govern by means of a party. Bound as he was, closely, to the Whigs, he employed Tory Ministers. . . . The new idea of a homogeneous government was working itself into shape under the mild direction of Lord Somers; but the form finally taken under Sir Robert Walpole, which has continued to the present time, was as yet some way off. Marlborough's notions were those of the late King. Both abroad and at home he carried out the policy of William. He refused to rely wholly upon the Whigs, and the extreme Tories were not given employment. The Ministry of Godolphin was a composite administration, containing at one time, in 1705, Tories like Harley and St. John as well as Whigs such as Sunderland and Halifax. . . . Lord Somers was a type of statesman of a novel order at that time. . . . In the beginning of the eighteenth century it was rare to find a man attaining the highest political rank who was unconnected by birth or training or marriage with any of the great 'governing families,' as they have been called. Lord Somers was the son of a Worcester attorney. . . . It was fortunate for England that Lord Somers should have been the foremost man of the Whig party at the time when constitutional government, as we now call it, was in course of construction. By his prudent counsel the Whigs were guided through the difficult years at the end of Queen Anne's reign; and from the ordeal of seeing their rivals in power they certainly managed, as a party, to emerge on the whole with credit. Although he was not nominally their leader, the paramount influence in the Tory party was Bolingbroke's; and that the Tories suffered from the defects of his great qualities, no unprejudiced critic can doubt. Between the two parties, and at the head of the Treasury through the earlier years of the reign, stood Godolphin, without whose masterly knowledge of finance and careful attention to the details of administration Marlborough's policy would have been baffled and his campaigns remained unfought. To Godolphin, more than to any other one man, is due the preponderance of the Treasury control in public affairs. It was his admin-

istration, during the absence of Marlborough on the Continent, which created for the office of Lord Treasurer its paramount importance, and paved the way for Sir Robert Walpole's government of England under the title of First Lord of the Treasury. . . . Marlborough saw and always admitted that his victories were due in large measure to the financial skill of Godolphin. To this statesman's lasting credit it must be remembered that in a venal age, when the standards of public honesty were so different from those which now prevail, Godolphin died a poor man. . . . Bolingbroke is interesting to us as the most striking figure among the originators of the new parliamentary system. With Marlborough disappeared the type of Tudor statesmen modified by contact with the Stuarts. He was the last of the Imperial Chancellors. Bolingbroke and his successor Walpole were the earlier types of constitutional statesmen among whom Mr. Pitt and, later, Mr. Gladstone stand pre-eminent. . . . He and his friends, opponents of Marlborough, and contributors to his fall, are interesting to us mainly as furnishing the first examples of 'Her Majesty's Opposition,' as the authors of party government and the prototypes of cabinet ministers of to-day. Their ways of thought, their style of speech and of writing, may be dissimilar to those now in vogue, but they show greater resemblance to those of modern politicians than to those of the Ministers of William or of the Stuarts. Bolingbroke may have appeared a strange product of the eighteenth century to his contemporaries, but he would not have appeared peculiarly misplaced among the colleagues of Lord Randolph Churchill or Mr. Chamberlain."—R. B. Brett, *Footprints of Statesmen*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough*, ch. 89-107.—The same, *Memoirs of Walpole*, v. 1, ch. 5-6.—G. Saintsbury, *Marlborough*.—G. W. Cooke, *Memoirs of Bolingbroke*, v. 1, ch. 6-13.—J. C. Collins, *Bolingbroke*.—A. Hassall, *Life of Bolingbroke*, ch. 3.

A. D. 1711-1714.—The Occasional Conformity Bill and the Schism Act.—"The Test Act, making the reception of the Anglican Sacrament a necessary qualification for becoming a member of corporations, and for the enjoyment of most civil offices, was very efficacious in excluding Catholics, but was altogether insufficient to exclude moderate Dissenters. . . . Such men, while habitually attending their own places of worship, had no scruple about occasionally entering an Anglican church, or receiving the sacrament from an Anglican clergyman. The Independents, it is true, and some of the Baptists, censured this practice, and Defoe wrote vehemently against it, but it was very general, and was supported by a long list of imposing authorities. . . . In 1702, in 1703, and in 1704, measures for suppressing occasional conformity were carried through the Commons, but on each occasion they were defeated by the Whig preponderance in the Lords." In 1711, the Whigs formed a coalition with one section of the Tories to defeat the negotiations which led to the Peace of Utrecht; but the Tories "made it the condition of alliance that the Occasional Conformity Bill should be accepted by the Whigs. The bargain was made; the Dissenters were abandoned, and, on the motion of Nottingham, a measure was carried providing that all persons in places of profit or trust, and all common councilmen in corpora-

tions, who, while holding office, were proved to have attended any Nonconformist place of worship, should forfeit the place, and should continue incapable of public employment till they should depose that for a whole year they had not attended a conventicle. The House of Commons added a fine of £40, which was to be paid to the informer, and with this addition the Bill became a law. Its effects during the few years it continued in force were very inconsiderable, for the great majority of conspicuous Dissenters remained in office, abstaining from public worship in conventicles, but having Dissenting ministers as private chaplains in their houses. . . . The object of the Occasional Conformity Bill was to exclude the Dissenters from all Government positions of power, dignity or profit. It was followed in 1714 by the Schism Act, which was intended to crush their seminaries and deprive them of the means of educating their children in their faith. . . . As carried through the House of Commons, it provided that no one, under pain of three months' imprisonment, should keep either a public or a private school, or should even act as tutor or usher, unless he had obtained a licence from the Bishop, had engaged to conform to the Anglican liturgy, and had received the sacrament in some Anglican church within the year. In order to prevent occasional conformity it was further provided that if a teacher so qualified were present at any other form of worship he should at once become liable to three months' imprisonment, and should be incapacitated for the rest of his life from acting as schoolmaster or tutor. . . . Some important clauses, however, were introduced by the Whig party qualifying its severity. They provided that Dissenters might have school-mistresses to teach their children to read; that the Act should not extend to any person instructing youth in reading, writing, or arithmetic, in any part of mathematics relating to navigation, or in any mechanical art only. . . . The facility with which this atrocious Act was carried, abundantly shows the danger in which religious liberty was placed in the latter years of the reign of Queen Anne."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng., 18th Century*, ch. 1.—The Schism Act was repealed in 1719, during the administration of Lord Stanhope.—*Cobbett's Parliamentary History*, v. 7, pp. 567-587.

ALSO IN: J. Stoughton, *Hist. of Religion in Eng.*, v. 5, ch. 14-16.

A. D. 1713.—Ending of the War of the Spanish Succession.—The Peace of Utrecht.—Acquisitions from Spain and France. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712-1714; CANADA: A. D. 1711-1713; also, NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1713; and SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1698-1776.

A. D. 1713.—Second Barrier Treaty with the Dutch. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1713-1715.

A. D. 1713-1714.—The desertion of the Catalans. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1714.

A. D. 1714.—The end of the Stuart line and the beginning of the Hanoverians.—Queen Anne died, after a short illness, on the morning of August 1, 1714. The Tories, who had just gained control of the ministry, were wholly unprepared for this emergency. They assembled in Privy Council, on the 29th of July, when the probably fatal issue of the Queen's illness became apparent, and "a strange scene is said to have occurred. Argyle and Somerset, though they

had contributed largely by their defection to the downfall of the Whig ministry of Godolphin, were now again in opposition to the Tories, and had recently been dismissed from their posts. Availing themselves of their rank of Privy Counsellors, they appeared unsummoned in the council room, pleading the greatness of the emergency. Shrewsbury, who had probably concocted the scene, rose and warmly thanked them for their offer of assistance; and these three men appear to have guided the course of events. . . . Shrewsbury, who was already Chamberlain and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, became Lord Treasurer, and assumed the authority of Prime Minister. Summons were at once sent to all Privy Counsellors, irrespective of party, to attend; and Somers and several other of the Whig leaders were speedily at their post. They had the great advantage of knowing clearly the policy they should pursue, and their measures were taken with admirable promptitude and energy. The guards of the Tower were at once doubled. Four regiments were ordered to march from the country to London, and all seamen to repair to their vessels. An embargo was laid on all shipping. The fleet was equipped, and speedy measures were taken to protect the seaports and to secure tranquility in Scotland and Ireland. At the same time despatches were sent to the Netherlands ordering seven of the ten British battalions to embark without delay; to Lord Strafford, the ambassador at the Hague, desiring the States-General to fulfil their guarantee of the Protestant succession in England; to the Elector, urging him to hasten to Holland, where, on the death of the Queen, he would be met by a British squadron, and escorted to his new kingdom." When the Queen's death occurred, "the new King was at once proclaimed, and it is a striking proof of the danger of the crisis that the funds, which had fallen on a false rumour of the Queen's recovery, rose at once when she died. Atterbury is said to have urged Bolingbroke to proclaim James III. at Charing Cross, and to have offered to head the procession in his lawn sleeves, but the counsel was mere madness, and Bolingbroke saw clearly that any attempt to overthrow the Act of Settlement would be now worse than useless. . . . The more violent spirits among the Jacobites now looked eagerly for a French invasion, but the calmer members of the party perceived that such an invasion was impossible. . . . The Regency Act of 1705 came at once into operation. The Hanoverian minister produced the sealed list of the names of those to whom the Elector entrusted the government before his arrival, and it was found to consist of eighteen names taken from the leaders of the Whig party. . . . Parliament, in accordance with the provisions of the Bill, was at once summoned, and it was soon evident that there was nothing to fear. The moment for a restoration was passed."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng., 18th Cent.*, ch. 1 (v. 1).—"George I., whom circumstances and the Act of Settlement had thus called to be King of Great Britain and Ireland, had been a sovereign prince for sixteen years, during which time he had been Elector of Brunswick-Lüneburg. He was the second who ever bore that title. By right of his father he was Elector; it was by right of his mother that he now became ruler of the United Kingdom. The father was Ernest Augustus, Sovereign Bishop of Osnaburg, who, by the death of his elder brothers, had

become Duke of Hanover, and then Duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg. In 1692 he was raised by the Emperor to the dignity of Elector. . . . The mother of George I. was Sophia, usually known as the Electress Sophia. The title was merely one of honour, and only meant wife of an Elector. . . . The Electress Sophia was the daughter of Elizabeth, daughter of King James I., and Frederick, the Elector Palatine [whose election to the throne of Bohemia and subsequent expulsion from that kingdom and from his Palatine dominions were the first acts in the Thirty Years' War]. . . . The new royal house in England is sometimes called the House of Hanover, sometimes the House of Brunswick. It will be found that the latter name is more generally used in histories written during the last century, the former in books written in the present day. If the names were equally applicable, the modern use is the more convenient, because there is another, and in some respects well known, branch of the House of Brunswick; but no other has a right to the name of Hanover. It is, however, quite certain that, whatever the English use may be, Hanover is properly the name of a town and of a duchy, but that the electorate was Brunswick-Lüneburg. . . . The House of Brunswick was of noble origin, tracing itself back to a certain Guelph d'Este, nicknamed 'the Robust,' son of an Italian nobleman, who had been seeking his fortunes in Germany. Guelph married Judith, widow of the English King, Harold, who fell on the hill of Senlac. . . . One of Guelph's descendants, later, married Maud, the daughter of King Henry II., probably the most powerful king in Europe of his day, at whose persuasion the Emperor conferred on the Guelphs the duchy of Brunswick." —E. E. Morris, *The Early Hanoverians*, bk. 1, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: P. M. Thornton, *The Brunswick Accession*, ch. 1-10.—Sir A. Halliday, *Annals of the House of Hanover*, bk. 10 (v. 2).—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of the Four Georges*, ch. 1-4.—W. M. Thackeray, *The Four Georges*, lect. 1.—A. W. Ward, *The Electress Sophia and the Hanoverian Succession* (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, v. 1).—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1701, THE ACT OF SETTLEMENT.

A. D. 1714-1721.—First years of George I. —The rise of Walpole to power and the founding of Parliamentary Government.—“The accession of the house of Hanover in the person of the great-grandson of James I. was once called by a Whig of this generation the greatest miracle in our history. It took place without domestic or foreign disturbance. . . . Within our own borders a short lull followed the sharp agitations of the last six months. The new king appointed an exclusively Whig Ministry. The office of Lord Treasurer was not revived, and the title disappears from political history. Lord Townshend was made principal Secretary of State, and assumed the part of first Minister. Mr. Walpole [Sir Robert] took the subaltern office of paymaster of the forces, holding along with it the paymastership of Chelsea Hospital. Although he had at first no seat in the inner Council or Cabinet, which seems to have consisted of eight members, only one of them a commoner, it is evident that from the outset his influence was hardly second to that of Townshend himself. In little more than a year (October 1715) he had made himself so prominent and valuable in the House of Commons, that the opportunity of a vacancy was

taken to appoint him to be First Commissioner of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. . . . Besides excluding their opponents from power, the Whigs instantly took more positive measures. The new Parliament was strongly Whig. A secret committee was at once appointed to inquire into the negotiations for the Peace. Walpole was chairman, took the lead in its proceedings, and drew the report.” On Walpole's report, the House “directed the impeachment of Oxford, Bolingbroke, and Ormond for high treason, and other high crimes and misdemeanours mainly relating to the Peace of Utrecht. . . . The proceedings against Oxford and Bolingbroke are the last instance in our history of a political impeachment. They are the last ministers who were ever made personally responsible for giving bad advice and pursuing a discredited policy, and since then a political mistake has ceased to be a crime. . . . The affair came to an abortive end. . . . The opening years of the new reign mark one of the least attractive periods in political history. George I. . . . cared very little for his new kingdom, and knew very little about its people or its institutions. . . . His expeditions to Hanover threw the management of all domestic affairs almost without control into the hands of his English ministers. If the two first Hanoverian kings had been Englishmen instead of Germans, if they had been men of talent and ambition, or even men of strong and commanding will without much talent, Walpole would never have been able to lay the foundations of government by the House of Commons and by Cabinet so firmly that even the obdurate will of George III. was unable to overthrow it [see CABINET, THE ENGLISH]. Happily for the system now established, circumstances compelled the first two sovereigns of the Hanoverian line to strike a bargain with the English Whigs, and it was faithfully kept until the accession of the third George. The king was to manage the affairs of Hanover, and the Whigs were to govern England. It was an excellent bargain for England. Smooth as this operation may seem in historic description, Walpole found its early stages rough and thorny.” The king was not easily brought to understand that England would not make war for Hanoverian objects, nor allow her foreign policy to be shaped by the ambitions of the Electorate. Differences arose which drove Townshend from the Cabinet, and divided the Whig party. Walpole retired from the government with Townshend, and was in opposition for three years, while Lord Stanhope and the Earl of Sunderland controlled the administration. The Whig schism came to an end in 1720, and Townshend and Walpole rejoined the administration, the latter as Paymaster of the Forces without a seat in the Cabinet. “His opposition was at an end, but he took no part in the active work of government. . . . Before many months had passed the country was overtaken by the memorable disasters of the South Sea Bubble [see SOUTH SEA BUBBLE]. . . . All eyes were turned to Walpole. Though he had privately dabbled in South Sea stock on his own account, his public predictions came back to men's minds; they remembered that he had been called the best man for figures in the House, and the disgrace of his most important colleagues only made his sagacity the more prominent. . . . He returned to his old posts, and once more became First Lord of the

Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer (April 1721), while Townshend was again Secretary of State. Walpole held his offices practically without a break for twenty-one years. The younger Pitt had an almost equal span of unbroken supremacy, but with that exception there is no parallel to Walpole's long tenure of power. To estimate aright the vast significance of this extraordinary stability, we must remember that the country had just passed through eighty years of revolution. A man of 80 in 1721 could recall the execution of Charles I., the protectorate of Oliver, the fall of Richard Cromwell, the restoration of Charles II., the exile of James II., the change of the order of succession to William of Orange, the reactionary ministry of Anne, and finally the second change to the House of Hanover. The interposition, after so long a series of violent perturbations as this, of twenty years of settled system and continuous order under one man, makes Walpole's government of capital and decisive importance in our history, and constitutes not an artificial division like the reign of a king, but a true and definite period, with a beginning, an end, a significance, and a unity of its own."—J. Morley, *Walpole*, ch. 3-4.

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole*, ch. 9-21 (v. 1).

A. D. 1715.—The Jacobite rising. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1715.

A. D. 1716.—The Septennial Act.—The easy suppression of the Jacobite rebellion was far from putting an end to the fears of the loyal supporters of the Hanoverian dynasty. They regarded with especial anxiety the approaching Parliamentary elections. "As, by the existing statute of 6 William and Mary [the Triennial Act, of 1694], Parliament would be dissolved at the close of the year, and a new election held in the spring of 1717, there seemed great probability of a renewal of the contest, or at least of very serious riots during the election time. With this in view, the ministers proposed that the existing Parliament should be continued for a term of seven instead of three years. This, which was meant for a temporary measure, has never been repealed, and is still the law under which Parliaments are held. It has been often objected to this action of Parliament, that it was acting arbitrarily in thus increasing its own duration. 'It was a direct usurpation,' it has been said, 'of the rights of the people, analogous to the act of the Long Parliament in declaring itself indestructible.' It has been regarded rather as a party measure than as a forward step in liberal government. We must seek its vindication in the peculiar conditions of the time. It was useless to look to the constituencies for the support of the popular liberty. The return of members in the smaller boroughs was in the hands of corrupt or corruptible freemen; in the counties, of great landowners; in the larger towns, of small place-holders under Government. A general election in fact only gave fresh occasion for the exercise of the influence of the Crown and of the House of Lords—freedom and independence in the presence of these two permanent powers could be secured only by the greater permanence of the third element of the Legislature, the House of Commons. It was thus that, though no doubt in some degree a party measure for securing a more lengthened tenure of office to the Whigs, the Septennial Act received, upon

good constitutional grounds, the support and approbation of the best statesmen of the time."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.*, period 3, p. 938.

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, v. 1, ch. 6.

A. D. 1717-1719.—The Triple Alliance.—The Quadruple Alliance.—War with Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725; also, ITALY: A. D. 1715-1735.

A. D. 1720.—The South Sea Bubble. See SOUTH SEA BUBBLE.

A. D. 1721-1742.—Development of the Cabinet System of ministerial government. See CABINET, THE ENGLISH.

A. D. 1725.—The Alliance of Hanover. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725.

A. D. 1726-1731.—Fresh differences with Spain.—Gibraltar besieged.—The Treaty of Seville.—The Second Treaty of Vienna. See SPAIN: A. D. 1726-1731.

A. D. 1727.—Accession of King George II.

A. D. 1727-1741.—Walpole's administration under George II.—"The management of public affairs during the six years of George the First's reign in which Walpole was Prime Minister, was easy. . . . His political fortunes seemed to be ruined by George the First's death [1727]. That King's successor had ransacked a very copious vocabulary of abuse, in order to stigmatise the minister and his associates. Rogue and rascal, scoundrel and fool, were his commonest utterances when Robert Walpole's name was mentioned. . . . Walpole bowed meekly to the coming storm," and an attempt was made to put Sir Spencer Compton in his place. But Compton himself, as well as the king and his sagacious queen, soon saw the futility of it, and the old ministry was retained. "At first, Walpole was associated with his brother-in-law, Townsend. But they soon disagreed, and the rupture was total after the death of Walpole's sister, Townsend's wife. . . . After Townsend's dismissal, Walpole reigned alone, if, indeed, he could be said to exercise sole functions while Newcastle was tied to him. Long before he was betrayed by this person, of whom he justly said that his name was perfidy, he knew how dangerous was the association. But Newcastle was the largest proprietor of rotten boroughs in the kingdom, and, fool and knave as he was, he had wit enough to guess at his own importance, and knavery enough to make his market. Walpole's chief business lay in managing the King, the Queen, the Church, the House of Commons, and perhaps the people. I have already said, that before his accession George hated Walpole. But there are hatreds and hatreds, equal in fervency while they last, but different in duration. The King hated Walpole because he had served his father well. But one George was gone, and another George was in possession. Then came before the man in possession the clear vision of Walpole's consummate usefulness. The vision was made clearer by the sagacious hints of the Queen. It became clear as noonday when Walpole contrived to add £115,000 to the civil list. . . . Besides, Walpole was sincerely determined to support the Hanoverian succession. He constantly insisted to George that the final settlement of his House on the throne would be fought out in England. . . . Hence he was able to check one of the King's ruling passions, a longing to engage in war. . . . It is generally understood that Walpole managed

the House of Commons by bribery; that the secret service money was thus employed: and that this minister was the father of that corruption which was reported to have disgraced the House during the first half of the last century. I suspect that these influences have been exaggerated. It is a stock story that Walpole said he knew every man's price. It might have been generally true, but the foundation of this apothegm is, in all likelihood, a recorded saying of his about certain members of the opposition. . . . Walpole has been designated, and with justice, as emphatically a peace minister. He held 'that the most pernicious circumstances in which this country can be, are those of war, as we must be great losers while the war lasts, and cannot be great gainers when it ends.' He kept George the Second at peace, as well as he could, by insisting on it that the safety of his dynasty lay in avoiding foreign embroilments. He strove in vain against the war which broke out in 1739. . . . I do not intend to disparage Walpole's administrative ability when I say that the country prospered independently of any financial policy which he adopted or carried out. . . . Walpole let matters take their course, for he understood that the highest merit of a minister consists in his doing no mischief. But Walpole's praise lies in the fact, that, with this evident growth of material prosperity, he steadily set his face against gambling with it. He resolved, as far as lay in his power, to keep the peace of Europe; and he was seconded in his efforts by Cardinal Fleury. He contrived to smooth away the difficulties which arose in 1727; and on January 13, 1730, negotiated the treaty of Seville [see SPAIN: A. D. 1726-1731], the benefits of which lasted through ten years of peace, and under which he reduced the army to 5,000 men." But the opposition to Walpole's peace policy became a growing passion, which overcame him in 1741 and forced him to resign. On his resignation he was raised to the peerage, with the title of Earl of Orford, and defeated, though with great difficulty, the determination of his enemies to impeach him.—J. E. T. Rogers, *Historical Gleanings*, v. 1, ch. 2.—"It is impossible, I think, to consider his [Walpole's] career with adequate attention without recognising in him a great minister, although the merits of his administration were often rather negative than positive, and although it exhibits few of those dramatic incidents, and is but little susceptible of that rhetorical colouring, on which the reputation of statesmen largely depends. . . . He was eminently true to the character of his countrymen. He discerned with a rare sagacity the lines of policy most suited to their genius and to their needs, and he had a sufficient ascendancy in English politics to form its traditions, to give a character and a bias to its institutions. The Whig party, under his guidance, retained, though with diminished energy, its old love of civil and of religious liberty, but it lost its foreign sympathies, its tendency to extravagance, its military restlessness. The landed gentry, and in a great degree the Church, were reconciled to the new dynasty. The dangerous fissures which divided the English nation were filled up. Parliamentary government lost its old violence, it entered into a period of normal and pacific action, and the habits of compromise, of moderation, and of practical good sense, which are most essential to

its success, were greatly strengthened. These were the great merits of Walpole. His faults were very manifest, and are to be attributed in part to his own character, but in a great degree to the moral atmosphere of his time. He was an honest man in the sense of desiring sincerely the welfare of his country and serving his sovereign with fidelity; but he was intensely wedded to power, exceedingly unscrupulous about the means of grasping or retaining it, and entirely destitute of that delicacy of honour which marks a high-minded man. . . . His estimate of political integrity was very similar to his estimate of female virtue. He governed by means of an assembly which was saturated with corruption, and he fully acquiesced in its conditions and resisted every attempt to improve it. . . . It is necessary to speak with much caution on this matter, remembering that no statesman can emancipate himself from the conditions of his time. . . . The systematic corruption of Members of Parliament is said to have begun under Charles II., in whose reign it was practised to the largest extent. It was continued under his successor, and the number of scandals rather increased than diminished after the Revolution. . . . And if corruption did not begin with Walpole, it is equally certain that it did not end with him. His expenditure of secret service money, large as it was, never equalled in an equal space of time the expenditure of Bute. . . . The real charge against him is that in a period of profound peace, when he exercised an almost unexampled ascendancy in politics, and when public opinion was strongly in favour of the diminution of corrupt influence in Parliament, he steadily and successfully resisted every attempt at reform. . . . It was his settled policy to maintain his Parliamentary majority, not by attracting to his ministry great orators, great writers, great financiers, or great statesmen, . . . but simply by engrossing borough influence and extending the patronage of the Crown."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 3 (v. 1).—"But for Sir Robert Walpole, we should have had the Pretender back again. But for his obstinate love of peace, we should have had wars, which the nation was not strong enough nor united enough to endure. But for his resolute counsels and good-humoured resistance, we might have had German despots attempting a Hanoverian regimen over us: we should have had revolt, commotion, want, and tyrannous misrule, in place of a quarter of a century of peace, freedom and material prosperity, such as the country never enjoyed, until that corrupter of parliaments, that dissolute tipsy cynic, that courageous lover of peace and liberty, that great citizen, patriot and statesman governed it. . . . In private life the old pagan revelled in the lowest pleasures: he passed his Sundays tippling at Richmond; and his holidays bawling after dogs, or boozing at Houghton with Boors over beef and punch. He cared for letters no more than his master did: he judged human nature so meanly that one is ashamed to have to own that he was right, and that men could be corrupted by means so base. But, with his hireling House of Commons, he defended liberty for us; with his incredulity he kept Church-craft down. . . . He gave Englishmen no conquests, but he gave them peace, and ease, and freedom; the Three per Cents. nearly at par; and wheat at five and six and twenty shillings a

quarter."—W. M. Thackeray, *The Four Georges*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Memoirs of Sir R. Walpole*, ch. 31-59 (v. 1).—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 15-23 (v. 2-3).—Lord Hervey, *Memoirs of the Reign of George II.*

A. D. 1731-1740.—The question of the Austrian Succession.—Guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1718-1738, and 1740.

A. D. 1732.—The grant of Georgia to General Oglethorpe. See GEORGIA: A. D. 1732-1739.

A. D. 1733.—The first Bourbon Family Compact.—Its hostility to Great Britain. See FRANCE, A. D. 1733.

A. D. 1733-1787.—The great inventions which built up the Cotton Manufacture. See COTTON MANUFACTURE.

A. D. 1739-1741.—The War of Jenkins' Ear.—"In spite of Walpole's love of peace, and determined efforts to preserve it, in the year 1739 a war broke out with Spain, which is an illustration of the saying that the occasion of a war may be trifling, though its real cause be very serious. The war is often called the War of Jenkins' Ear. The story ran that eight years before (1731) a certain Captain Jenkins, skipper of the ship 'Rebecca,' of London, had been maltreated by the Spaniards. His ship was sailing from Jamaica, and hanging about the entrance of the Gulf of Florida, when it was boarded by the Spanish coastguard. The Spaniards could find no proof that Jenkins was smuggling, though they searched narrowly, and being angry at their ill-success they hanged him to the yardarm, lowering him just in time to save his life. At length they pulled off his ear and told him to take it to his king. . . . Seven years later Captain Jenkins was examined by the House of Commons, on which occasion some member asked him how he felt when being maltreated, and Jenkins answered, 'I recommended my soul to God and my cause to my country.' The answer, whether made at the time or prepared for use in the House of Commons, touched a chord of sympathy, and soon was circulated through the country. 'No need of allies now,' said one politician; 'the story of Jenkins will raise us volunteers.' The truth of the matter is that this story from its somewhat ridiculous aspect has remained in the minds of men, but that it is only a specimen of many stories then afloat, all pointing to insolence of Spaniards in insisting upon what was after all strictly within their rights. But the legal treaty rights of Spain were growing intolerable to Englishmen, though not necessarily to the English Government; and traders and sailors were breaking the international laws which practically stopped the expansion of England in the New World. The war arose out of a question of trade, in this as in so many other cases the English being prepared to fight in order to force an entrance for their trade, which the Spaniards wished to shut out from Spanish America. This question found a place amongst the other matters arranged by the treaty of Utrecht, when the English obtained almost as their sole return for their victories what was known as the *Assiento*. This is a Spanish word meaning contract, but its use had been for some time confined to the disgraceful privilege of providing Spanish America with negroes kidnapped from their homes in

Africa. The Flemings, the Genoese, the Portuguese, and the French Guinea Company received in turn from Spanish kings the monopoly in this shameful traffic, which at the treaty of Utrecht was passed on for a period of thirty years to England, now becoming mistress of the seas, and with her numerous merchant ships better able than others to carry on the business. The English Government committed the contract to the South Sea Company, and the number of negroes to be supplied annually was no less than 4,800 'sound, healthy, merchantable negroes, two-thirds to be male, none under ten or over forty years old.' In the *Assiento* Treaty there was also a provision for the trading of one English ship each year with Spanish America; but in order to prevent too great advantage therefrom it was carefully stipulated that the ship should not exceed 600 tons burden. There is no doubt that this stipulation was regularly violated by the English sending a ship of the required number of tons, but with it numerous tenders and smaller craft. Moreover smuggling, being very profitable, became common; it was of this smuggling that Captain Jenkins was accused. . . . Walpole, always anxious for peace, by argument, by negotiation, by delays, resisted the growing desire for war; at length he could resist no longer. For the sake of his reputation he should have resigned office, but he had enjoyed power too long to be ready to yield it, and most unwisely he allowed himself to be forced into a declaration of war October 19, 1739. The news was received throughout England with a perfect frenzy of delight. . . . A year and a day after this declaration of war an event occurred—the death of the Emperor—which helped to swell the volume of this war until it was merged into the European war, called the War of the Austrian Succession, which includes within itself the First and Second Silesian Wars, between Austria and Frederick the Great of Prussia. The European war went on until the general pacification in the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1748. Within another ten years war broke out again on somewhat similar grounds, but on a much wider scale and with the combatants differently arranged, under the title 'Seven Years' War.' The events of this year, whilst the war was only between Spain and England, were the attacks on Spanish settlements in America, the capture of Porto Bello, and the failure before Cartagena, which led to Anson's famous voyage."—E. E. Morris, *The Early Hanoverians*, bk. 2, ch. 3.—"Admiral Vernon, setting sail with the English fleet from Jamaica, captured Porto Bello, on the Isthmus of Darien, Dec. 1st—an exploit for which he received the thanks of both Houses of Parliament. His attempt on Cartagena, in the spring of 1741, proved, however, a complete failure through his dissensions, it is said, with General Wentworth, the commander of the land forces. A squadron, under Commodore Anson, despatched to the South Sea for the purpose of annoying the Spanish colonies of Peru and Chili, destroyed the Peruvian town of Païta, and made several prizes; the most important of which was one of the great Spanish galleons trading between Acapulco and Manila, having a large treasure on board. It was on this occasion that Anson circumnavigated the globe, having sailed from England in 1740 and returned to Spithead in 1744."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 6, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: R. Walter, *Voyage around the World of George Anson*.—Sir J. Barrow, *Life of Lord George Anson*, ch. 1-2.—W. Coxe, *Memoirs of the Bourbon Kings of Spain*, ch. 43 (v. 3).—See, also, FRANCE, A. D. 1733, and GEORGIA: A. D. 1738-1743.

A. D. 1740-1741.—Beginning of the War of the Austrian Succession. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1740-1741.

A. D. 1742.—Naval operations in the Mediterranean. See ITALY: A. D. 1741-1743.

A. D. 1742-1745.—Ministries of Carteret and the Pelhams.—Pitt's admission to the Cabinet.—"Walpole resigned in the beginning of February, 1742; but his retirement did not bring Pitt into office. The King had conceived a violent prejudice against him, not only on account of the prominent and effective part he had taken in the general assault upon the late administration, but more especially in consequence of the strong opinions he had expressed on the subject of Hanover, and respecting the public mischiefs arising from George the Second's partiality to the interests of the Electorate. Lord Wilmington was the nominal head of the new administration, which was looked on as little more than a weak continuation of Walpole's. The same character was generally given to Pelham's ministry, (Pelham succeeded Wilmington as Premier, on the death of the latter in 1743,) and Pitt soon appeared in renewed opposition to the Court. It was about this time that he received a creditable and convenient addition to his private fortune, which also attested his celebrity. In 1744, the celebrated Duchess of Marlborough died, leaving him a legacy 'of 10,000 l. on account of his merit in the noble defence he has made of the laws of England, to prevent the ruin of his country.' Pitt was now at the head of a small but determined band of Opposition statesmen, with whom he was also connected by intermarriages between members of their respective families and his own. These were Lord Cobham, the Grenvilles, and his schoolfellow Lord Lyttelton. The genius of Pitt had made the opposition of this party so embarrassing to the minister, that Mr. Pelham, the leader of the House of Commons, and his brother, the Duke of Newcastle, found it necessary to get rid of Lord Carteret, who was personally most obnoxious to the attacks of Pitt, on account of his supposed zeal in favour of the King's Hanoverian policy. Pitt's friends, Lyttelton and Grenville, were taken into the ministry [called the Broad-bottomed Administration], and the undoubted wish of the Pelhams was to enlist Pitt also among their colleagues. But 'The great Mr. Pitt,' says old Horace Walpole—using in derision an epithet soon confirmed by the serious voice of the country—'the great Mr. Pitt insisted on being Secretary at War';—but it was found that the King's aversion to him was insurmountable; and after much reluctance and difficulty, his friends were persuaded to accept office without him, under an assurance from the Duke of Newcastle that 'he should at no distant day be able to remove this prejudice from his Majesty's mind.' Pitt concurred in the new arrangement, and promised to give his support to the remodelled administration. . . . On the breaking out of the rebellion of 1745, Pitt energetically supported the ministry in their measures to protect the established government. George the Second's prejudices against him, were, however, as strong as

ever. At last a sort of compromise was effected. Pitt waived for a time his demand of the War Secretaryship, and on the 22nd of February, 1746, he was appointed one of the joint Vice-treasurers for Ireland; and on the 6th of May following he was promoted to the more lucrative office of Paymaster-General of the Forces. . . . In his office of Paymaster of the Forces Pitt set an example then rare among statesmen, of personal disinterestedness. He held what had hitherto been an exceedingly lucrative situation: for the Paymaster seldom had less than 100,000 l. in his hands, and was allowed to appropriate the interest of what funds he held to his own use. In addition to this it had been customary for foreign princes in the pay of England to allow the Paymaster of the Forces a per-centage on their subsidies. Pitt nobly declined to avail himself of these advantages, and would accept of nothing beyond his legal salary."—Sir E. Creasy, *Memoirs of Eminent Etonians*, ch. 4.—"From Walpole's death in 1745, when the star of the Stuarts set for ever among the clouds of Culloden, to 1754, when Henry Pelham followed his old chief, public life in England was singularly calm and languid. The temperate and peaceful disposition of the Minister seemed to pervade Parliament. At his death the King exclaimed: 'Now I shall have no more peace'; and the words proved to be prophetic. Both in Parliament and in the country, as well as beyond its shores, the elements of discord were swiftly at war. Out of conflicting ambitions and widely divergent interests a new type of statesman, very different from Walpole, or from Bolingbroke, or from Pelham, or from the 'hubble-bubble Newcastle,' was destined to arise. And along with the new statesman a new force, of which he was in part the representative, in part the creator, was to be introduced into political life. This new force was the unrepresented voice of the people. The new statesman was an ex-cornet of horse, William Pitt, better known as Lord Chatham. The characteristics of William Pitt which mainly influenced his career were his ambition and his ill-health. Power, and that conspicuous form of egotism called personal glory, were the objects of his life. He pursued them with all the ardour of a strong-willed purpose; but the flesh was in his case painfully weak. Gout had declared itself his foe while he was still an Eton boy. His failures, and prolonged withdrawal at intervals from public affairs, were due to the inroads of this fatal enemy, from whom he was destined to receive his death-blow. Walpole had not been slow to recognise the quality of this 'terrible cornet of horse,' as he called him."—R. B. Brett, *Footprints of Statesmen*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 24-28 (v. 3).

A. D. 1743.—The British Pragmatic Army.—Battle of Dettingen. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1743.

A. D. 1743 (October).—The second Bourbon Family Compact. See FRANCE: A. D. 1743 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1743-1752.—Struggle of French and English for supremacy in India.—The founding of British empire by Clive. See INDIA: A. D. 1743-1752.

A. D. 1744-1745.—War of the Austrian Succession: Hostilities in America. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1744; and 1745.

A. D. 1745 (May).—War of the Austrian Succession in the Netherlands.—Fontenoy. See NETHERLANDS (THE AUSTRIAN PROVINCES): A. D. 1745.

A. D. 1745-1746.—The Young Pretender's invasion.—Last rising of the Jacobites. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1745-1746.

A. D. 1745-1747.—War of the Austrian Succession.—British incapacity.—Final successes at Sea.—“The extraordinary incapacity of English commanders, both by land and sea, is one of the most striking facts in the war we are considering. . . . Mismanagement and languor were general. The battle of Dettingen was truly described as a happy escape rather than a great victory; the army in Flanders can hardly be said to have exhibited any military quality except courage, and the British navy, though it gained some successes, added little to its reputation. The one brilliant exception was the expedition of Anson round Cape Horn, for the purpose of plundering the Spanish merchandise and settlements in the Pacific. It lasted for nearly four years. . . . The overwhelming superiority of England upon the sea began, however, gradually to influence the war. The island of Cape Breton, which commanded the mouth of Gulf St. Lawrence, and protected the Newfoundland fisheries, was captured in the June of 1745. In 1747 a French squadron was destroyed by a very superior English fleet off Cape Finisterre. Another was defeated near Belleisle, and in the same year as many as 644 prizes were taken. The war on the part of the English, however, was most efficiently conducted by means of subsidies, which were enormously multiplied.”—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng., 18th Century, ch. 3 (v. 1)*.

A. D. 1746-1747.—War of the Austrian Succession in Italy.—Siege of Genoa. See ITALY: A. D. 1746-1747.

A. D. 1748 (October).—End and results of the War of the Austrian Succession. See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: A. D. 1748; and NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1745-1748.

A. D. 1748-1754.—First movements to dispute possession of the Ohio Valley with the French. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1748-1754.

A. D. 1749-1755.—Unsettled boundary disputes with France in America.—Preludes of the final contest. See NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1749-1755; CANADA: A. D. 1750-1753; and OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1751.—Reformation of the Calendar. See CALENDAR, GREGORIAN.

A. D. 1753.—The Jewish Naturalization Bill. See JEWS: A. D. 1662-1753.

A. D. 1754.—Collision with the French in the Ohio Valley. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1754.

A. D. 1754-1755.—The Seven Years War.—Its causes and provocations.—“The seven years that succeeded the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle are described by Voltaire as among the happiest that Europe ever enjoyed. Commerce revived, the fine arts flourished, and the European nations resembled, it is said, one large family that had been reunited after its dissensions. Unfortunately, however, the peace had not exterminated all the elements of discord. Scarcely had Europe begun to breathe again when new disputes arose, and the seven years of peace and prosperity were succeeded by another seven of misery and war. The ancient rivalry between France and Eng-

land, which had formerly vented itself in continental struggles, had, by the progress of maritime discovery and colonisation, been extended to all the quarters of the globe. The interests of the two nations came into collision in India, Africa and America, and a dispute about boundaries in this last quarter again plunged them into a war. By the 9th article of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, France and England were mutually to restore their conquests in such state as they were before the war. This clause became a copious source of quarrel. The principal dispute regarded the limits of Acadia, or Nova Scotia, which province had, by the 12th article of the Treaty of Utrecht, been ceded to England ‘conformably to its ancient boundaries’; but what these were had never been accurately determined, and each Power fixed them according to its convenience. Thus, while the French pretended that Nova Scotia embraced only the peninsula extending from Cape St. Mary to Cape Canseau, the English further included in it that part of the American continent which extends to Pentagoet on the west, and to the river St. Lawrence on the north, comprising all the province of New Brunswick. Another dispute regarded the western limits of the British North American settlements. The English claimed the banks of the Ohio as belonging to Virginia, the French as forming part of Louisiana; and they attempted to confine the British colonies by a chain of forts stretching from Louisiana to Canada. Commissaries were appointed to settle these questions, who held their conferences at Paris between the years 1750 and 1755. Disputes also arose respecting the occupation by the French of the islands of St. Lucia, Dominica, St. Vincent, and Tobago, which had been declared neutral by former treaties. Before the Commissaries could terminate their labours, mutual aggressions had rendered a war inevitable. As is usual in such cases, it is difficult to say who was the first aggressor. Each nation laid the blame on the other. Some French writers assert that the English resorted to hostilities out of jealousy at the increase of the French navy. According to the plans of Rouillé, the French Minister of Marine, 111 ships of the line, 54 frigates, and smaller vessels in proportion, were to be built in the course of ten years. The question of boundaries was, however, undoubtedly the occasion, if not also the true cause, of the war. A series of desultory conflicts had taken place along the Ohio, and on the frontiers of Nova Scotia, in 1754, without being avowed by the mother countries. A French writer, who flourished about this time, the Abbé Raynal, ascribes this clandestine warfare to the policy of the Court of Versailles, which was seeking gradually to recover what it had lost by treaties. Orders were now issued to the English fleet to attack French vessels wherever found. . . . It being known that a considerable French fleet was preparing to sail from Brest and Rochefort for America, Admiral Boscawen was despatched thither, and captured two French men-of-war off Cape Race in Newfoundland, June 1755. Hostilities were also transferred to the shores of Europe. . . . A naval war between England and France was now unavoidable; but, as in the case of the Austrian Succession, this was also to be mixed up with a European war. The complicated relations of the European system again caused these two wars to run into one, though their origin had nothing in

common. France and England, whose quarrel lay in the New World, appeared as the leading Powers in a European contest in which they had only a secondary interest, and decided the fate of Canada on the plains of Germany. The war in Europe, commonly called the Seven Years' War, was chiefly caused by the pride of one Empress [Maria Theresa], the vanity of another [Elizabeth of Russia], and the subserviency of a royal courtizan [Madame Pompadour], who became the tool of these passions."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 6, ch. 5 (v. 3).—"The Seven Years' War was in its origin not an European war at all; it was a war between England and France on Colonial questions with which the rest of Europe had nothing to do; but the alliances and enmities of England and France in Europe, joined with the fact that the King of England was also Elector of Hanover, made it almost certain that a war between England and France must spread to the Continent. I am far from charging on the English Government of the time—for it was they, and not the French, who forced on the war—as Macaulay might do, the blood of the Austrians who perished at Leuthen, of the Russians sabred at Zorndorf, and the Prussians mown down at Kunersdorf. The States of the Continent had many old enmities not either appeased or fought out to a result; and these would probably have given rise to a war some day, even if no black men, to adapt Macaulay again, had been previously fighting on the coast of Coromandel, nor red men scalping each other by the great lakes of North America. Still, it is to be remembered that it was the work of England that the war took place then and on those lines; and in view of the enormous suffering and slaughter of that war, and of the violent and arbitrary proceedings by which it was forced on, we may well question whether English writers have any right to reprobate Frederick's seizure of Silesia as something specially immoral in itself and disastrous to the world. If the Prussians were high-way robbers, the English were pirates. . . . The origin of the war between England and France, if a struggle which had hardly been interrupted since the nominal peace could be said to have an origin, was the struggle for America."—A. R. Ropes, *The Causes of the Seven Years' War* (Royal Hist. Soc., Transactions, new series, v. 4).

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 31-32 (v. 4).—F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*, ch. 1-7.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 1755-1756; CANADA: A. D. 1750-1753; and OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1748-1754.

A. D. 1755 (April).—Demand of the royal governors in America for taxation of the colonies by act of Parliament. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1755.

A. D. 1755 (June).—Boscawen's naval victory over the French. See CANADA: A. D. 1755 (JUNE).

A. D. 1755 (July).—Braddock's defeat in America. See OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1755.

A. D. 1755 (September).—Victory at Lake George. See CANADA: A. D. 1755 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1756.—Loss of Minorca and reverses in America. See MINORCA: A. D. 1756; and CANADA: A. D. 1756-1757.

A. D. 1757-1759.—Campaigns on the Continent.—Defence of Hanover. See GERMANY: A. D. 1757 (JULY-DECEMBER), to 1759 (APRIL-AUGUST).

A. D. 1757-1760.—The great administration of the elder Pitt.—"In 1754 Henry Pelham died. The important consequence of his death was the fact that it gave Pitt at last an opportunity of coming to the front. The Duke of Newcastle, Henry Pelham's brother, became leader of the administration, with Henry Fox for Secretary at War, Pitt for Paymaster-general of the Forces, and Murray, afterwards to be famous as Lord Mansfield, for Attorney-general. There was some difficulty about the leadership of the House of Commons. Pitt was still too much disliked by the King to be available for the position. Fox for a while refused to accept it, and Murray was unwilling to do anything which might be likely to withdraw him from the professional path along which he was to move to such distinction. An attempt was made to get on with a Sir Thomas Robinson, a man of no capacity for such a position, and the attempt was soon an evident failure. Then Fox consented to take the position on Newcastle's own terms, which were those of absolute submission to the dictates of Newcastle. Later still he was content to descend to a subordinate office which did not even give him a place in the Cabinet. Fox never recovered the damage which his reputation and his influence suffered by this amazing act. . . . The Duke of Newcastle's Ministry soon fell. Newcastle was not a man who had the slightest capacity for controlling or directing a policy of war; and the great struggle known as the Seven Years' War had now broken out. One lamentable event in the war has to be recorded, although it was but of minor importance. This was the capture of Minorca by the French under the romantic, gallant, and profligate Duc de Richelieu. The event is memorable chiefly, or only, because it was followed by the trial and execution [March 14, 1757] of the unfortunate Admiral Byng [see MINORCA: A. D. 1756]. . . . The Duke of Newcastle resigned office, and for a short time the Duke of Devonshire was at the head of a coalition Ministry which included Pitt. The King, however, did not stand this long, and one day suddenly turned them all out of office. Then a coalition of another kind was formed, which included Newcastle and Pitt, with Henry Fox in the subordinate position of paymaster. Pitt now for the first time had it all his own way. He ruled everything in the House of Commons. He flung himself with passionate and patriotic energy into the alliance with that great Frederick whose genius and daring were like his own."—Justin McCarthy, *Hist. of the Four Georges*, v. 2, ch. 41.—"Newcastle took the Treasury. Pitt was Secretary of State, with the lead in the House of Commons, and with the supreme direction of the war and of foreign affairs. Fox, the only man who could have given much annoyance to the new Government, was silenced with the office of Paymaster, which, during the continuance of that war, was probably the most lucrative place in the whole Government. He was poor, and the situation was tempting. . . . The first acts of the new administration were characterized rather by vigour than by judgment. Expeditions were sent against different parts of the French coast with little success. . . . But soon conquests of a very different kind filled the kingdom with pride and rejoicing. A succession of victories undoubtedly brilliant, and, as it was thought, not barren, raised to the highest

point the fame of the minister to whom the conduct of the war had been intrusted. In July, 1758, Louisburg fell. The whole island of Cape Breton was reduced. The fleet to which the Court of Versailles had confided the defence of French America was destroyed. The captured standards were borne in triumph from Kensington Palace to the city, and were suspended in St. Paul's Church, amidst the roar of guns and kettle-drums, and the shouts of an immense multitude. Addresses of congratulation came in from all the great towns of England. Parliament met only to decree thanks and monuments, and to bestow, without one murmur, supplies more than double of those which had been given during the war of the Grand Alliance. The year 1759 opened with the conquest of Goree. Next fell Guadaloupe; then Ticonderoga; then Niagara. The Toulon squadron was completely defeated by Boscawen off Cape Lagos. But the greatest exploit of the year was the achievement of Wolfe on the heights of Abraham. The news of his glorious death and of the fall of Quebec reached London in the very week in which the Houses met. All was joy and triumph. Envy and faction were forced to join in the general applause. Whigs and Tories vied with each other in extolling the genius and energy of Pitt. His colleagues were never talked of or thought of. The House of Commons, the nation, the colonies, our allies, our enemies, had their eyes fixed on him alone. Scarcely had Parliament voted a monument to Wolfe when another great event called for fresh rejoicings. The Brest fleet, under the command of Conflans, had put out to sea. It was overtaken by an English squadron under Hawke. Conflans attempted to take shelter close under the French coast. The shore was rocky: the night was black: the wind was furious: the waves of the Bay of Biscay ran high. But Pitt had infused into every branch of the service a spirit which had long been unknown. No British seaman was disposed to err on the same side with Byng. The pilot told Hawke that the attack could not be made without the greatest danger. 'You have done your duty in remonstrating,' answered Hawke; 'I will answer for everything. I command you to lay me alongside the French admiral.' Two French ships of the line struck. Four were destroyed. The rest hid themselves in the rivers of Brittany. The year 1760 came; and still triumph followed triumph. Montreal was taken; the whole Province of Canada was subjugated; the French fleets underwent a succession of disasters in the seas of Europe and America. In the meantime conquests equalling in rapidity, and far surpassing in magnitude, those of Cortes and Pizarro, had been achieved in the East. In the space of three years the English had founded a mighty empire. The French had been defeated in every part of India. Chandernagore had surrendered to Clive, Pondicherry to Coote. Throughout Bengal, Bahar, Orissa and the Carnatic, the authority of the East India Company was more absolute than that of Acbar or Aurungzebe had ever been. On the continent of Europe the odds were against England. We had but one important ally, the King of Prussia; and he was attacked, not only by France, but also by Russia and Austria. Yet even on the Continent, the energy of Pitt triumphed over all difficulties. Vehemently as he had condemned the practice of

subsidising foreign princes, he now carried that practice farther than Carteret himself would have ventured to do. The active and able Sovereign of Prussia received such pecuniary assistance as enabled him to maintain the conflict on equal terms against his powerful enemies. On no subject had Pitt ever spoken with so much eloquence and ardour as on the mischiefs of the Hanoverian connection. He now declared, not without much show of reason, that it would be unworthy of the English people to suffer their King to be deprived of his electoral dominions in an English quarrel. He assured his countrymen that they should be no losers, and that he would conquer America for them in Germany. By taking this line he conciliated the King, and lost no part of his influence with the nation. In Parliament, such was the ascendancy which his eloquence, his success, his high situation, his pride, and his intrepidity had obtained for him, that he took liberties with the House of which there had been no example, and which have never since been imitated. . . . The face of affairs was speedily changed. The invaders [of Hanover] were driven out. . . . In the meantime, the nation exhibited all the signs of wealth and prosperity. . . . The success of our arms was perhaps owing less to the skill of his [Pitt's] dispositions than to the national resources and the national spirit. But that the national spirit rose to the emergency, that the national resources were contributed with unexampled cheerfulness, this was undoubtedly his work. The ardour of his soul had set the whole kingdom on fire. . . . The situation which Pitt occupied at the close of the reign of George the Second was the most enviable ever occupied by any public man in English history. He had conciliated the King; he domineered over the House of Commons; he was adored by the people; he was admired by all Europe. He was the first Englishman of his time; and he had made England the first country in the world. The Great Commoner, the name by which he was often designated, might look down with scorn on coronets and garters. The nation was drunk with joy and pride."—Lord Macaulay, *First Essay on William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (Essays, v. 3).

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng., 1713-1783*, ch. 33-36 (v. 4).—Sir E. Creasy, *Memoirs of Eminent Etonians*, ch. 4.

A. D. 1758 (June-August).—The Seven Years War.—Abortive expeditions against the coast of France.—Early in 1758 there was sent out "one of those joint military and naval expeditions which Pitt seems at first to have thought the proper means by which England should assist in a continental war. Like all such isolated expeditions, it was of little value. St. Malo, against which it was directed, was found too strong to be taken, but a large quantity of shipping and naval stores was destroyed. The fleet also approached Cherbourg, but although the troops were actually in their boats ready to land, they were ordered to re-embark, and the fleet came home. Another somewhat similar expedition was sent out later in the year. In July General Bligh and Commodore Howe took and destroyed Cherbourg, but on attempting a similar assault on St. Malo they found it too strong for them. The army had been landed in the Bay of St. Cast, and, while engaged in re-embarkation, it was attacked by some French troops

which had been hastily collected, and severely handled."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period 3*, p. 1027.

A. D. 1758 (July—November).—The Seven Years War in America: Final capture of Louisbourg and recovery of Fort Duquesne.—Bloody defeat at Ticonderoga. See CANADA: A. D. 1758; and CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1758-1760.

A. D. 1758-1761.—Breaking of French power in India. See INDIA: A. D. 1758-1761.

A. D. 1759.—Great victories in America.—Niagara, Ticonderoga, Crown Point, Quebec. See CANADA: A. D. 1759.

A. D. 1759 (August—November).—British naval supremacy established.—Victories off Lagos and in Quiberon Bay.—“Early in the year [1759] the French had begun to make preparations for an invasion of the British Isles on a large scale. Flat-bottomed boats were built at Havre and other places along the coasts of Normandy and Brittany, and large fleets were collected at Brest and Toulon, besides a small squadron at Dunkirk. A considerable force was assembled at Vannes in the south of Brittany, under the command of the Duc d’Aiguillon, which was to be conveyed to the Irish coasts by the combined fleets of Brest and Toulon, while the flat-bottomed boats transported a second army across the channel under cover of a dark night. The Dunkirk squadron, under Admiral Thurot, a celebrated privateer, was to create a diversion by attacking some part of the Scotch coast. The design was bold and well contrived, and would not improbably have succeeded three or even two years before, but the opportunity was gone. England was no longer in ‘that enervate state in which 20,000 men from France could shake her.’ Had a landing been effected, the regular troops in the country, with the support of the newly created militia, would probably have been equal to the emergency; but a more effectual bulwark was found in the fleet, which watched the whole French coast, ready to engage the enemy as soon as he ventured out of his ports. The first attempt to break through the cordon was made by M. de la Clue from Toulon. The English Mediterranean fleet, under Admiral Boscawen, cruising before that port, was compelled early in July to retire to Gibraltar to take in water and provisions and to refit some of the ships. Hereupon M. de la Clue put to sea, and hugging the African coast, passed the straits without molestation. Boscawen, however, though his ships were not yet refitted, at once gave chase, and came up with the enemy off [Lagos, on] the coast of Portugal, where an engagement took place [Aug. 18], in which three French ships were taken and two driven on shore and burnt. The remainder took refuge in Cadiz, where they were blockaded till the winter, when, the English fleet being driven off the coast by a storm, they managed to get back to Toulon. The discomfiture of the Brest fleet, under M. de Conflans, was even more complete. On November 9 Admiral Sir Edward Hawke, who had blockaded Brest all the summer and autumn, was driven from his post by a violent gale, and on the 14th, Conflans put to sea with 21 sail of the line and 4 frigates. On the same day, Hawke, with 22 sail of the line, stood out from Torbay, where he had taken shelter, and made sail for Quiberon Bay, judging that Conflans would steer thither

to liberate a fleet of transports which were blocked up in the river Morbihan, by a small squadron of frigates under Commodore Duff. On the morning of the 20th, he sighted the French fleet chasing Duff in Quiberon Bay. Conflans, when he discerned the English, recalled his chasing ships and prepared for action; but on their nearer approach changed his mind, and ran for shelter among the shoals and rocks of the coast. The sea was running mountains high and the coast was very dangerous and little known to the English, who had no pilots; but Hawke, whom no peril could daunt, never hesitated a moment, but crowded all sail after them. Without regard to lines of battle, every ship was directed to make the best of her way towards the enemy, the admiral telling his officers he was for the old way of fighting, to make downright work with them. In consequence many of the English ships never got into action at all; but the short winter day was wearing away, and all haste was needed if the enemy were not to escape. . . . As long as daylight lasted the battle raged with great fury, so near the coast that ‘10,000 persons on the shore were the sad spectators of the white flag’s disgrace.’ . . . By nightfall two French ships, the *Thésée* 74, and *Superb* 70, were sunk, and two, the *Formidable* 80, and the *Héros* 74, had struck. The *Soleil Royal* afterwards went aground, but her crew escaped, as did that of the *Héros*, whose captain dishonourably ran her ashore in the night. Of the remainder, seven ships of the line and four frigates threw their guns overboard, and escaped up the river Vilaine, where most of them bumped their bottoms out in the shallow water; the rest got away and took shelter in the Charente, all but one, which was wrecked, but very few ever got out again. With two hours more of daylight Hawke thought he could have taken or destroyed all, as he was almost up with the French van when night overtook him. Two English ships, the *Essex* 64, and the *Resolution* 74, went ashore in the night and could not be got off, but the crews were saved, and the victory was won with the loss of 40 killed and 200 wounded. The great invasion scheme was completely wrecked. Thurot had succeeded in getting out from Dunkirk, and for some months was a terror to the northern coast-towns, but early in the following year an end was put to his career. For the rest of the war the French never ventured to meet the English in battle on the high seas, and could only look on helplessly while their colonies and commerce fell into the hands of their rivals. From the day of the fight in Quiberon Bay, the naval and commercial supremacy of England was assured.”—F. W. Longman, *Frederick the Great and the Seven Years War*, ch. 12, sect. 3.

ALSO IN: C. D. Yonge, *Hist. of the British Navy*, v. 1, ch. 12.—J. Entick, *Hist. of the late War*, v. 4, pp. 241-290.

A. D. 1760.—Completed conquest of Canada.—Successes of the Prussians and their allies. See CANADA: A. D. 1760; and GERMANY: A. D. 1760.

A. D. 1760-1763.—Accession of George III.—His ignorance and his despotic notions of kingship.—Retirement of the elder Pitt.—Rise and fall of Bute.—The Grenville Ministry.—“When George III. came to the throne, in 1760, England had been governed for more than half a century by the great Whig families which

had been brought into the foreground by the revolution of 1688. . . . Under Walpole's wise and powerful sway, the first two Georges had possessed scarcely more than the shadow of sovereignty. It was the third George's ambition to become a real king, like the king of France or the king of Spain. From earliest babyhood, his mother had forever been impressing upon him the precept, 'George be king!' and this simple lesson had constituted pretty much the whole of his education. Popular tradition regards him as the most ignorant king that ever sat upon the English throne; and so far as general culture is concerned, this opinion is undoubtedly correct. . . . Nevertheless . . . George III. was not destitute of a certain kind of ability, which often gets highly rated in this not too clear-sighted world. He could see an immediate end very distinctly, and acquired considerable power from the dogged industry with which he pursued it. In an age where some of the noblest English statesmen drank their gallon of strong wine daily, or sat late at the gambling-table, or lived in scarcely hidden concubinage, George III. was decorous in personal habits and pure in domestic relations, and no banker's clerk in London applied himself to the details of business more industriously than he. He had a genuine talent for administration, and he devoted this talent most assiduously to selfish ends. Scantly endowed with human sympathy, and almost boorishly stiff in his ordinary unstudied manner, he could be smooth as oil whenever he liked. He was an adept in gaining men's confidence by a show of interest, and securing their aid by dint of fair promises; and when he found them of no further use, he could turn them adrift with wanton insult. Any one who dared to disagree with him upon even the slightest point of policy he straightway regarded as a natural enemy, and pursued him ever afterward with vindictive hatred. As a natural consequence, he surrounded himself with weak and short-sighted advisers, and toward all statesmen of broad views and independent character he nursed the bitterest rancour. . . . Such was the man who, on coming to the throne in 1760, had it for his first and chiefest thought to break down the growing system of cabinet government in England."—J. Fiske, *The American Revolution*, ch. 1 (v. 1).—"The dissolution of Parliament, shortly after his accession, afforded an opportunity of strengthening the parliamentary connection of the king's friends. Parliament was kept sitting while the king and Lord Bute were making out lists of the court candidates, and using every exertion to secure their return. The king not only wrested government boroughs from the ministers, in order to nominate his own friends, but even encouraged opposition to such ministers as he conceived not to be in his interest. . . . Lord Bute, the originator of the new policy, was not personally well qualified for its successful promotion. He was not connected with the great families who had acquired a preponderance of political influence; he was no parliamentary debater: his manners were unpopular: he was a courtier rather than a politician: his intimate relations with the Princess of Wales were an object of scandal; and, above all, he was a Scotchman. . . . Immediately after the king's accession he had been made a privy councillor, and admitted into the cabinet. An arrangement was soon afterwards concerted, by which Lord Holderness retired from office with

a pension, and Lord Bute succeeded him as Secretary of State. It was now the object of the court to break up the existing ministry, and to replace it with another, formed from among the king's friends. Had the ministry been united, and had the chiefs reposed confidence in one another, it would have been difficult to overthrow them. But there were already jealousies amongst them, which the court lost no opportunity of fomenting. A breach soon arose between Mr. Pitt, the most powerful and popular of the ministers, and his colleagues. He desired to strike a sudden blow against Spain, which had concluded a secret treaty of alliance with France, then at war with this country [see FRANCE: A. D. 1761 (AUGUST)]. Though war minister he was opposed by all his colleagues except Lord Temple. He bore himself haughtily at the council, —declared that he had been called to the ministry by the voice of the people, and that he could not be responsible for measures which he was no longer allowed to guide. Being met with equal loftiness in the cabinet, he was forced to tender his resignation. The king overpowered the retiring minister with kindness and condescension. He offered the barony of Chatham to his wife, and to himself an annuity of £3,000 a year for three lives. The minister had deserved these royal favours, and he accepted them, but at the cost of his popularity. . . . The same Gazette which announced his resignation, also trumpeted forth the peerage and the pension, and was the signal for clamors against the public favourite. On the retirement of Mr. Pitt, Lord Bute became the most influential of the ministers. He undertook the chief management of public affairs in the cabinet, and the sole direction of the House of Lords. . . . His ascendancy provoked the jealousy and resentment of the king's veteran minister, the Duke of Newcastle: who had hitherto distributed all the patronage of the Crown, but now was never consulted. . . . At length, in May 1762, his grace, after frequent disagreements in the cabinet and numerous affronts, was obliged to resign. And now, the object of the court being at length attained, Lord Bute was immediately placed at the head of affairs, as First Lord of the Treasury. . . . The king and his minister were resolved to carry matters with a high hand, and their arbitrary attempts to coerce and intimidate opponents disclosed their imperious views of the prerogative. Preliminaries of a treaty of peace with France having been agreed upon, against which a strong popular feeling was aroused, the king's vengeance was directed against all who ventured to disapprove them. The Duke of Devonshire having declined to attend the council summoned to decide upon the peace, was insulted by the king, and forced to resign his office of Lord Chamberlain. A few days afterwards the king, with his own hand, struck his grace's name from the list of privy councillors. . . . No sooner had Lord Rockingham heard of the treatment of the Duke of Devonshire than he . . . resigned his place in the household. A more general proscription of the Whig nobles soon followed. The Dukes of Newcastle and Grafton, and the Marquess of Rockingham, having presumed, as peers of Parliament, to express their disapprobation of the peace, were dismissed from the lord-lieutenancies of their counties. . . . Nor was the vengeance of the court confined to the heads of the Whig

party. All placemen, who had voted against the preliminaries of peace, were dismissed. . . . The preliminaries of peace were approved by Parliament; and the Princess of Wales, exulting in the success of the court, exclaimed, 'Now my son is king of England.' But her exultation was premature. . . . These stretches of prerogative served to unite the Whigs into an organised opposition. . . . The fall of the king's favoured minister was even more sudden than his rise. . . . Afraid, as he confessed, 'not only of falling himself, but of involving his royal master in his ruin,' he resigned suddenly [April 7, 1763],—to the surprise of all parties, and even of the king himself,—before he had held office for eleven months. . . . He retreated to the interior cabinet, whence he could direct more securely the measures of the court; having previously negotiated the appointment of Mr. George Grenville as his successor, and arranged with him the nomination of the cabinet. The ministry of Mr. Grenville was constituted in a manner favourable to the king's personal views, and was expected to be under the control of himself and his favourite."—T. E. May, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, 1760-1860, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of the Life and Reign of George III.*, ch. 1-10 (v. 1).—*The Grenville Papers*, v. 1-2.—W. Massey, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of George III.*, ch. 2-3 (v. 1).—G. O. Trevelyan, *Early Hist. of Charles James Fox*, ch. 4.

A. D. 1760-1775.—**Crown, Parliament and Colonies.**—The conflicting theories of their relations. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1760-1775.

A. D. 1761-1762.—The third Family Compact of the Bourbon kings.—War with Spain. See FRANCE: A. D. 1761 (AUGUST).

A. D. 1761-1762.—The Seven Years War: Last Campaigns in Germany. See GERMANY: A. D. 1761-1762.

A. D. 1762.—Capture of Havana. See CUBA: A. D. 1514-1851.

A. D. 1762-1764.—"The North Briton," No. 45, and the prosecution of Wilkes.—"The popular dislike to the new system of Government by courtiers had found vent in a scurrilous press, the annoyance of which continued unabated by the sham retirement of the minister whose ascendancy had provoked this grievous kind of opposition. The leader of the host of libellers was John Wilkes, a man of that audacity and self-possession which are indispensable to success in the most disreputable line of political adventure. But Wilkes had qualities which placed him far above the level of a vulgar demagogue. Great sense and shrewdness, brilliant wit, extensive knowledge of the world, with the manners of a gentleman, were among the accomplishments which he brought to a vocation, but rarely illustrated by the talents of a Catiline. Long before he engaged in public life, Wilkes had become infamous for his debaucheries, and, with a few other men of fashion, had tested the toleration of public opinion by a series of outrages upon religion and decency. Profligacy of morals, however, has not in any age or country proved a bar to the character of a patriot. . . . Wilkes' journal, which originated with the administration of Lord Bute [first issued June 5, 1762], was happily entitled 'The North Briton,' and from its boldness and personality soon obtained a large circulation. It is surpassed in ability though not

often equalled in virulence by the political press of the present day; but at a time when the characters of public men deservedly stood lowest in public estimation, they were protected, not unadvisedly perhaps, from the assaults of the press by a stringent law of libel. . . . It had been the practice since the Revolution, and it is now acknowledged as an important constitutional right, to treat the Speech from the Throne, on the opening of Parliament, as the manifesto of the minister; and in that point of view, it had from time to time been censured by Pitt, and other leaders of party, with the ordinary license of debate. But when Wilkes presumed to use this freedom in his paper, though in a degree which would have seemed temperate and even tame had he spoken to the same purport in his place in Parliament, it was thought necessary to repress such insolence with the whole weight of the law. A warrant was issued from the office of the Secretary of State to seize—not any person named—but 'the authors, printers, and publishers of the seditious libel, entitled the North Briton, No. 45.' Under this warrant, forty-nine persons were arrested and detained in custody for several days; but as it was found that none of them could be brought within the description in the warrant, they were discharged. Several of the individuals who had been so seized, brought actions for false imprisonment against the messengers; and in one of these actions, in which a verdict was entered for the plaintiff under the direction of the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the two important questions as to the claim of a Secretary of State to the protection given by statute to justices of the peace acting in that capacity, and as to the legality of a warrant which did not specify any individual by name, were raised by a Bill of Exceptions to the ruling of the presiding judge, and thus came upon appeal before the Court of King's Bench. . . . The Court of King's Bench . . . intimated a strong opinion against the Crown upon the important constitutional questions which had been raised, and directed the case to stand over for further argument; but when the case came on again, the Attorney-General Yorke prudently declined any further agitation of the questions. . . . These proceedings were not brought to a close until the end of the year 1763, long after the administration under which they were instituted had ceased to exist. . . . The prosecution of Wilkes himself was pressed with the like indiscreet vigour. The privilege of Parliament, which extends to every case except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, presented an obstacle to the vengeance of the Court. But the Crown lawyers, with a servility which belonged to the worst times of prerogative, advised that a libel came within the purview of the exception, as having a tendency to a breach of the peace; and upon this perversion of plain law, Wilkes was arrested, and brought before Lord Halifax for examination. The cool and wary demagogue, however, was more than a match for the Secretary of State; but his authorship of the alleged libel having been proved by the printer, he was committed close prisoner to the Tower. In a few days, having sued out writs of habeas, he was brought up before the Court of Common Pleas. . . . The argument which would confound the commission of a crime with conduct which had no more than a tendency to provoke it, was at once rejected

by an independent court of justice; and the result was the liberation of Wilkes from custody. But the vengeance of the Court was not turned aside by this disappointment. An ex-officio prosecution for libel was immediately instituted against the member for Aylesbury; he was deprived of his commission as colonel of the Buckinghamshire militia; his patron, Earl Temple, who provided the funds for his defence, was at the same time dismissed from the lord-lieutenancy of the same county, and from the Privy Council. When Parliament assembled in the autumn, the first business brought forward by the Government was this contemptible affair—a proceeding not merely foolish and undignified, but a flagrant violation of common justice and decency. Having elected to prosecute Wilkes for this alleged libel before the ordinary tribunals of the country, it is manifest that the Government should have left the law to take its course unprejudiced. But the House of Commons was now required to pronounce upon the very subject-matter of inquiry which had been referred to the decision of a court of law; and this degenerate assembly, at the bidding of the minister, readily condemned the indicted paper in terms of extravagant and fulsome censure, and ordered that it should be burned by the hands of the common hangman. Lord North, on the part of the Government, then pressed for an immediate decision on the question of privilege; but Pitt, in his most solemn manner, insisting on an adjournment, the House yielded this point. On the following day, Wilkes, being dangerously wounded in a duel with Martin, one of the joint Secretaries to the Treasury, who had grossly insulted him in the House, for the purpose of provoking a quarrel, was disabled from attending in his place; but the House, nevertheless, refused to postpone the question of privilege beyond the 24th of the month. On that day, they resolved 'that the privilege of Parliament does not extend to the case of writing and publishing seditious libels, nor ought to be allowed to obstruct the ordinary course of the laws in the speedy and effectual prosecution of so heinous and dangerous an offence.' Whatever may be thought of the public spirit or prudence of a House of Commons which could thus officiously define its privilege, the vote was practically futile, since a court of justice had already decided in this very case, as a matter of strict law, that the person of a member of Parliament was protected from arrest on a charge of this description. The conduct of Pitt on this occasion was consistent with the loftiness of his character. . . . The conduct of the Lords was in harmony with that of the Lower House. . . . The session was principally occupied by the proceedings against this worthless demagogue, whom the unworthy hostility of the Crown and both Houses of Parliament had elevated into a person of the first importance. His name was coupled with that of Liberty; and when the executioner appeared to carry into effect the sentence of Parliament upon 'The North Briton,' he was driven away by the populace, who rescued the obnoxious paper from the flames, and evinced their hatred and contempt for the Court faction by burning in its stead the jack-boot and the petticoat, the vulgar emblems which they employed to designate John Earl of Bute and his supposed royal patroness. . . . Wilkes himself, however, was forced to yield to the

storm. Beset by the spies of Government, and harassed by its prosecutions, which he had not the means of resisting, he withdrew to Paris. Failing to attend in his place in the House of Commons on the first day after the Christmas recess, according to order, his excuse was eagerly declared invalid; a vote of expulsion immediately followed [January 19, 1764], and a new writ was ordered for Aylesbury."—W. Massey, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of George III.*, ch. 4 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: J. E. T. Rogers, *Historical Gleanings*, v. 2, ch. 3.—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 41-42 (v. 5).

A. D. 1763.—The end and results of the Seven Years War: The Peace of Paris and Peace of Hubertsburg.—America to be English, not French. See SEVEN YEARS WAR.

A. D. 1763-1764.—Determination to tax the American colonies.—The Sugar (or Molasses) Act. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1763-1764.

A. D. 1764.—The climax of the mercantile colonial policy and its consequences. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1764.

A. D. 1765.—Passage of the Stamp Act for the colonies. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765.

A. D. 1765-1768.—Grenville dismissed.—The Rockingham and the Grafton-Chatham Ministries.—Repeal of the Stamp Act.—Fresh trouble in the American colonies.—"Hitherto the Ministry had only excited the indignation of the people and the colonies. Not satisfied with the number of their enemies, they now proceeded to quarrel openly with the king. In 1765 the first signs of the illness, to which George afterwards fell a victim, appeared; and as soon as he recovered he proposed, with wonderful firmness, that a Regency Bill should be brought in, limiting the king's choice of a Regent to the members of the Royal Family. The Ministers, however, in alarm at the prospect of a new Bute Ministry, persuaded the king that there was no hope of the Princess's name being accepted, and that it had better be left out of the Bill. The king unwisely consented to this unparalleled insult on his parent, apparently through lack of consideration. Parliament, however, insisted on inserting the Princess's name by a large majority, and thus exposed the trick of his Ministers. This the king never forgave. They had been for some time obnoxious to him, and now he determined to get rid of them. With this view he induced the Duke of Cumberland to make overtures to Chatham [Pitt, not yet titled], offering almost any terms." But no arrangement was practicable, and the king was left quite at the mercy of the Ministers he detested. "He was obliged to consent to dismiss Bute and all Bute's following. He was obliged to promise that he would use no underhand influence for the future. Life, in fact, became a burden to him under George Grenville's domination, and he determined to dismiss him, even at the cost of accepting the Whig Houses, whom he had pledged himself never to employ again. Pitt and Temple still proving obdurate, Cumberland opened negotiations with the Rockingham Whigs, and the Grenville Ministry was at an end [July, 1765]. . . . The new Ministry was composed as follows: Rockingham became First Lord of the Treasury; Dowdeswell, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Newcastle, Privy Seal; Northington, Lord Chancellor.

... Their leader Rockingham was a man of sound sense, but no power of language or government. . . . He was totally free from any suspicion of corruption. In fact there was more honesty than talent in the Ministry altogether. . . . The back-bone of the party was removed by the refusal of Pitt to co-operate. Burke was undoubtedly the ablest man among them, but his time was not yet come. Such a Ministry, it was recognized even by its own members, could not last long. However, it had come in to effect certain necessary legislation, and it certainly so far accomplished the end of its being. It repealed the Stamp Act [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1766], which had caused so much indignation among the Americans; and at the same time passed a law securing the dependence of the colonies. . . . The king, however, made no secret of his hostility to his Ministers. . . . The conduct of Pitt in refusing to join them was a decided mistake, and more. He was really at one with them on most points. Most of their acts were in accordance with his views. But he was determined not to join a purely party Ministry, though he could have done so practically on whatever terms he pleased. In 1766, however, he consented to form a coalition, in which were included men of the most opposite views—'King's Friends,' Rockingham Whigs, and the few personal followers of Pitt. Rockingham refused to take any office, and retired to the more congenial occupation of following the hounds. The nominal Prime Minister of this Cabinet was the Duke of Grafton, for Pitt refused the leadership, and retired to the House of Lords as Lord Chatham. Charles Townshend became Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Lord North, the leader of the 'King's Friends,' was Pay-master. The Ministry included Shelburne, Barré, Conway, Northington, Barrington, Camden, Granby—all men of the most opposite views. . . . This second Ministry of Pitt was a mistake from the very first. He lost all his popularity by taking a peerage. . . . As a peer and Lord Privy Seal he found himself in an uncongenial atmosphere. . . . His name, too, had lost a great deal of its power abroad. 'Pitt' had, indeed, been a word to conjure with; but there were no associations of defeat and humiliation connected with the name of 'Chatham.' . . . There were other difficulties, however, as well. His arrogance had increased, and it was so much intensified by irritating gout, that it became almost impossible to serve with him. His disease later almost approached madness. . . . The Ministry drifted helplessly about at the mercy of each wind and wave of opinion like a water-logged ship; and it was only the utter want of union among the Opposition which prevented its sinking entirely. As it was, they contrived to renew the breach with America, which had been almost entirely healed by Rockingham's repeal of the Stamp Act. Charles Townshend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was by far the ablest man left in the Cabinet, and he rapidly assumed the most prominent position. He had always been in favour of taxing America. He now brought forward a plan for raising a revenue from tea, glass, and paper [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1766-1767, and 1767-1768], by way of import duty at the American ports. . . . This wild measure was followed shortly by the death of its author, in September; and then the weakness of the Minis-

try became so obvious that, as Chatham still continued incapable, some fresh reinforcement was absolutely necessary. A coalition was effected with the Bloomsbury Gang; and, in consequence, Lords Gower, Weymouth, and Sandwich joined the Ministry. Lord Northington and General Conway retired. North succeeded Townshend at the Exchequer. Lord Hillsborough became the first Secretary of State for the Colonies, thus raising the number of Secretaries to three. This Ministry was probably the worst that had governed England since the days of the Cabal; and the short period of its existence was marked by a succession of arbitrary and foolish acts. On every important question that it had to deal with, it pursued a course diametrically opposed to Chatham's views; and yet with singular irony his nominal connection with it was not severed for some time"—that is, not until the following year, 1768.—B. C. Skottowe, *Our Hanoverian Kings*, pp. 234-239.

ALSO IN: *The Grenville Papers*, v. 3-4.—C. W. Dilke, *Papers of a Critic*, v. 2.—E. Lodge, *Portraits*, v. 8, ch. 2.

A. D. 1767-1769.—The first war with Hyder Ali, of Mysore. See INDIA: A. D. 1767-1769.

A. D. 1768-1770.—The quartering of troops in Boston and its ill consequences. See BOSTON: A. D. 1768; and 1770.

A. D. 1768-1774.—John Wilkes and the King and Parliament again.—The Middlesex elections.—In March, 1768, Wilkes, though outlawed by the court, returned to London from Paris and solicited a pardon from the king; but his petition was unnoticed. Parliament being then dissolved and writs issued for a new election, he offered himself as a candidate to represent the City of London. "He polled 1,247 votes, but was unsuccessful. On the day following this decision he issued an address to the freeholders of Middlesex. The election took place at Brentford, on the 28th of March. At the close of the poll the numbers were—Mr. Wilkes, 1,292; Mr. Cooke, 827; Sir W. B. Proctor, 807. This was a victory which astonished the public and terrified the ministry. The mob was in ecstasies. The citizens of London were compelled to illuminate their houses and to shout for 'Wilkes and liberty.' It was the earnest desire of the ministry to pardon the man whom they had persecuted, but the king remained inexorable. . . . A month after the election he wrote to Lord North: 'Though relying entirely on your attachment to my person as well as in your hatred of any lawless proceeding, yet I think it highly expedient to apprise you that the expulsion of Mr. Wilkes appears to be very essential, and must be effected.' What the sovereign counselled was duly accomplished. Before his expulsion, Wilkes was a prisoner in the King's Bench. Having surrendered, it was determined that his outlawry was informal; consequently it was reversed, and sentence was passed for the offences whereof he had been convicted. He was fined £1,000, and imprisoned for twenty-two months. On his way to prison he was rescued by the mob; but as soon as he could escape out of the hands of his boisterous friends he went and gave himself into the custody of the Marshal of the King's Bench. Parliament met on the 10th of April, and it was thought that he would be released in order to take his seat. A dense multitude assembled before the prison, but, balked in its purpose of

escorting the popular favourite to the House, became furious, and commenced a riot. Soldiers were at hand prepared for this outbreak. They fired, wounding and slaughtering several persons; among others, they butchered a young man whom they found in a neighbouring house, and who was mistaken for a rioter they had pursued. At the inquest the jury brought in a verdict of wilful murder against the magistrate who ordered the firing, and the soldier who did the deed. The magistrate was tried and acquitted. The soldier was dismissed the service, but received in compensation, as a reward for his services, a pension of one shilling a day. A general order sent from the War Office by Lord Barrington conveyed his Majesty's express thanks to the troops employed, assuring them 'that every possible regard shall be shown to them; their zeal and good behaviour on this occasion deserve it; and in case any disagreeable circumstance should happen in the execution of their duty, they shall have every defence and protection that the law can authorise and this office can give.' This approbation of what the troops had done was the necessary supplement to a despatch from Lord Weymouth sent before the riot, and intimating that force was to be used without scruple. Wilkes commented on both documents. His observations on the latter drew a complaint from Lord Weymouth of breach of privilege. This was made an additional pretext for his expulsion from the House of Commons. Ten days afterwards he was re-elected, his opponent receiving five votes only. On the following day the House resolved 'that John Wilkes, Esquire, having been in this session of Parliament expelled this House, and is incapable of being elected a member to serve in this present Parliament'; and his election was declared void. Again the freeholders of Middlesex returned him, and the House re-affirmed the above resolution. At another election he was opposed by Colonel Luttrell, a Court tool, when he polled 1,143 votes against 296 cast for Luttrell. It was declared, however, that the latter had been elected. Now began a struggle between the country, which had been outraged in the persons of the Middlesex electors, and a subservient majority in the House of Commons that did not hesitate to become instrumental in gratifying the personal resentment of a revengeful and obstinate king. The cry of 'Wilkes and liberty' was raised in quarters where the very name of the popular idol had been proscribed. It was evident that not the law only had been violated in his person, but that the Constitution itself had sustained a deadly wound. Wilkes was overwhelmed with substantial marks of sympathy. In the course of a few weeks £20,000 were subscribed to pay his debts. He could boast, too, that the courts of law had at length done what was right between him and one of the Secretaries of State who had signed the General Warrant, the other having been removed by death beyond the reach of justice. Lord Halifax was sentenced to pay £4,000 damages. These damages, and the costs of the proceedings, were defrayed out of the public purse. Lord North admitted that the outlay had exceeded £100,000. Thus the nation was doubly insulted by the ministers, who first violated the law, and then paid the costs of the proceedings out of the national taxes. On the 17th of April, 1770, Wilkes left the prison, to be elected in rapid succession to the offices—then

much sought after, because held in high honour—of Alderman, Sheriff, and Lord Mayor of London. In 1774 he was permitted to take his seat as Member for Middlesex. After several failures, he succeeded in getting the resolutions of his incapacity to sit in the House formally expunged from its journals. He was elected Chamberlain of the City in 1779, and filled that lucrative and responsible post till his death, in 1797, at the age of seventy. Although the latter portion of his career as Member of Parliament has generally been considered a blank, yet it was marked by several incidents worthy of attention. He was a consistent and energetic opponent of the war with America.—W. F. Rae, *John Wilkes (Fortnightly Rev., Sept., 1868, v. 10)*.

ALSO IN: The same, *Wilkes, Sheridan, Fox, pt. 1*.—G. O. Trevelyan, *Early Hist. of Charles James Fox, ch. 5-6, and 8*.

A. D. 1769-1772.—The Letters of Junius.—“One of the newspapers in London at this period was the ‘Public Advertiser,’ printed and directed by Mr. Henry Sampson Woodfall. His politics were those of the Opposition of the day; and he readily received any contributions of a like tendency from unknown correspondents. Among others was a writer whose letters beginning at the latest in April, 1767, continued frequent through that and the ensuing year. It was the pleasure of this writer to assume a great variety of signatures in his communications, as Mnemon, Atticus, and Brutus. It does not appear, however, that these letters (excepting only some with the signature of Lucius which were published in the autumn of 1768) attracted the public attention to any unusual extent, though by no means wanting in ability, or still less in acrimony. . . . Such was the state of these publications, not much rising in interest above the common level of many such at other times, when on the 21st of January 1769 there came forth another letter from the same hand with the novel signature of Junius. It did not differ greatly from its predecessors either in superior merit or superior moderation; it contained, on the contrary, a fierce and indiscriminate attack on most men in high places, including the Commander-in-Chief, Lord Granby. But, unlike its predecessors, it roused to controversy a well-known and respectable opponent. Sir William Draper, General in the army and Knight of the Bath, undertook to meet and parry the blows which it had aimed at his Noble friend. In an evil hour for himself he sent to the Public Advertiser a letter subscribed with his own name, and defending the character and conduct of Lord Granby. An answer from Junius soon appeared, urging anew his original charge, and adding some thrusts at Sir William himself on the sale of a regiment, and on the nonpayment of the Manila ransom. Wincing at the blow, Sir William more than once replied; more than once did the keen pen of Junius lay him prostrate in the dust. The discomfiture of poor Sir William was indeed complete. Even his most partial friends could not deny that so far as wit and eloquence were concerned the man in the mask had far, very far, the better in the controversy. . . . These victories over a man of rank and station such as Draper's gave importance to the name of Junius. Henceforth letters with that signature were eagerly expected by the public, and carefully prepared by the author. He did not indeed

altogether cease to write under other names; sometimes especially adopting the part of a bystander, and the signature of Philo-Junius; but it was as Junius that his main and most elaborate attacks were made. Nor was it long before he swooped at far higher game than Sir William. First came a series of most bitter pasquinades against the Duke of Grafton. Dr. Blackstone was then assailed for the unpopular vote which he gave in the case of Wilkes. In September was published a false and malignant attack upon the Duke of Bedford,—an attack, however, of which the sting is felt by his descendants to this day. In December the acme of audacity was reached by the celebrated letter to the King. All this while conjecture was busy as to the secret author. Names of well-known statesmen or well-known writers—Burke or Dunning, Boyd or Dyer, George Sackville or Gerard Hamilton—flew from mouth to mouth. Such guesses were for the most part made at mere hap-hazard, and destitute of any plausible ground. Nevertheless the stir and talk which they created added not a little to the natural effects of the writer's wit and eloquence. 'The most important secret of our times!' cries Wilkes. Junius himself took care to enhance his own importance by arrogant, nay even impious, boasts of it. In one letter of August 1771 he goes so far as to declare that 'the Bible and Junius will be read when the commentaries of the Jesuits are forgotten!' Mystery, as I have said, was one ingredient to the popularity of Junius. Another not less efficacious was supplied by persecution. In the course of 1770 Mr. Woodfall was indicted for publishing, and Mr. Almon with several others for reprinting, the letter from Junius to the King. The verdict in Woodfall's case was: Guilty of printing and publishing only. It led to repeated discussions and to ulterior proceedings. But in the temper of the public at that period such measures could end only in virtual defeat to the Government, in augmented reputation to the libeller. During the years 1770 and 1771 the letters of Junius were continued with little abatement of spirit. He renewed invectives against the Duke of Grafton; he began them against Lord Mansfield, who had presided at the trials of the printers; he plunged into the full tide of City politics; and he engaged in a keen controversy with the Rev. John Horne, afterwards Horne Tooke. The whole series of letters from January 1769, when it commences, until January 1772, when it terminates, amounts to 69, including those with the signature of Philo-Junius, those of Sir William Draper, and those of Mr. Horne. . . . Besides the letters which Junius designed for the press, there were many others which he wrote and sent to various persons, intending them for those persons only. Two addressed to Lord Chatham appear in Lord Chatham's correspondence. Three addressed to Mr. George Grenville have until now remained in manuscript among the papers at Wotton, or Stowe; all three were written in the same year, 1768, and the two first signed with the same initial C. Several others addressed to Wilkes were first made known through the son of Mr. Woodfall. But the most important of all, perhaps, are the private notes addressed to Mr. Woodfall himself. Of these there are upwards of sixty, signed in general with the letter C.; some only a few lines in length; but many of

great value towards deciding the question of authorship. It seems that the packets containing the letters of Junius for Mr. Woodfall or the Public Advertiser were sometimes brought to the office-door, and thrown in, by an unknown gentleman, probably Junius himself; more commonly they were conveyed by a porter or other messenger hired in the streets. When some communication from Mr. Woodfall in reply was deemed desirable, Junius directed it to be addressed to him under some feigned name, and to be left till called for at the bar of some coffee-house. . . . It may be doubted whether Junius had any confidant or trusted friend. . . . When dedicating his collected letters to the English people, he declares: 'I am the sole depository of my own secret, and it shall perish with me.'

—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 47 (v. 5).—The following list of fifty-one names of persons to whom the letters of Junius have been attributed at different times by different writers is given in Cushing's "Initials and Pseudonyms": James Adair, M. P.; Captain Allen; Lieut.-Col. Isaac Barré, M. P.; William Henry Cavendish Bentinck; Mr. Bickerton; Hugh M'Aulay Boyd; Edmund Burke; William Burke; John Butler, Bishop of Hereford; Lord Camden; John Lewis De Lolme; John Dunning, afterwards Lord Ashburton; Samuel Dyer; Henry Flood; Sir Philip Francis; George III.; Edward Gibbon; Richard Glover; Henry Grattan; William Greatrakes; George Grenville; James Grenville; William Gerard Hamilton; James Hollis; Thomas Hollis; Sir George Jackson; Sir William Jones; John Kent; Major-General Charles Lee; Charles Lloyd; Thomas Lyttleton; Laughlin Maclean; Rev. Edmund Marshall; Thomas Paine; William Pitt, Earl of Chatham; the Duke of Portland; Thomas Pownall; Lieut.-Col. Sir Robert Rich; John Roberts; Rev. Philip Rosenhagen; George, Viscount Sackville; the Earl of Shelburne; Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield; Richard Suett; Earl Temple; John Horne Tooke; Horace Walpole; Alexander Wedderburn, Lord Loughborough; John Wilkes; James Wilmot, D. D.; Daniel Wray.

ALSO IN: G. W. Cooke, *Hist. of Party*, v. 3, ch. 6.—C. W. Dilke, *Papers of a Critic*, v. 2.—Lord Macaulay, *Warren Hastings (Essays)*, v. 5).—A. Bisset, *Short Hist. of the English Parliament*, ch. 7.

A. D. 1770.—Fall of the Grafton Ministry.—Beginning of the administration of Lord North.—'The incompetency of the ministry was . . . becoming obvious. In the first place it was divided within itself. The Prime Minister, with the Chancellor and some others, were remnants of the Chatham ministry and admirers of Chatham's policy. The rest of the Cabinet were either men who represented Bedford's party, or members of that class whose views are sufficiently explained by their name, 'the King's friends.' Grafton, fonder of hunting and the turf than of politics, had by his indolence suffered himself to fall under the influence of the last-named party, and unconstitutional action had been the result which had brought discontent in England to the verge of open outbreak. Hillsborough, under the same influence, was hurrying along the road which led to the loss of America. On this point the Prime Minister had found himself in a minority in his own Cabinet. France too, under Choiseul, in

alliance with Spain, was beginning to think of revenge for the losses of the Seven Years' War. A crisis was evidently approaching, and the Opposition began to close their ranks. Chatham, yielding again to the necessities of party, made a public profession of friendship with Temple and George Grenville; and though there was no cordial connection, there was external alliance between the brothers and the old Whigs under Rockingham. In the first session of 1770 the storm broke. Notwithstanding the state of public affairs, the chief topic of the King's speech was the murrain among 'horned beasts,'—a speech not of a king, but, said Junius, of 'a ruined grazier.' Chatham at once moved an amendment when the address in answer to this speech was proposed. He deplored the want of all European alliances, the fruit of our desertion of our allies at the Peace of Paris; he blamed the conduct of the ministry with regard to America, which, he thought, needed much gentle handling, inveighed strongly against the action of the Lower House in the case of Wilkes, and ended by moving that that action should at once be taken into consideration. At the sound of their old leader's voice his followers in the Cabinet could no longer be silent. Camden declared he had been a most unwilling party to the persecution of Wilkes, and though retaining the Seals, attacked and voted against the ministry. In the Lower House, Granby, one of the most popular men in England, followed the same course. James Grenville and Dunning, the Solicitor-General, also resigned. Chatham's motion was lost, but was followed up by Rockingham, who asked for a night to consider the state of the nation. . . . Grafton thus found himself in no state to meet the Opposition, and in his heart still admiring Chatham, and much disliking business, he suddenly and unexpectedly gave in his resignation the very day fixed for Rockingham's motion. The Opposition seemed to have everything in their own hands, but there was no real cordiality between the two sections. . . . The King with much quickness and decision, took advantage of this disunion. To him it was of paramount importance to retain his friends in office, and to avoid a new Parliament elected in the present excited state of the nation. There was only one of the late ministry capable of assuming the position of Prime Minister. This was Lord North, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to him the King immediately and successfully applied, so that while the different sections of the Opposition were still unable to decide on any united action, they were astonished to find the old ministry reconstituted and their opportunity gone. The new Prime Minister . . . had great capacity for business and administration, and much sound sense; he was a first-rate debater, and gifted with a wonderful sweetness of temper, which enabled him to listen unmoved, or even to sleep, during the most violent attacks upon himself, and to turn aside the bitterest invectives with a happy joke. With his accession to the Premiership the unstable character of the Government ceased. Resting on the King, making himself no more than an instrument of the King's will, and thus commanding the support of all royal influence, from whatever source derived, North was able to bid defiance to all enemies, till the ill effects of such a system of government, and of the King's policy, became so evident that the clamour for a

really responsible minister grew too loud to be disregarded. Thus is closed the great constitutional struggle of the early part of the reign—the struggle of the King, supported by the unrepresented masses, and the more liberal and independent of those who were represented, against the domination of the House of Commons. It was an attempt to break those trammels which, under the guise of liberty, the upper classes, the great lords and landed aristocracy, had succeeded after the Revolution in laying on both Crown and people. In that struggle the King had been victorious. But he did not recognize the alliance which had enabled him to succeed. He did not understand that the people had other objects much beyond his own."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng.*, period 3, pp. 1057–1060.

ALSO IN: *Cor. of George III. with Lord North*, v. 1.—W. Massey, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of George III.*, ch. 10–13 (v. 1).—J. Adolphus, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of George III.*, ch. 17 (v. 1).—E. Burke, *Thoughts on the Present Discontents* (Works, v. 1).

A. D. 1770–1773.—Repeal of the Townshend duties, except on tea.—The tea-ships and the Boston Tea-party. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1770, and 1772–1773; and BOSTON: A. D. 1773.

A. D. 1771.—Last contention of Parliament against the Press.—Freedom of reporting secured.—“The session of 1771 commenced with a new quarrel between the House of Commons and the country. The standing order for the exclusion of strangers, which had long existed (and which still exists), was seldom enforced, except when it was thought desirable that a question should be debated with closed doors. It was now attempted, by means of this order, to prevent the publication of the debates and proceedings of the House. It had long been the practice of the newspapers, and other periodical journals, to publish the debates of Parliament, under various thin disguises, and with more or less fulness and accuracy, from speeches furnished at length by the speakers themselves, to loose and meagre notes of more or less authenticity. One of the most attractive features of the ‘Gentleman’s Magazine,’ a monthly publication of respectability, which has survived to the present day, was an article which purported to be a report of the debates in Parliament. This report was, for nearly three years, prepared by Dr. Johnson, who never attended the galleries himself, and derived his information from persons who could seldom give him more than the names of the speakers, and the side which each of them took in the debate. The speeches were, therefore, the composition of Johnson himself; and some of the most admired oratory of the period was avowedly the product of his genius. Attempts were made from time to time, both within and without the walls of Parliament, to abolish, or at least to modify, the standing order for the exclusion of strangers, by means of which the license of reporting had been restricted; for there was no order of either House specifically prohibiting the publication of its debates. But such proposals had always been resisted by the leaders of parties, who thought that the privilege was one which might be evaded, but could not safely be formally relinquished. The practice of reporting, therefore, was tolerated on the understanding, that a decent disguise should be observed; and that no publication of the proceedings of Parliament should take place during

the session. There can be little doubt, however, that the public journals would have gone on, with the tacit connivance of the parliamentary chiefs, until they had practically established a right of reporting regularly the proceedings of both Houses, had not the presumptuous folly of inferior members provoked a conflict with the press upon this ground of privilege, and, in the result, driven Parliament reluctantly to yield what they would otherwise have quietly conceded. It was Colonel Onslow, member for Guildford, who rudely agitated a question which wiser men had been content to leave unvexed; and by his rash meddling, precipitated the very result which he thought he could prevent. He complained that the proceedings of the House had been inaccurately reported; and that the newspapers had even presumed to reflect on the public conduct of honourable members."—Wm. Massey, *Hist. of England*, v. 2, ch. 15.—"Certain printers were in consequence ordered to attend the bar of the House. Some appeared and were discharged, after receiving, on their knees, a reprimand from the Speaker. Others evaded compliance; and one of them, John Miller, who failed to appear, was arrested by its messenger, but instead of submitting, sent for a constable and gave the messenger into custody for an assault and false imprisonment. They were both taken before the Lord Mayor (Mr. Brass Crosby), Mr. Alderman Oliver, and the notorious John Wilkes, who had recently been invested with the aldermanic gown. These civic magistrates, on the ground that the messenger was neither a peace-officer nor a constable, and that his warrant was not backed by a city magistrate, discharged the printer from custody, and committed the messenger to prison for an unlawful arrest. Two other printers, for whose apprehension a reward had been offered by a Government proclamation, were collusively apprehended by friends, and taken before Aldermen Wilkes and Oliver, who discharged the prisoners as 'not being accused of having committed any crime.' These proceedings at once brought the House into conflict with the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London. The Lord Mayor and Alderman Oliver, who were both members of Parliament, were ordered by the House to attend in their places, and were subsequently committed to the Tower. Their imprisonment, instead of being a punishment, was one long-continued popular ovation, and from the date of their release, at the prorogation of Parliament shortly afterwards, the publication of debates has been pursued without any interference or restraint. Though still in theory a breach of privilege, reporting is now encouraged by Parliament as one of the main sources of its influence—its censure being reserved for wilful misrepresentation only. But reporters long continued beset with many difficulties. The taking of notes was prohibited, no places were reserved for reporters, and the power of a single member of either House to require the exclusion of strangers was frequently and capriciously employed. By the ancient usage of the House of Commons [until 1875] any one member by merely 'spying' strangers present could compel the Speaker to order their withdrawal."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist.*, ch. 17.

ALSO IN: R. F. D. Palgrave, *The House of Commons*, lect. 2.—T. E. May, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 7 (v. 1).

A. D. 1772.—The ending of Negro slavery in the British Islands. See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1685-1772.

A. D. 1773.—Reconstitution of the Government of British India. See INDIA: A. D. 1770-1773.

A. D. 1774.—The Boston Port Bill, the Massachusetts Act and the Quebec Act.—The First Continental Congress in America. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1774.

A. D. 1774.—Advent in English industries of the Steam-Engine as made efficient by James Watt. See STEAM ENGINE: A. D. 1765-1785.

A. D. 1775.—The beginning of the War of the American Revolution.—Lexington.—Concord.—The colonies in arms and Boston beleaguered.—Ticonderoga.—Bunker Hill.—The Second Continental Congress. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775.

A. D. 1775-1776.—Successful defence of Canada against American invasion. See CANADA: A. D. 1775-1776.

A. D. 1776.—War measures against the colonies.—The drift toward American independence. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (JANUARY—JUNE).

A. D. 1776-1778.—The People, the Parties, the King, and Lord North, in their relations to the American War.—"The undoubted popularity of the war [in America] in its first stage had for some time continued to increase, and in the latter part of 1776 and 1777 it had probably attained its maximum. . . . The Whigs at this time very fully admitted that the genuine opinion of the country was with the Government and with the King. . . . The Declaration of Independence, and the known overtures of the Americans to France, were deemed the climax of insolence and ingratitude. The damage done to English commerce, not only in the West Indies but even around the English and Irish coast, excited a widespread bitterness. . . . In every stage of the contest the influence of the Opposition was employed to trammel the Government. . . . The statement of Wraxall that the Whig colours of buff and blue were first adopted by Fox in imitation of the uniform of Washington's troops, is, I believe, corroborated by no other writer; but there is no reason to question his assertion that the members of the Whig party in society and in both Houses of Parliament during the whole course of the war wished success to the American cause and rejoiced in the American triumphs. . . . While the Opposition needlessly and heedlessly intensified the national feeling against them, the King, on his side, did the utmost in his power to embitter the contest. It is only by examining his correspondence with Lord North that we fully realise how completely at this time he assumed the position not only of a prime minister but of a Cabinet, superintending, directing, and prescribing, in all its parts, the policy of the Government. . . . 'Every means of distressing America,' wrote the King, 'must meet with my concurrence.' He strongly supported the employment of Indians. . . . It was the King's friends who were most active in promoting all measures of violence. . . . The war was commonly called the 'King's war,' and its opponents were looked upon as opponents of the King. The person, however, who in the eye of history appears most culpable in this matter, was

Lord North. . . . The publication of the correspondence of George III. . . . supplies one of the most striking and melancholy examples of the relation of the King to his Tory ministers. It appears from this correspondence that for the space of about five years North, at the entreaty of the King, carried on a bloody, costly, and disastrous war in direct opposition to his own judgment and to his own wishes. . . . Again and again he entreated that his resignation might be accepted, but again and again he yielded to the request of the King, who threatened, if his minister resigned, to abdicate the throne. . . . The King was determined, under no circumstances, to treat with the Americans on the basis of the recognition of their independence; but he acknowledged, after the surrender of Burgoyne, and as soon as the French war had become inevitable, that unconditional submission could no longer be hoped for. . . . He consented, too, though apparently with extreme reluctance, and in consequence of the unanimous vote of the Cabinet, that new propositions should be made to the Americans." These overtures, conveyed to America by three Commissioners, were rejected, and the colonies concluded, in the spring of 1778, their alliance with France. "The moment was one of the most terrible in English history. England had not an ally in the world. . . . England, already exhausted by a war which its distance made peculiarly terrible, had to confront the whole force of France, and was certain in a few months to have to encounter the whole force of Spain. . . . There was one man to whom, in this hour of panic and consternation, the eyes of all patriotic Englishmen were turned. . . . If any statesman could, at the last moment, conciliate [the Americans], dissolve the new alliance, and kindle into a flame the loyalist feeling which undoubtedly existed largely in America, it was Chatham. If, on the other hand, conciliation proved impossible, no statesman could for a moment be compared to him in the management of a war. Lord North implored the King to accept his resignation, and to send for Chatham. Bute, the old Tory favourite, breaking his long silence, spoke of Chatham as now indispensable. Lord Mansfield, the bitterest and ablest rival of Chatham, said, with tears in his eyes, that unless the King sent for Chatham the ship would assuredly go down. . . . The King was unmoved. He consented indeed—and he actually authorised Lord North to make the astounding proposition—to receive Chatham as a subordinate minister to North. . . . This episode appears to me the most criminal in the whole reign of George III., and in my own judgment it is as criminal as any of those acts which led Charles I. to the scaffold."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 14 (v. 4).—"George III. and Lord North have been made scapegoats for sins which were not exclusively their own. The minister, indeed, was only the vizier, who hated his work, but still did not shrink from it, out of a sentiment that is sometimes admired under the name of loyalty, but which in such a case it is difficult to distinguish from base servility. The impenetrable mind of the King was, in the case of the American war, the natural organ and representative of all the lurking ignorance and arbitrary humours of the entire community. It is totally unjust and inadequate to lay upon him the entire burden."—J. Morley, *Edmund*

Burke: a Historical Study, p. 135.—"No sane person in Great Britain now approves of the attempt to tax the colonies. No sane person does otherwise than rejoice that the colonies became free and independent. But let us in common fairness say a word for King George. In all that he did he was backed by the great mass of the British nation. And let us even say a word for the British nation also. Had the King and the nation been really wise, they would have let the colonies go without striking a blow. But then no king and no nation ever was really wise after that fashion. King George and the British nation were simply not wiser than other people. I believe that you may turn the pages of history from the earliest to the latest times, without finding a time when any king or any commonwealth, freely and willingly, without compulsion or equivalent, gave up power or dominion, or even mere extent of territory on the map, when there was no real power or dominion. Remember that seventeen years after the acknowledgment of American independence, King George still called himself King of France. Remember that, when the title was given up, some people thought it unwise to give it up. Remember that some people in our own day regretted the separation between the crowns of Great Britain and Hanover. If they lived to see the year 1866, perhaps they grew wiser."—E. A. Freeman, *The English People in its Three Homes (Lectures to American Audiences)*, pp. 183-184.

ALSO IN: *Correspondence of George III. with Lord North*.—Lord Brougham, *Hist. Sketches of Statesmen in the Reign of George III.*—T. Mac-knight, *Hist. of the Life and Times of Edmund Burke*, ch. 22-26 (v. 2).

A. D. 1778.—War with France. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1778-1780.—Repeal of Catholic penal laws.—The Gordon No-Popery Riots.—"The Quebec Act of 1774 [see CANADA: A. D. 1763-1774], establishing Catholicism in Canada, would a generation earlier have been impossible, and it was justly considered a remarkable sign of the altered condition of opinion that such a law should be enacted by a British Parliament, and should have created no serious disturbances in the country. . . . The success of the Quebec Act led Parliament, a few years later, to undertake the relief of the Catholics at home from some part of the atrocious penal laws to which they were still subject. . . . The Act still subsisted which gave a reward of £100 to any informer who procured the conviction of a Catholic priest performing his functions in England, and there were occasional prosecutions, though the judges strained the law to the utmost in order to defeat them. . . . The worst part of the persecution of Catholics was based upon a law of William III., and in 1778 Sir George Savile introduced a bill to repeal those portions of this Act which related to the apprehending of Popish bishops, priests, and Jesuits, which subjected these and also Papists keeping a school to perpetual imprisonment, and which disabled all Papists from inheriting or purchasing land. . . . It is an honourable fact that this Relief Bill was carried without a division in either House, without any serious opposition from the bench of bishops, and with the concurrence of both parties in the State. The law applied to England only, but the Lord Advocate promised, in the ensuing session, to intro-

duce a similar measure for Scotland. It was hoped that a measure which was so manifestly moderate and equitable, and which was carried with such unanimity through Parliament, would have passed almost unnoticed in the country; but fiercer elements of fanaticism than politicians perceived were still smouldering in the nation. The first signs of the coming storm were seen among the Presbyterians of Scotland. The General Assembly of the Scotch Established Church was sitting when the English Relief Bill was pending, and it rejected by a large majority a motion for a remonstrance to Parliament against it. But in a few months an agitation of the most dangerous description spread swiftly through the Lowlands. It was stimulated by many incendiary resolutions of provincial synods, by pamphlets, hand-bills, newspapers, and sermons, and a 'Committee for the Protestant Interests' was formed at Edinburgh to direct it. . . . Furious riots broke out in January, 1779, both in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Several houses in which Catholics lived, or the Catholic worship was celebrated, were burnt to the ground. The shops of Catholic tradesmen were wrecked, and their goods scattered, plundered, or destroyed. Catholic ladies were compelled to take refuge in Edinburgh Castle. The houses of many Protestants who were believed to sympathise with the Relief Bill were attacked, and among the number was that of Robertson the historian. The troops were called out to suppress the riot, but they were resisted and pelted, and not suffered to fire in their defence. . . . The flame soon spread southwards. For some years letters on the increase of Popery had been frequently appearing in the London newspapers. Many murmurs had been heard at the enactment of the Quebec Act, and many striking instances in the last ten years had shown how easily the spirit of riot could be aroused, and how impotent the ordinary watchmen were to cope with it. . . . The fanatical party had unfortunately acquired an unscrupulous leader in the person of Lord George Gordon, whose name now attained a melancholy celebrity. He was a young man of thirty, of very ordinary talents, and with nothing to recommend him but his connection with the ducal house of Gordon. . . . A 'Protestant Association,' consisting of the worst agitators and fanatics, was formed, and at a great meeting held on May 29, 1780, and presided over by Lord George Gordon, it was determined that 20,000 men should march to the Parliament House to present a petition for the repeal of the Relief Act. It was about half-past two on the afternoon of Friday, June 2, that three great bodies, consisting of many thousands of men, wearing blue cockades, and carrying a petition which was said to have been signed by near 120,000 persons, arrived by different roads at the Parliament House. Their first design appears to have been only to intimidate, but they very soon proceeded to actual violence. The two Houses were just meeting, and the scene that ensued resembled on a large scale and in an aggravated form the great riot which had taken place around the Parliament House in Dublin during the administration of the Duke of Bedford. The members were seized, insulted, compelled to put blue cockades in their hats, to shout 'No Popery!' and to swear that they would vote for the repeal; and many of them, but especially the members of

the House of Lords, were exposed to the grossest indignities. . . . In the Commons Lord George Gordon presented the petition, and demanded its instant consideration. The House behaved with much courage, and after a hurried debate it was decided by 192 to 7 to adjourn its consideration till the 6th. Lord George Gordon several times appeared on the stairs of the gallery, and addressed the crowd, denouncing by name those who opposed him, and especially Burke and North; but Conway rebuked him in the sight and hearing of the mob, and Colonel Gordon, one of his own relatives, declared that the moment the first man of the mob entered the House he would plunge his sword into the body of Lord George. The doors were locked. The strangers' gallery was empty, but only a few doorkeepers and a few other ordinary officials protected the House, while the mob is said at first to have numbered not less than 60,000 men. Lord North succeeded in sending a messenger for the guards, but many anxious hours passed before they arrived. Twice attempts were made to force the doors. . . . At last about nine o'clock the troops appeared, and the crowd, without resisting, agreed to disperse. A great part of them, however, were bent on further outrages. They attacked the Sardinian Minister's chapel in Duke Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields. They broke it open, carried away the silver lamps and other furniture, burnt the benches in the street, and flung the burning brands into the chapel. The Bavarian Minister's chapel in Warwick Street Golden Square was next attacked, plundered, and burnt before the soldiers could intervene. They at last appeared upon the scene, and some slight scuffling ensued, and thirteen of the rioters were captured. It was hoped that the riot had expended its force, for Saturday and the greater part of Sunday passed with little disturbance, but on Sunday afternoon new outrages began in Moorfields, where a considerable Catholic population resided. Several houses were attacked and plundered, and the chapels utterly ruined."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 13 (v. 3).—"On Monday the rioters continued their outrages. . . . Notwithstanding, however, that the town might now be said to have been in the possession of the rioters for more than three days, it does not appear that any more decided measures were adopted to put them down. Their audacity and violence, as might have been expected, increased under this treatment. On Tuesday afternoon and evening the most terrible excesses were perpetrated. Notwithstanding that a considerable military force was stationed around and on the way to the Houses of Parliament, several of the members were again insulted and maltreated in the grossest manner. Indeed, the mob by this time seem to have got over all apprehensions of the interference of the soldiers." The principal event of the day was the attack on Newgate prison, which was destroyed and the prisoners released. "The New Prison, Clerkenwell, was also broken open . . . and all the prisoners set at large. Attacks were likewise made upon several . . . private houses. . . . But the most lamentable of all the acts of destruction yet perpetrated by these infuriated ruffians was that with which they closed the day of madness and crime—the entire demolition of the residence of Lord Mansfield, the venerable Lord Chief Jus-

tice, in Bloomsbury Square. . . . The scenes that took place on Wednesday were still more dreadful than those by which Tuesday had been marked. The town indeed was now in a state of complete insurrection: and it was felt by all that the mob must be put down at any cost, if it was intended to save the metropolis of the kingdom from utter destruction. This day, accordingly, the military were out in all quarters, and were everywhere employed against the infuriated multitudes who braved their power. . . . The King's Bench Prison, the New Gaol, the Borough Clink, the Surrey Bridewell, were all burned today. . . . The Mansion House, the Museum, the Exchange, the Tower, and the Bank, were all, it is understood, marked for destruction. Lists of these and the other buildings which it was intended to attack were circulated among the mob. The bank was actually twice assaulted; but a powerful body of soldiers by whom it was guarded on both occasions drove off the crowd, though not without great slaughter. At some places the rioters returned the fire of the military. . . . Among other houses which were set on fire in Holborn were the extensive premises of Mr. Langdale, the distiller, who was a Catholic. . . . The worst consequence of this outrage, however, was the additional excitement which the frenzy of the mob received from the quantities of spirits with which they were here supplied. Many indeed drank themselves literally dead; and many more, who had rendered themselves unable to move, perished in the midst of the flames. Six and thirty fires, it is stated, were this night to be seen, from one spot, blazing at the same time in different quarters of the town. . . . By Thursday morning . . . the exertions of Government, now thoroughly alarmed, had succeeded in bringing up from different parts so large a force of regular troops and of militia as to make it certain that the rioters would be speedily overpowered. . . . The soldiers attacked the mob in various places, and everywhere with complete success. . . . On Friday the courts of justice were again opened for business, and the House of Commons met in the evening. . . . On this first day after the close of the riots, 'the metropolis,' says the Annual Register, 'presented in many places the image of a city recently stormed and sacked.' . . . Of the persons apprehended and brought to trial, 59 were capitally convicted; and of these more than 20 were executed; the others were sent to expiate their offences by passing the remainder of their days in hard labour and bondage in a distant land. . . . Lord George Gordon, in consequence of the part he had borne in the measures which led to these riots, was sent to the Tower, and some time afterwards brought to trial on a charge of high treason," but was acquitted.—*Sketches of Popular Tumults*, sect. 1, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: J. H. Jesse, *Memoirs of the Life and Reign of George III.*, ch. 34 (v. 2).—H. Walpole, *Journal of the Reign of George III.*, v. 2, pp. 403-424.—*Annual Register*, 1780, pp. 254-287.—C. Dickens, *Barnaby Rudge*.—W. J. Amherst, *Hist. of Catholic Emancipation*, v. 1, ch. 1-5.

A. D. 1780-1782.—Declining strength of the government.—Rodney's great naval victory.—The siege of Gibraltar.—"The fall of Lord North's ministry, and with it the overthrow of the personal government of George III., was now close at hand. For a long time the government

had been losing favour. In the summer of 1780, the British victories in South Carolina had done something to strengthen, yet when, in the autumn of that year, Parliament was dissolved, although the king complained that his expenses for purposes of corruption had been twice as great as ever before, the new Parliament was scarcely more favourable to the ministry than the old one. Misfortunes and perplexities crowded in the path of Lord North and his colleagues. The example of American resistance had told upon Ireland. . . . For more than a year there had been war in India, where Hyder Ali, for the moment, was carrying everything before him. France, eager to regain her lost foothold upon Hindustan, sent a strong armament thither, and insisted that England must give up all her Indian conquests except Bengal. For a moment England's great Eastern empire tottered, and was saved only by the superhuman efforts of Warren Hastings, aided by the wonderful military genius of Sir Eyre Coote. In May, 1781, the Spaniards had taken Pensacola, thus driving the British from their last position in Florida. In February, 1782, the Spanish fleet captured Minorca, and the siege of Gibraltar, which had been kept up for nearly three years, was pressed with redoubled energy. During the winter the French recaptured St. Eustatius, and handed it over to Holland; and Grasse's great fleet swept away all the British possessions in the West Indies, except Jamaica, Barbadoes, and Antigua. All this time the Northern League kept up its jealous watch upon British cruisers in the narrow seas, and among all the powers of Europe the government of George could not find a single friend. The maritime supremacy of England was, however, impaired but for a moment. Rodney was sent back to the West Indies, and on the 12th of April, 1782, his fleet of 36 ships encountered the French near the island of Sainte-Marie-Galante. The battle of eleven hours which ensued, and in which 5,000 men were killed or wounded, was one of the most tremendous contests ever witnessed upon the ocean before the time of Nelson. The French were totally defeated, and Grasse was taken prisoner,—the first French commander-in-chief, by sea or land, who had fallen into an enemy's hands since Marshal Tallard gave up his sword to Marlborough, on the terrible day of Blenheim. France could do nothing to repair this crushing disaster. Her naval power was eliminated from the situation at a single blow; and in the course of the summer the English achieved another great success by overthrowing the Spaniards at Gibraltar, after a struggle which, for dogged tenacity, is scarcely paralleled in modern warfare. By the autumn of 1782, England, defeated in the United States, remained victorious and defiant as regarded the other parties to the war."—J. Fiske, *American Revolution*, ch. 15 (v. 2).—"Gibraltar . . . had been closely invested for nearly three years. At first, the Spanish had endeavoured to starve the place; but their blockade having been on two occasions forced by the British fleet, they relinquished that plan, and commenced a regular siege. During the spring and summer of 1781, the fortress was bombarded, but with little success; in the month of November, the enemy were driven from their approaches, and the works themselves were almost destroyed by a sally from the garrison. Early in the year, however, the fall of Minorca

enabled the Spanish to reform the siege of Gibraltar. De Grillon himself, the hero of Minorca, superseding Alvarez, assumed the chief command. . . . The garrison of Gibraltar comprised no more than 7,000 men; while the force of the allied monarchies amounted to 33,000 soldiers, with an immense train of artillery. De Grillon, however, who was well acquainted with the fortress, had little hope of taking it from the land side, but relied with confidence on the formidable preparations which he had made for bombarding it from the sea. Huge floating batteries, bomb-proof and shot-proof, were constructed; and it was calculated that the action of these tremendous engines alone would be sufficient to destroy the works. Besides the battering ships, of which ten were provided, a large armament of vessels of all rates was equipped; and a grand attack was to take place, both from sea and land, with 400 pieces of artillery. Six months were consumed in these formidable preparations; and it was not until September that they were completed. A partial cannonade took place on the 9th and three following days; but the great attack, which was to decide the fate of the beleaguered fortress, was commenced on the 13th of September. On that day, the combined fleets of France and Spain, consisting of 47 sail of the line, besides numerous ships of inferior rate, were drawn out in order of battle before Gibraltar. Numerous bomb ketches, gun and mortar boats, dropped their anchors within close range; while the ten floating batteries were moored with strong iron chains within half gun-shot of the walls. On the land 170 guns were prepared to open fire simultaneously with the ships; and 40,000 troops were held in readiness to rush in at the first practicable breach. . . . The grand attack was commenced at ten o'clock in the forenoon, by the fire of 400 pieces of artillery. The great floating batteries, securely anchored within 600 yards of the walls, poured in an incessant storm, from 142 guns. Elliot had less than 100 guns to reply to the cannonade both from sea and land; and of these he made the most judicious use. Disregarding the attack from every other quarter, he concentrated the whole of his ordnance on the floating batteries in front of him; for unless these were silenced, their force would prove irresistible. But for a long time the thunder of 80 guns made no impression on the enormous masses of wood and iron. The largest shells glanced harmless from their sloping roofs; the heaviest shot could not penetrate their hulls seven feet in thickness. Nevertheless, the artillery of the garrison was still unceasingly directed against these terrible engines of destruction. A storm of red-hot balls was poured down upon them; and about midday it was observed that the combustion caused by these missiles, which had hitherto been promptly extinguished, was beginning to take effect. Soon after, the partial cessation of the guns from the battering ships, and the volumes of smoke which issued from their decks, made it manifest they were on fire, and that all the efforts of the crews were required to subdue the conflagration. Towards evening, their guns became silent; and before midnight, the flames burst forth from the principal floating battery, which carried the Admiral's flag. . . . Eight of the 10 floating batteries were on fire during the night; and the only care of the besieged was to save from the flames and from the waters, the

wretched survivors of that terrible flotilla, which had so recently menaced them with annihilation. . . . The loss of the enemy was computed at 2,000; that of the garrison, in killed and wounded, amounted to no more than 84. The labour of a few hours sufficed to repair the damage sustained by the works. The French and Spanish fleets remained in the Straits, expecting the appearance of the British squadron under Lord Howe; and relying on their superiority in ships and weight of metal, they still hoped that the result of an action at sea might enable them to resume the siege of Gibraltar. Howe, having been delayed by contrary winds, did not reach the Straits until the 9th of October; and, notwithstanding the superior array which the enemy presented, he was prepared to risk an engagement. But at this juncture, a storm having scattered the combined fleet, the British Admiral was enabled to land his stores and reinforcements without opposition. Having performed this duty, he set sail for England; nor did the Spanish Admiral, though still superior by eight sail of the line, venture to dispute his passage. Such was the close of the great siege of Gibraltar; an undertaking which had been regarded by Spain as the chief object of the war, which she had prosecuted for three years, and which, at the last, had been pressed by the whole force of the allied monarchies. After this event, the war itself was virtually at an end."—W. Massey, *Hist. of Eng., Reign of George III., ch. 27 (v. 3)*.

Also in: Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng., 1713-1783, ch. 62-66 (v. 7)*.—J. Drinkwater, *Hist. of the Siege of Gibraltar*.

A. D. 1780-1783.—Second war with Hyder Ali, or Second Mysore War. See INDIA: A. D. 1780-1783.

A. D. 1781-1783.—War with Holland. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1746-1787.

A. D. 1782.—Legislative independence conceded to Ireland. See IRELAND: A. D. 1778-1794.

A. D. 1782-1783.—Fall of Lord North.—The second Rockingham Ministry.—Fox, Shelburne, and the American peace negotiations.—The Shelburne Ministry.—Coalition of Fox and North.—"There comes a point when even the most servile majority of an unrepresentative Parliament finds the strain of party allegiance too severe, and that point was reached when the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown became known in November, 1781. 'O God, it is all over!' cried Lord North, wringing his hands, when he heard of it. . . . On February 7, a vote of censure, moved by Fox, upon Lord Sandwich, was negatived by a majority of only twenty-two. On the 22nd, General Conway lost a motion in favour of putting an end to the war by only one vote. On the 27th, the motion was renewed in the form of a resolution and carried by a majority of nineteen [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1782 (FEBRUARY-MAY)]. Still the King would not give his consent to Lord North's resignation. Rather than commit himself to the opposition, he seriously thought of abdicating his crown and retiring to Hanover. . . . Indeed, if it had not been for his large family, and the character of the Prince of Wales, already too well known, it is far from improbable that he would have carried this idea into execution, and retired from a Government of which he was no longer master. By the 20th [of March], however, even

George III. saw that the game could not be kept up any longer. He gave permission to Lord North to announce his resignation, and parted with him with the characteristic words: 'Remember, my Lord, it is you who desert me, not I who desert you.' . . . Even when the long-deferred blow fell, and Lord North's Ministry was no more, the King refused to send for Lord Rockingham. He still flattered himself that he might get together a Ministry from among the followers of Chatham and of Lord North, which would be able to restore peace without granting independence, and Shelburne was the politician whom he fixed upon to aid him in this scheme. . . . Shelburne, however, was too clever to fall into the trap. A Ministry which had against it the influence of the Rockingham connection and the talents of Charles Fox, and would not receive the hearty support of Lord North's phalanx of placemen, was foredoomed to failure. The pear was not yet ripe. He saw clearly enough that his best chance of permanent success lay in becoming the successor, not the supplanter, of Rockingham. . . . His game was to wait. He respectfully declined to act without Rockingham. . . . Before Rockingham consented to take office, he procured a distinct pledge from the King that he would not put a veto upon American independence, if the Ministers recommended it; and on the 27th of March the triumph of the Opposition was completed by the formation of a Ministry, mainly representative of the old Whig families, pledged to a policy of economical reform, and of peace with America on the basis of the acknowledgment of independence. Fox received the reward of his services by being appointed Foreign Secretary, and Lord Shelburne took charge of the Home and Colonial Department. Rockingham himself went to the Treasury, Lord John Cavendish became Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Keppel First Lord of the Admiralty, Lord Camden President of the Council. Burke was made Paymaster of the Forces, and Sheridan Under-Secretary to his friend Fox. At the King's special request, Thurlow was allowed to remain as Chancellor. . . . The Cabinet no sooner met than it divided into the parties of Shelburne and of Fox, while Rockingham, Conway, and Cavendish tried to hold the balance between them, and Thurlow artfully fomented the dissensions. . . . Few Administrations have done so much in a short time as did the Rockingham Ministry during the three months of its existence, and it so happened that the lion's share of the work fell to Fox. Upon his appointment to office his friends noticed a change in habits and manner of life, as complete as that ascribed to Henry V. on his accession to the throne. He is said never to have touched a card during either of his three short terms of office. . . . By the division of work among the two Secretaries of State, all matters which related to the colonies were under the control of Shelburne, while those relating to foreign Governments belonged to the department of Fox. Consequently it became exceedingly important to these two Ministers whether independence was to be granted to the American colonies by the Crown of its own accord, or should be reserved in order to form part of the general treaty of peace. According to Fox's plan, independence was to be offered at once fully and freely to the Americans. They would thus gain at a blow all that they wanted.

Their jealousy of French and Spanish interests in America would at once assert itself, and England would have no difficulty in bringing them over to her side in the negotiations with France. Such was Fox's scheme, but unfortunately, directly America became independent, she ceased to be in any way subject to Shelburne's management, and the negotiations for peace would pass wholly out of his control into the hands of Fox. . . . Shelburne at once threw his whole weight into the opposite scale. He urged with great effect that to give independence at once was to throw away the trump card. It was the chief concession which England would be required to make, the only one which she was prepared to make; and to make it at once, before she was even asked, was wilfully to deprive herself of her best weapon. The King and the Cabinet adopted Shelburne's view. Fox's scheme for the isolation of France failed, and a double negotiation for peace was set on foot. Shelburne and Franklin took charge of the treaty with America [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1782 (SEPTEMBER)], Fox and M. de Vergennes that with France and Spain and Holland. An arrangement of this sort could hardly have succeeded had the two Secretaries been the firmest of friends; since they were rivals and enemies it was foredoomed to failure." Fox found occasion very soon to complain that important matters in Shelburne's negotiation with Franklin were kept from his knowledge, and once more he proposed to the Cabinet an immediate concession of independence to the Americans. Again he was outvoted, and, "defeated and despairing, only refrained from resigning there and then because he would not embitter Rockingham's last moments upon earth." This was on the 30th of June. "On the 1st of July Rockingham died, and on the 2nd Shelburne accepted from the King the task of forming a Ministry." Fox, of course, declined to enter it, and suffered in influence because he could not make public the reasons for his inability to act with Lord Shelburne. "Only Lord Cavendish, Burke, and the Solicitor-General, Lee, left office with Portland and Fox, and the gap was more than supplied by the entrance of William Pitt [Lord Chatham's son, who had entered Parliament in 1780] into the Cabinet as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Fortune seemed to smile on Shelburne. He . . . might well look forward to a long and unclouded tenure of political power. His Administration lasted not quite seven months." It was weakened by distrust and dissatisfaction among its members, and overturned in February, 1783, by a vote of censure on the peace which it had concluded with France, Spain and the American States. It was succeeded in the Government by the famous Coalition Ministry formed under Fox and Lord North. "The Duke of Portland succeeded Shelburne at the Treasury. Lord North and Fox became the Secretaries of State. Lord John Cavendish returned to the Exchequer, Keppel to the Admiralty, and Burke to the Paymastership, the followers of Lord North . . . were rewarded with the lower offices. Few combinations in the history of political parties have been received by historians and posterity with more unqualified condemnation than the coalition of 1783. . . . There is no evidence to show that at the time it struck politicians in general as being specially heinous."—H. O. Wakeman, *Life of Charles James Fox*, ch. 3-5.

ALSO IN: Lord J. Russell, *Life of Fox*, ch. 16-17 (v. 1).—W. F. Rae, *Wilkes, Sheridan, Fox*, pp. 307-317.—Lord E. Fitzmaurice, *Life of William, Earl of Shelburne*, v. 3, ch. 3-6.

A. D. 1783.—The definitive Treaty of Peace with the United States of America signed at Paris. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1783 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1783-1787.—Fall of the Coalition.—Ascendancy of the younger Pitt.—His extraordinary grasp of power.—His attempted measures of reform.—“Parliament met on the 11th of November; on the 18th Fox asked for leave to introduce a Bill for the Better Government of India. That day month the Government had ceased to exist. Into the merits of the Bill it is not now necessary to enter. . . . It was clear that it furnished an admirable weapon against an unpopular Coalition which had resisted economical reform, demanded a great income for a debauched prince, and now aimed at securing a monopoly of the vast patronage of India,—patronage which, genially exercised by Dundas, was soon to secure Scotland for Pitt. In the House of Commons the majority for the Bill was over 100; the loftiest eloquence of Burke was exerted in its favour; and Fox was, as ever, dauntless and crushing in debate. But outside Parliament the King schemed, and controversy raged. . . . When the Bill arrived at the House of Lords, the undertakers were ready. The King had seen Temple, and empowered him to communicate to all whom it might concern his august disapprobation. The uneasy whisper circulated, and the joints of the lords became as water. The peers who yearned for lieutenantancies or regiments, for stars or strawberry leaves; the prelates, who sought a larger sphere of usefulness; the minions of the bedchamber and the janissaries of the closet; all, temporal or spiritual, whose convictions were unequal to their appetite, rallied to the royal nod. . . . The result was overwhelming. The triumphant Coalition was paralysed by the rejection of their Bill. They rightly refused to resign, but the King could not sleep until he had resumed the seals. Late at night he sent for them. The messenger found North and Fox gaily seated at supper with their followers. At first he was not believed. ‘The King would not dare do it,’ exclaimed Fox. But the under Secretary charged with the message soon convinced them of its authenticity, and the seals were delivered with a light heart. In such dramatic fashion, and the springtide of its youth, fell that famous government, unhonoured and unwept. ‘England,’ once said Mr. Disraeli, ‘does not love coalitions.’ She certainly did not love this one. On this occasion there was neither hesitation nor delay; the moment had come, and the man. Within 12 hours of the King’s receiving the seals, Pitt had accepted the First Lordship of the Treasury and the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. That afternoon his writ was moved amid universal derision. And so commenced a supreme and unbroken Ministry of 17 years. Those who laughed were hardly blamable, for the difficulties were tremendous. . . . The composition of the Government was . . . the least of Pitt’s embarrassments. The majority against him in the House of Commons was not less than 40 or 50, containing, with the exception of Pitt himself and Dundas, every debater of eminence; while he had, before the meeting of Parliament, to pre-

pare and to obtain the approval of the East India Company to a scheme which should take the place of Burke’s. The Coalition Ministers were only dismissed on the 18th of December, 1783; but, when the House of Commons met on the 12th of January, 1784, all this had been done. The narrative of the next three months is stirring to read, but would require too much detail for our limits. . . . On the day of the meeting of Parliament, Pitt was defeated in two pitched divisions, the majorities against him being 39 and 54. His government seemed still-born. His colleagues were dismayed. The King came up from Windsor to support him. But in truth he needed no support. He had inherited from his father that confidence which made Chatham once say, ‘I am sure that I can save this country, and that nobody else can’; which made himself say later, ‘I place much dependence on my new colleagues; I place still more dependence on myself.’ He had refused, in spite of the King’s insistence, to dissolve; for he felt that the country required time. . . . The Clerkship of the Pells, a sinecure office worth not less than £3,000 a year, fell vacant the very day that Parliament met. It was universally expected that Pitt would take it as of right, and so acquire an independence, which would enable him to devote his life to politics, without care for the morrow. He had not £300 a year; his position was to the last degree precarious. . . . Pitt disappointed his friends and amazed his enemies. He gave the place to Barré. . . . To a nation inured to jobs this came as a revelation. . . . Above and beyond all was the fact that Pitt, young, unaided, and alone, held his own with the great leaders allied against him. . . . In face of so resolute a resistance, the assailants began to melt away. Their divisions, though they always showed a superiority to the Government, betrayed notable diminution. . . . On the 25th of March Parliament was dissolved, the announcement being retarded by the unexplained theft of the Great Seal. When the elections were over, the party of Fox, it was found, had shared the fate of the host of Sennacherib. The number of Fox’s martyrs—of Fox’s followers who had earned that nickname by losing their seats—was 160. . . . The King and Pitt were supported on the tidal wave of one of those great convulsions of feeling, which in Great Britain relieve and express pent-up national sentiment, and which in other nations produce revolutions.”—Lord Rosebery, *Pitt*, ch. 3.—“Three subjects then needed the attention of a great statesman, though none of them were so pressing as to force themselves on the attention of a little statesman. These were, our economical and financial legislation, the imperfection of our parliamentary representation, and the unhappy condition of Ireland. Pitt dealt with all three. . . . He brought in a series of resolutions consolidating our customs laws, of which the inevitable complexity may be estimated by their number. They amounted to 133, and the number of Acts of Parliament which they restrained or completed was much greater. He attempted, and successfully, to apply the principles of Free Trade, the principles which he was the first of English statesmen to learn from Adam Smith, to the actual commerce of the country. . . . The financial reputation of Pitt has greatly suffered from the absurd praise which was once lavished on the worst part of it. The dread of national ruin

from the augmentation of the national debt was a sort of nightmare in that age. . . . Mr. Pitt sympathised with the general apprehension and created the well-known 'Sinking Fund.' He proposed to apply annually a certain fixed sum to the payment of the debt, which was in itself excellent, but he omitted to provide real money to be so paid. . . . He proposed to borrow the money to pay off the debt, and fancied that he thus diminished it. . . . The exposure of this financial juggle, for though not intended to be so, such in fact it was, has reacted very unfavourably upon Mr. Pitt's deserved fame. . . . The subject of parliamentary reform is the one with which, in Mr. Pitt's early days, the public most connected his name, and is also that with which we are now least apt to connect it. . . . He proposed the abolition of the worst of the rotten boroughs fifty years before Lord Grey accomplished it. . . . If the strong counteracting influence of the French Revolution had not changed the national opinion, he would unquestionably have amended our parliamentary representation. . . . The state of Ireland was a more pressing difficulty than our financial confusion, our economical errors, or our parliamentary corruption. . . . He proposed at once to remedy the national danger of having two Parliaments, and to remove the incredible corruption of the old Irish Parliament, by uniting the three kingdoms in a single representative system, of which the Parliament should sit in England. . . . Of these great reforms he was only permitted to carry a few into execution. His power, as we have described it, was great when his reign commenced, and very great it continued to be for very many years; but the time became unfavourable for all forward-looking statesmanship."—W. Bagehot, *Biographical Studies: William Pitt*.

ALSO IN: Earl Stanhope, *Life of William Pitt*, ch. 4-9 (v. 1).—G. Tomline, *Life of William Pitt*, ch. 3-9 (v. 1-2).—Lord Rosebery, *Pitt*, ch. 3-4.

A. D. 1788 (February).—Opening of the Trial of Warren Hastings. See INDIA: A. D. 1785-1795.

A. D. 1788-1789.—The King's second derangement.—The king's second derangement, which began to show itself in the summer of 1788, was more serious and of longer duration than the first. "He was able . . . to sign a warrant for the further prorogation of Parliament by commission, from the 25th September to the 20th November. But, in the interval, the king's malady increased: he was wholly deprived of reason, and placed under restraint; and for several days his life was in danger. As no authority could be obtained from him for a further prorogation, both Houses assembled on the 20th November. . . . According to long established law, Parliament, without being opened by the Crown, had no authority to proceed to any business whatever: but the necessity of an occasion, for which the law had made no provision, was now superior to the law; and Parliament accordingly proceeded to deliberate upon the momentous questions to which the king's illness had given rise." By Mr. Fox it was maintained that "the Prince of Wales had as clear a right to exercise the power of sovereignty during the king's incapacity as if the king were actually dead; and that it was merely for the two Houses of Parliament to pronounce at what time he should commence the exercise of his

right. . . . Mr. Pitt, on the other hand, maintained that as no legal provision had been made for carrying on the government, it belonged to the Houses of Parliament to make such provision." The discussion to which these differences, and many obstructing circumstances in the situation of affairs, gave rise, was so prolonged, that the king recovered his faculties (February, 1789) before the Regency Bill, framed by Mr. Pitt, had been passed.—T. E. May, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, v. 1, ch. 3.

A. D. 1789-1792.—War with Tippoo Saib (third Mysore War). See INDIA: A. D. 1785-1793.

A. D. 1793.—The Coalition against Revolutionary France.—Unsuccessful siege of Dunkirk. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER), and (JULY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1793-1796.—Popular feeling towards the French Revolution.—Small number of the English Jacobins.—Pitt forced into war.—Tory panic and reign of terror.—Violence of government measures.—"That the war [of Revolutionary France] with Germany would widen into a vast European struggle, a struggle in which the peoples would rise against their oppressors, and the freedom which France had won diffuse itself over the world, no French revolutionist doubted for an hour. Nor did they doubt that in this struggle England would join them. It was from England that they had drawn those principles of political and social liberty which they believed themselves to be putting into practice. It was to England that they looked above all for approbation and sympathy. . . . To the revolutionists at Paris the attitude of England remained unintelligible and irritating. Instead of the aid they had counted on, they found but a cold neutrality. . . . But that this attitude was that of the English people as a whole was incredible to the French enthusiasts. . . . Their first work therefore they held to be the bringing about a revolution in England. . . . They strove, through a number of associations which had formed themselves under the name of Constitutional Clubs, to rouse the same spirit which they had roused in France; and the French envoy, Chauvelin, protested warmly against a proclamation which denounced this correspondence as seditious. . . . Burke was still working hard in writings whose extravagance of style was forgotten in their intensity of feeling to spread alarm throughout Europe. He had from the first encouraged the emigrant princes to take arms, and sent his son to join them at Coblenz. 'Be alarmists,' he wrote to them; 'diffuse terror!' But the royalist terror which he sowed would have been of little moment had it not roused a revolutionary terror in France. . . . In November the Convention decreed that France offered the aid of her soldiers to all nations who would strive for freedom. . . . In the teeth of treaties signed only two years before, and of the stipulation made by England when it pledged itself to neutrality, the French Government resolved to attack Holland, and ordered its generals to enforce by arms the opening of the Scheldt [see FRANCE: A. D. 1792-1793 (DECEMBER—FEBRUARY)]. To do this was to force England into war. Public opinion was already pressing every day harder upon Pitt. . . . But even while withdrawing our Minister from Paris on the imprisonment of the King, to whose Court he had been commissioned, Pitt clung

stubbornly to a policy of peace. . . . No hour of Pitt's life is so great as the hour when he stood lonely and passionless before the growth of national passion, and refused to bow to the gathering cry for war. . . . But desperately as Pitt struggled for peace, his struggle was in vain. . . . Both sides ceased from diplomatic communications, and in February 1793 France issued her Declaration of War. From that moment Pitt's power was at an end. His pride, his immoveable firmness, and the general confidence of the nation, still kept him at the head of affairs; but he could do little save drift along with a tide of popular feeling which he never fully understood. Around him the country broke out in a fit of passion and panic which rivalled the passion and panic overseas. . . . The partisans of Republicanism were in reality but a few handfuls of men. . . . But in the mass of Englishmen the dread of these revolutionists passed for the hour into sheer panic. Even the bulk of the Whig party believed property and the constitution to be in peril, and forsook Fox when he still proclaimed his faith in France and the Revolution."—J. R. Green, *Hist. of the Eng. People*, bk. 9, ch. 4 (v. 4).—"Burke himself said that not one man in a hundred was a Revolutionist. Fox's revolutionary sentiments met with no response, but with general reprobation, and caused even his friends to shrink from his side. Of the so-called Jacobin Societies, the Society for Constitutional Information numbered only a few hundred members, who, though they held extreme opinions, were headed by men of character, and were quite incapable of treason or violence. The Corresponding Society was of a more sinister character; but its numbers were computed only at 6,000, and it was swallowed up in the loyal masses of the people. . . . It is sad to say it, but when Pitt had once left the path of right, he fell headlong into evil. To gratify the ignoble fears and passions of his party, he commenced a series of attacks on English liberty of speaking and writing which Mr. Massey, a strong anti-revolutionist, characterizes as unparalleled since the time of Charles I. The country was filled with spies. A band of the most infamous informers was called into activity by the government. . . . There was a Tory reign of terror, to which a slight increase of the panic among the upper classes would probably have lent a redder hue. Among other measures of repression the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended; and the liberties of all men were thus placed at the mercy of the party in power. . . . In Scotland the Tory reign of terror was worse than in England."—Goldwin Smith, *Three English Statesmen*, pp. 239-247.—"The gaols were filled with political delinquents, and no man who professed himself a reformer could say, that the morrow might not see him a prisoner upon a charge of high treason. . . . But the rush towards despotism against which the Whigs could not stand, was arrested by the people. Although the Habeas Corpus had fallen, the Trial by Jury remained, and now, as it had done before, when the alarm of fictitious plots had disposed the nation to acquiesce in the surrender of its liberties, it opposed a barrier which Toryism could not pass." The trials which excited most interest were those of Hardy, who organized the Corresponding Society, and Horne Tooke. But no unlawful conduct or treasonable designs could be proved against them by creditable witnesses, and both were acquitted. "The

public joy was very general at these acquittals. . . . The war lost its popularity; bread grew scarce; commerce was crippled; . . . the easy success that had been anticipated was replaced by reverses. The people clamoured and threw stones at the king, and Pitt eagerly took advantage of their violence to tear away the few shreds of the constitution which yet covered them. He brought forward the Seditious Meetings bill, and the Treasonable Practices bill. Bills which, among other provisions, placed the conduct of every political meeting under the protection of a magistrate, and rendered disobedience to his command a felony."—G. W. Cooke, *Hist. of Party*, v. 3, ch. 17.

ALSO IN: J. Adolphus, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of George III.*, ch. 81-89 and 95 (v. 5-6).—J. Gifford, *Hist. of the Political Life of Wm. Pitt*, ch. 23-24, and 28-29 (v. 3-4).—W. Massey, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of George III.*, ch. 32-36 (v. 3-4).—E. Smith, *The Story of the English Jacobins*.—A. Bisset, *Short Hist. of the Eng. Parliament*, ch. 8.

A. D. 1794.—Campaigns of the Coalition against France.—French successes in the Netherlands and on the Rhine.—Conquest of Corsica.—Naval victory of Lord Howe. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (MARCH—JULY).

A. D. 1794.—Angry relations with the United States.—The Jay Treaty. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1794-1795.

A. D. 1794-1795.—Withdrawal of troops from the Netherlands.—French conquest of Holland.—Establishment of the Batavian Republic.—Crumbling of the European Coalition. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794-1795 (OCTOBER—MAY).

A. D. 1795.—Disastrous expedition to Quiberon Bay. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794-1796.

A. D. 1795.—Capture of the Cape of Good Hope from the Dutch. See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1796 (September).—Evacuation and abandonment of Corsica. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1796 (October).—Unsuccessful peace negotiations with the French Directory. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1796-1798.—Attempted French invasions of Ireland.—Irish Insurrection. See IRELAND: A. D. 1793-1798.

A. D. 1797.—Monetary panic and suspension of specie payments.—Defeat of the first Reform movement.—Mutiny of the Fleet.—Naval victories of Cape St. Vincent and Camperdown.—"The aspect of affairs in Britain had never been so clouded during the 18th century as at the beginning of the year 1797. The failure of Lord Malmesbury's mission to Paris had closed every hope of an honourable termination to the war, while of all her original allies, Austria alone remained; the national burdens were continually increasing, and the three percents had fallen to fifty-one; while party spirit raged with uncommon violence, and Ireland was in a state of partial insurrection. A still greater disaster resulted from the panic arising from the dread of invasion, and which produced such a run on all the banks, that the Bank of England itself was reduced to payment in sixpences, and an Order in Council appeared (Feb. 26) for the suspension of all cash payments. This measure, at first only temporary, was prolonged from time to time by parliamentary enactments, making bank-notes a legal-tender; and it was not till

1819, after the conclusion of peace, that the recurrence to metallic currency took place. The Opposition deemed this a favourable opportunity to renew their cherished project of parliamentary reform; and on 26th May, Mr. (afterwards Lord) Grey brought forward a plan chiefly remarkable for containing the outlines of that subsequently carried into effect in 1831. It was negatived, however, after violent debates, by a majority of 258 against 93. After a similar strife of parties, the motion for the continuance of the war was carried by a great majority in both houses; and the requisite supplies were voted. . . . Unknown to the government, great discontent had for a long time prevailed in the navy. The exciting causes were principally the low rate of pay (which had not been raised since the time of Charles II.), the unequal distribution of prize-money, and undue severity in the maintenance of discipline. These grounds of complaint, with others not less well founded, gave rise to a general conspiracy, which broke out (April 15) in the Channel fleet under Lord Bridport. All the ships fell under the power of the insurgents; but they maintained perfect order, and memorialised the Admiralty and the Commons on their grievances: their demands being examined by government, and found to be reasonable, were granted; and on the 7th of May the fleet returned to its duty. But scarcely was the spirit of disaffection quelled in this quarter, when it broke out in a more alarming form (May 22) among the squadron at the Nore, which was soon after (June 6) joined by the force which had been cruising off the Texel under Lord Duncan. The mutineers appointed a seaman named Parker to the command; and, blockading the mouth of the Thames, announced their demands in such a tone of menacing audacity as insured their instant rejection by the government. This second mutiny caused dreadful consternation in London; but the firmness of the King remained unshaken, and he was nobly seconded by the parliament. A bill was passed, prohibiting all communication with the mutineers under pain of death. Sheerness and Tilbury Fort were armed and garrisoned for the defence of the Thames; and the sailors, finding the national feelings strongly arrayed against them, became gradually sensible that their enterprise was desperate. One by one the ships returned to their duty; and on 15th June all had submitted. Parker and several other ringleaders suffered death; but clemency was extended to the multitude. . . . Notwithstanding all these dissensions, the British navy was never more terrible to its enemies than during this eventful year. On the 14th of February, the Spanish fleet of 27 sail of the line and 12 frigates, which had put to sea for the purpose of raising the blockade of the French harbours, was encountered off Cape St. Vincent by Sir John Jarvis, who had only 15 ships and 6 frigates. By the old manœuvre of breaking the line, 9 of the Spanish ships were cut off from the rest; and the admiral, while attempting to regain them by wearing round the rear of the British line, was boldly assailed by Nelson and Collingwood, — the former of whom, in the Captain, of 74 guns, engaged at once two of the enemy's gigantic vessels, the Santissima Trinidad of 136 guns, and the San Josef of 112; while the Salvador del Mundo, also of 112 guns, struck in a quarter of an hour to Collingwood. Nelson at length car-

ried the San Josef by boarding, and received the Spanish admiral's sword on his own quarter-deck. The Santissima Trinidad—an enormous four-decker—though her colours were twice struck, escaped in the confusion; but the San Josef and the Salvador, with two 74-gun ships, remained in the hands of the British; and the Spanish armament, thus routed by little more than half its own force, retired in the deepest dejection to Cadiz, which was shortly after insulted by a bombardment from the gallant Nelson. A more important victory than that of Sir John Jarvis (created in consequence Earl St. Vincent) was never gained at sea, from the evident superiority of skill and seamanship which it demonstrated in the British navy. The battle of St. Vincent disconcerted the plans of Truguet for the naval campaign; but later in the season a second attempt to reach Brest was made by a Dutch fleet of 15 sail of the line and 11 frigates, under the command of De Winter, a man of tried courage and experience. The British blockading fleet, under Admiral Duncan, consisted of 16 ships and 3 frigates; and the battle was fought (Oct. 16) off Camperdown, about nine miles from the shore of Holland. The manœuvres of the British Admiral were directed to cut off the enemy's retreat to his own shores; and this having been accomplished, the action commenced yard-arm to yard-arm, and continued with the utmost fury for more than three hours. The Dutch sailors fought with the most admirable skill and courage, and proved themselves worthy descendants of Van Tromp and De Ruyter; but the prowess of the British was irresistible. 12 sail of the line, including the flagship, two 56-gun ships, and 2 frigates, struck their colours; but the nearness of the shore enabled two of the prizes to escape, and one 74-gun ship foundered. The obstinacy of the conflict was evidenced by the nearly equal number of killed and wounded, which amounted to 1,040 English, and 1,160 Dutch. . . . The only remaining operations of the year were the capture of Trinidad in February, by a force which soon after was repulsed from before Porto Rico; and an abortive attempt at a descent in Pembroke Bay by about 1,400 French.—*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe*, sect. 190–196 (ch. 22, v. 5—of complete work).

ALSO IN: J. Adolphus, *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of George III.*, ch. 100–103 (v. 6).—R. Southey, *Life of Nelson*, ch. 4.—E. J. De La Gravière, *Sketches of the Last Naval War*, v. 1, pt. 2.—Capt. A. T. Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power on the French Rev. and Empire*, ch. 8 and 11 (v. 1).

A. D. 1798 (August).—Nelson's victory in the Battle of the Nile. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798 (MAY—AUGUST).

A. D. 1798.—Second Coalition against Revolutionary France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798–1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

A. D. 1799 (April).—Final war with Tippoo Saib (third Mysore War). See INDIA: A. D. 1798–1805.

A. D. 1799 (August—October).—Expedition against Holland.—Seizure of the Dutch fleet.—Ignominious ending of the enterprise.—Capitulation of the Duke of York. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER), and (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1800.—Legislative union of Ireland with Great Britain.—Creation of the "United Kingdom." See IRELAND: A. D. 1798–1800.

A. D. 1801.—The first Factory Act. See **FACTORY LEGISLATION.**

A. D. 1801-1802.—Import of the Treaty of Luneville.—Bonaparte's preparations for conflict with Great Britain alone.—Retirement of Pitt.—The Northern Maritime League and its summary annihilation at Copenhagen.—Expulsion of the French from Egypt.—The Peace of Amiens. See **FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802.**

A. D. 1801-1806.—Pitt's promise to the Irish Catholics broken by the King.—His resignation.—The Addington Ministry.—The Peace of Amiens.—War resumed.—Pitt at the helm again.—His death.—The Ministry of "All the Talents."—"The union with Ireland introduced a new topic of party discussion, which quickly became only second to that of parliamentary reform. In transplanting the parliament of College Green to St. Stephen's, Pitt had transplanted the questions which were there debated; and, of these, none had been more important than the demand of the Catholics to be admitted to the common rights of citizens. Pitt, whose Toryism was rather the imperiousness of a haughty master, than the cautious cowardice of the miser of power, thought their complaints were just. In his private negotiations with the Irish popular leaders he probably promised that emancipation should be the sequel to the union. In his place in parliament he certainly gave an intimation, which from the mouth of a minister could receive no second interpretation. Pitt was not a minister who governed by petty stratagems, by ambiguous professions, and by skilful shuffles; he was at least an honourable enemy. He prepared to fulfil the pledge he had given, and to admit the Catholics within the pale of the constitution. It had been better for the character of George III. had he imitated the candour of his minister; had he told him that he had made a promise he would not be suffered to fulfil, before he had obtained the advantage to gain which that promise had been made. When Pitt proposed Catholic emancipation as one of the topics of the king's speech, for the session of 1801, the royal negative was at once interposed, and when Dundas persisted in his attempt to overcome his master's objections, the king abruptly terminated the conference, saying, 'Scotch metaphysics cannot destroy religious obligations.' Pitt immediately tendered his resignation. . . . All that was brilliant in Toryism passed from the cabinet with the late minister. When Pitt and Canning were withdrawn, with their satellites, nothing remained of the Tory party but the mere courtiers who lived upon the favour of the king, and the insipid leeches of the party; men who voted upon every subject in accordance with their one ruling idea—the certain ruin which must follow the first particle of innovation. Yet from these relics the king was obliged to form a new cabinet, for application to the Whigs was out of the question. These were more strenuous for emancipation than Pitt. Henry Addington, Pitt's speaker of the house of commons, was the person upon whom the king's choice fell; and he succeeded, with the assistance of the late premier, in filling up the offices at his disposal. . . . The peace of Amiens was the great work of this feeble administration [see **FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1802**], and formed a severe commentary upon the boasts of the Tories. 'Unless the monarchy of France be restored,' Pitt had said, eight years

before, 'the monarchy of England is lost forever.' Eight years of warfare had succeeded, yet the monarchy of France was not restored, and the crusade was stayed. England had surrendered her conquests, France retained hers; the landmarks of Europe had been in some degree restored; England, alone, remained burdened with the enduring consequences of the ruinous and useless strife. The peace was approved by the Whigs, who were glad of any respite from such a war, and by Pitt, who gave his support to the Addington administration. But he could not control his adherents. . . . As the instability of the peace grew manifest, the incompetency of the administration became generally acknowledged: with Pitt sometimes chiding, Windham and Canning, and Lords Spencer and Grenville continually attacking, and Fox and the Whigs only refraining from violent opposition from a knowledge that if Addington went out Pitt would be his successor, the conduct of the government was by no means an easy or a grateful task to a man destitute of commanding talents. When to these parliamentary difficulties were added a recommencement of the war, and a popular panic at Bonaparte's threatened invasion, Addington's embarrassments became inextricable. He had performed the business which Pitt had assigned him; he had made an experimental peace, and had saved Pitt's honour with the Roman Catholics. The object of his appointment he had unconsciously completed, and no sooner did his predecessor manifest an intention of returning to office, than the ministerial majorities began to diminish, and Addington found himself without support. On the 12th of April it was announced that Mr. Addington had resigned, and Pitt appeared to resume his station as a matter of course. During his temporary retirement, Pitt had, however, lost one section of his supporters. The Grenville party and the Whigs had gradually approximated, and the former now refused to come into the new arrangements unless Fox was introduced into the cabinet. To this Pitt offered no objection, but the king was firm—or obstinate. . . . In the following year, Addington himself, now created Viscount Sidmouth, returned to office with the subordinate appointment of president of the council. The conflagration had again spread through Europe. . . . Pitt had the mortification to see his grand continental coalition, the produce of such immense expense and the object of such hope, shattered in one campaign. At home, Lord Melville, his most faithful political supporter, was attacked by a charge from which he could not defend him, and underwent the impeachment of the commons for malpractices in his office as treasurer of the navy. Lord Sidmouth and several others seceded from the cabinet, and Pitt, broken in health, and dispirited by reverses, had lost much of his wonted energy. Thus passed away the year 1805. On the 23d of January, 1806, Pitt expired. . . . The death of Pitt was the dissolution of his administration. The Tory party was scattered in divisions and subdivisions innumerable. Canning now recognised no political leader, but retained his old contempt for Sidmouth and his friends, and his hostility to the Grenvilles for their breach with Pitt. Castle-reagh, William Dundas, Hawkesbury, or Barham, although sufficiently effective when Pitt was present to direct and to defend, would have made

a hopeless figure without him in face of such an opposition as the house of commons now afforded. The administration, which was ironically designated by its opponents as 'All the Talents,' succeeded. Lord Grenville was first lord of the treasury. Fox chose the office of secretary for foreign affairs with the hope of putting an end to the war. Windham was colonial secretary. Earl Spencer had the seals of the home department. Erskine was lord chancellor. Mr. Grey was first lord of the admiralty. Sheridan, treasurer of the navy. Lord Sidmouth was privy seal. Lord Henry Petty, who, although now only in his 26th year, had already acquired considerable distinction as an eloquent Whig speaker, was advanced to the post of chancellor of the exchequer, the vacant chair of Pitt. Such were the men who now assumed the reins under circumstances of unparalleled difficulty."—G. W. Cooke, *Hist. of Party*, v. 3, ch. 17-18.

ALSO IN: Earl Stanhope (Lord Mahon), *Life of Pitt*, ch. 29-44 (v. 3-4).—A. G. Stapleton, *George Canning and His Times*, ch. 6-8.—Earl Russell, *Life and Times of Charles James Fox*, ch. 58-69 (v. 3).—G. Pellet, *Life and Corr. of Henry Addington*, 1st Viscount Sidmouth, ch. 10-26 (v. 1-2).

A. D. 1802 (October).—Protest against Bonaparte's interference in Switzerland.—His extraordinary reply. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1803.

A. D. 1802-1803.—Bonaparte's complaints and demands.—The Peltier trial.—The First Consul's rage.—Declaration of war.—Napoleon's seizure of Hanover.—Cruel detention of all English people in France, Italy, Switzerland and the Netherlands. See FRANCE: A. D. 1802-1803.

A. D. 1804-1809.—Difficulties with the United States.—Questions of neutral rights.—Right of Search and Impressment.—The American Embargo. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804-1809, and 1809.

A. D. 1805 (January-April).—Third Coalition against France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (JANUARY-APRIL).

A. D. 1805.—Napoleon's threatened invasion.—Nelson's long pursuit of the French fleet.—His victory and death at Trafalgar.—The crushing of the Coalition at Austerlitz. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (MARCH-DECEMBER).

A. D. 1806.—Final seizure of Cape Colony from the Dutch. See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1486-1806.

A. D. 1806.—Cession of Hanover to Prussia by Napoleon.—War with Prussia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (JANUARY-AUGUST).

A. D. 1806.—Attempted reinstatement of the dethroned King of Naples.—The Battle of Maida. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805-1806 (DECEMBER-SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1806.—Death of Pitt.—Peace negotiations with Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1806 (JANUARY-OCTOBER).

A. D. 1806-1807.—Expedition against Buenos Ayres. See ARGENTINE REPUBLIC: A. D. 1806-1820.

A. D. 1806-1810.—Commercial warfare with Napoleon.—Orders in Council.—Berlin and Milan Decrees. See FRANCE: A. D. 1806-1810.

A. D. 1806-1812.—The ministry of "All the Talents."—Abolition of the Slave Trade.—The Portland and the Perceval ministries.—Confirmed insanity of George III.—Beginning

of the regency of the Prince of Wales.—Assassination of Mr. Perceval.—The "Ministry of All the Talents" is "remarkable solely for its mistakes, and is to be remembered chiefly for the death of Fox [September 13, 1806] and the abolition of the slave-trade. Fox was now destined at the close of his career to be disillusioned with regard to Napoleon. He at last thoroughly realized the insincerity of his hero. . . . The second great object of Fox's life he succeeded in attaining before his death;—this was the abolition of the slave-trade. For more than thirty years the question had been before the country, and a vigorous agitation had been conducted by Clarkson, Wilberforce, and Fox. Pitt was quite at one with them on this question, and had brought forward motions on the subject. The House of Lords, however, rejected all measures of this description during the Revolutionary War, under the influence of the Anti-Jacobin feeling. It was reserved for Fox to succeed in carrying a Bill inflicting heavy pecuniary punishments on the traffic in slaves. And yet this measure—the sole fruit of Fox's statesmanship—was wholly inadequate; nor was it till the slave-trade was made felony in 1811 that its final extinction was secured. The remaining acts of the Ministry were blunders. . . . Their financial system was a failure. They carried on the war so as to alienate their allies and to cover themselves with humiliation. Finally, they insisted on bringing forward a measure for the relief of the Catholics, though there was not the slightest hope of carrying it, and it could only cause a disruption of the Government. . . . The king and the Pittites were determined to oppose it, and so the Ministry agreed to drop the question under protest. George insisted on their withdrawing the protest, and as this was refused he dismissed them. . . . This then was the final triumph of George III. He had successfully dismissed this Ministry; he had maintained the principle that every Ministry is bound to withdraw any project displeasing to the king. These principles were totally inconsistent with Constitutional Government, and they indirectly precipitated Reform by rendering it absolutely necessary in order to curb the royal influence. . . . The Duke of Portland's sole claims to form a Ministry were his high rank, and the length of his previous services. His talents were never very great, and they were weakened by age and disease. The real leader was Mr. Perceval, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a dexterous debater and a patriotic statesman. This Government, being formed on the closest Tory basis and on the king's influence, was pledged to pursue a retrograde policy and to oppose all measures of Reform. The one really high-minded statesman in the Cabinet was Canning, the Foreign Minister. His advanced views, however, continually brought him into collision with Castlereagh, the War Minister, a man of much inferior talents and the narrowest Tory views. Quarrels inevitably arose between the two, and there was no real Prime Minister to hold them strongly under control. . . . At last the ill-feeling ended in a duel, which was followed by a mutual resignation on the ground that neither could serve with the other. This was followed by the resignation of Portland, who felt himself wholly unequal to the arduous task of managing the Ministry any longer. The leadership now devolved on

Perceval, who found himself in an apparently hopeless condition. His only supporters were Lords Liverpool, Eldon, Palmerston, and Wellesley. Neither Canning, Castlereagh, nor Sidmouth (Addington) would join him. The miserable expedition to Walcheren had just ended in ignominy. The campaign in the Peninsula was regarded as a chimerical enterprise, got up mainly for the benefit of a Tory commander. Certainly the most capable man in the Cabinet was Lord Wellesley, the Foreign Minister, but he was continually thwarted by the incapable men he had to deal with. However, as long as he remained at the Foreign Office, he supported the Peninsular War with vigour, and enabled his brother to carry out more effectually his plans with regard to the defence of Portugal. In November, 1810, the king was again seized with insanity, nor did he ever recover the use of his faculties during the rest of his life. The Ministry determined to bring forward Pitt's old Bill of 1788 in a somewhat more modified form, February, 1811. The Prince of Wales requested Grey and Grenville to criticize this, but, regarding their reply as lukewarm, he began to entertain an ill-will for them. At this moment the judicious flattery of his family brought him over from the Whigs, and he decided to continue Perceval in office. Wellesley, however, took the opportunity to resign, and was succeeded by Castlereagh, February, 1812. In May Perceval was assassinated by Mr. Bellingham, a lunatic, and his Ministry at once fell to pieces."—B. C. Skottowe, *Our Hanoverian Kings*, bk. 10, ch. 3.

Also in: F. H. Hill, *George Canning*, ch. 13-17.—S. Walpole, *Life of Spencer Perceval*, v. 2.—R. I. and S. Wilberforce, *Life of William Wilberforce*, ch. 20 (v. 3).

A. D. 1807.—Act for the Abolition of the Slave-Trade. See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1792-1807.

A. D. 1807 (February—September).—Operations in support of the Russians against the Turks and French.—Bold naval attack on Constantinople and humiliating failure.—Disastrous expedition to Egypt. See TURKS: A. D. 1806-1807.

A. D. 1807 (June—July).—Alliance formed at Tilsit between Napoleon and Alexander I. of Russia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (JUNE—JULY).

A. D. 1807 (August—November).—Bombardment of Copenhagen and seizure of the Danish fleet.—War with Russia and Denmark. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1807-1810.

A. D. 1807 (October—November).—Submission of Portugal to Napoleon under English advice.—Flight of the house of Braganza to Brazil. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1807.

A. D. 1808 (May).—Ineffectual attempt to aid Sweden.—Expedition of Sir John Moore. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1807-1810.

A. D. 1808 (July).—Peace and alliance with the Spanish people against the new Napoleonic monarchy.—Opening of the Peninsular War. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808 (MAY—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1808.—Expulsion of English forces from Capri. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1808-1809.

A. D. 1808-1809.—Wellington's first campaign in the Peninsula.—Convention of Cintra.—Evacuation of Portugal by the French.—Sir John Moore's advance into Spain and his

retreat.—His death at Corunna. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808-1809 (AUGUST—JANUARY).

A. D. 1809 (February—July).—Wellington sent to the Peninsula.—The passage of the Douro and the Battle of Talavera. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JULY).

A. D. 1809 (July—December).—The Walcheren Expedition.—“Three times before, during the war, it had occurred to one or another, connected with the government, that it would be a good thing to hold Antwerp, and command the Scheldt, seize the French ships in the river, and get possession of their arsenals and dockyards. On each occasion, men of military science and experience had been consulted; and invariably they had pronounced against the scheme. Now, however, what Mr. Pitt had considered impracticable, Lord Castlereagh, with the rashness of incapacity, resolved should be done: and, in order not to be hindered, he avoided consulting with those who would have objected to the enterprise. Though the scene of action was to be the swamps at the mouths of the Scheldt, he consulted no physician. Having himself neither naval, military, nor medical knowledge, he assumed the responsibility—except such as the King and the Duke of York chose to share. . . . It was May, 1809, before any stir was apparent which could lead men outside the Cabinet to infer that an expedition for the Scheldt was in contemplation; but so early as the beginning of April (it is now known), Mr. Canning signified that he could not share in the responsibility of an enterprise which must so involve his own office. . . . The fleet that rode in the channel consisted of 39 ships of the line, and 36 frigates, and a due proportion of small vessels: in all, 245 vessels of war: and 400 transports carried 40,000 soldiers. Only one hospital ship was provided for the whole expedition, though the Surgeon General implored the grant of two more. He gave his reasons, but was refused. . . . The naval commander was Sir Richard J. Strachan, whose title to the responsibility no one could perceive, while many who had more experience were unemployed. The military command was given (as the selection of the present Cabinet had been) to Lord Chatham, for no better reason than that he was a favourite with the King and Queen, who liked his gentle and courtly manners, and his easy and amiable temper. . . . The fatal mistake was made of not defining the respective authorities of the two commanders; and both being inexperienced or apathetic, each relied upon the other first, and cast the blame of failure upon him afterwards. In the autumn, an epigram of unknown origin was in every body's mouth, all over England:

‘Lord Chatham, with his sword undrawn,
Stood waiting for Sir Richard Strachan;
Sir Richard, longing to be at ‘em,
Stood waiting for the Earl of Chatham.’

The fleet set sail on the 28th of July, and was on the coast of Holland the next day. The first discovery was that there were not boats enough to land the troops and the ordnance. The next was that no plan had been formed about how to proceed. The most experienced officers were for pushing on to Antwerp, 45 miles off, and taking it before it could be prepared for defence; but the commanders determined to take Flushing first. They set about it so slowly that a fortnight was consumed in preparations. In two

days more, the 15th of August, Flushing was taken. After this, Lord Chatham paused to consider what he should do next; and it was the 21st before he began to propose to go on to Antwerp. Then came the next discovery, that, by this time two intermediate places had been so strengthened that there must be some fighting on the way. So he did nothing more but take possession of two small islands near Flushing. Not another blow was struck; not another league was traversed by this magnificent expedition. But the most important discovery of all now disclosed itself. The army had been brought into the swamps at the beginning of the sickly season. Fever sprang up under their feet, and 3,000 men were in hospital in a few days, just when it became necessary to reduce the rations, because provisions were falling short. On the 27th of August, Lord Chatham led a council of war to resolve that 'it was not advisable to pursue further operations.' But, if they could not proceed, neither could they remain where they were. The enemy had more spirit than their invaders. On the 30th and 31st, such a fire was opened from both banks of the river, that the ships were obliged to retire. Flushing was given up, and everything else except the island of Walcheren, which it was fatal to hold at this season. On the 4th of September, most of the ships were at home again; and Lord Chatham appeared on the 14th. Eleven thousand men were by that time in the fever, and he brought home as many as he could. Sir Eyre Coote, whom he left in command, was dismayed to see all the rest sinking down in disease at the rate of hundreds in a day. Though the men had been working in the swamps, up to the waist in marsh water, and the roofs of their sleeping places had been carried off by bombardment, so that they slept under a canopy of autumn fog, it was supposed that a supply of Thames water to drink would stop the sickness; and a supply of 500 tons per week was transmitted. At last, at the end of October, a hundred English bricklayers, with tools, bricks, and mortar, were sent over to mend the roofs; but they immediately dropped into the hospitals. Then the patients were to be accommodated in the towns; but to spare the inhabitants, the soldiers were laid down in damp churches; and their bedding had from the beginning been insufficient for their need. At last, government desired the chief officers of the army Medical Board to repair to Walcheren, and see what was the precise nature of the fever, and what could be done. The Surgeon-General and the Physician-General threw the duty upon each other. Government appointed it to the Physician-General, Sir Lucas Pepys; but he refused to go. Both officers were dismissed, and the medical department of the army was reorganized and greatly improved. The deaths were at this time from 200 to 300 a week. When Walcheren was evacuated, on the 23rd of December, nearly half the force sent out five months before were dead or missing; and of those who returned, 35,000 were admitted into the hospitals of England before the next 1st of June. Twenty millions sterling were spent on this expedition. It was the purchase money of tens of thousands of deaths, and of ineffaceable national disgrace."—H. Martineau, *Hist. of Eng., 1800-1815*, bk. 2, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 7, ch. 29.

A. D. 1809 (August—December).—Difficulties of Wellington's campaign in the Peninsula.—His retreat into Portugal. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1810.—Capture of the Mauritius. See INDIA: A. D. 1805-1816.

A. D. 1810-1812.—The War in the Peninsula.—Wellington's Lines of Torres Vedras.—French recoil from them.—English advance into Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809-1810 (OCTOBER—SEPTEMBER), and 1810-1812.

A. D. 1811.—Capture of Java from the Dutch. See INDIA: A. D. 1805-1816.

A. D. 1811-1812.—Desertion of Napoleon's Continental System by Russia and Sweden.—Reopening of their ports to British commerce. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810-1812.

A. D. 1812 (January).—Building of the first passenger Steam-boat. See STEAM NAVIGATION: THE BEGINNINGS.

A. D. 1812 (June—August).—The Peninsular War.—Wellington's victory at Salamanca and advance to Madrid. See SPAIN: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—AUGUST).

A. D. 1812-1813.—The Liverpool Ministry.—Business depression and bad harvests.—Distress and rioting.—The Luddites.—'Again there was much negotiation, and an attempt to introduce Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning to the ministry. Of course they could not serve with Castlereagh; they were then asked to form a ministry with Grenville and Grey, but these Lords objected to the Peninsular War, to which Wellesley was pledged. Grenville and Grey then attempted a ministry of their own but quarrelled with Lord Moira on the appointments to the Household; and as an American war was threatening, and the ministry had already given up their Orders in Council (one of the chief causes of their unpopularity), the Regent rather than remain longer without a ministry, intrusted Lord Liverpool with the Premiership, with Castlereagh as his Foreign Secretary, and the old ministry remained in office. Before the day of triumph of this ministry arrived, while Napoleon was still at the height of his power, and the success of Wellington as yet uncertain, England had drifted into war with America. It is difficult to believe that this useless war might not have been avoided had the ministers been men of ability. It arose from the obstinate manner in which the Government clung to the execution of their retaliatory measures against France, regardless of the practical injury they were inflicting upon all neutrals. . . . The same motive of class aggrandizement which detracts from the virtue of the foreign policy of this ministry underlay the whole administration of home affairs. There was an incapacity to look at public affairs from any but a class or aristocratic point of view. The natural consequence was a constantly increasing mass of discontent among the lower orders, only kept in restraint by an overmastering fear felt by all those higher in rank of the possible revolutionary tendencies of any attempt at change. Much of the discontent was of course the inevitable consequence of the circumstances in which England was placed, and for which the Government was only answerable in so far as it created those circumstances. At the same time it is impossible not to blame the complacent manner in which the misery was ignored and the occasional success of individual merchants and contractors regarded

as evidences of national prosperity. . . . A plentiful harvest in 1813, and the opening of many continental ports, did much to revive both trade and manufactures; but it was accompanied by a fall in the price of corn from 17s. to 7s. The consequence was widespread distress among the agriculturists, which involved the country banks, so that in the two following years 240 of them stopped payment. So great a crash could not fail to affect the manufacturing interest also; apparently, for the instant, the very restoration of peace brought widespread ruin. . . . Before the end of the year 1811, wages had sunk to 7s. 6d. a week. The manufacturing operatives were therefore in a state of absolute misery. Petitions signed by 40,000 or 50,000 men urged upon Parliament that they were starving; but there was another class which fared still worse. Machinery had by no means superseded hand-work. In thousands of hamlets and cottages handlooms still existed. The work was neither so good nor so rapid as work done by machinery; even at the best of times used chiefly as an auxiliary to agriculture, this hand labour could now scarcely find employment at all. Not unnaturally, without work and without food, these hand workers were very ready to believe that it was the machinery which caused their ruin, and so in fact it was; the change, though on the whole beneficial, had brought much individual misery. The people were not wise enough to see this. They rose in riots in many parts of England, chiefly about Nottingham, calling themselves Luddites (from the name of a certain idiot lad who some 30 years before had broken stocking-frames), gathered round them many of the disbanded soldiery with whom the country was thronged, and with a very perfect secret organization, carried out their object of machine-breaking. The unexpected thronging of the village at nightfall, a crowd of men with blackened faces, armed sentinels holding every approach, silence on all sides, the village inhabitants cowering behind closed doors, an hour or two's work of smashing and burning, and the disappearance of the crowd as rapidly as it had arrived—such were the incidents of the night riots.”—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period 3*, pp. 1325-1332.

ALSO IN: C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 7, ch. 30.—*Pictorial Hist. of Eng.*, v. 8, ch. 4 (*Reign of George III.*, v. 4).

A. D. 1812-1815.—War with the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM. A. D. 1804-1809; 1808; and 1810-1812, to 1815 (JANUARY).

A. D. 1813 (June).—Joined with the new European Coalition against Napoleon. See GERMANY: A. D. 1813 (MAY—AUGUST).

A. D. 1813-1814.—Wellington's victorious and final campaigns in the Peninsular War. See SPAIN: A. D. 1812-1814.

A. D. 1813-1816.—War with the Ghorkas of Nepal. See INDIA: A. D. 1805-1816.

A. D. 1814.—The allies in France and in possession of Paris.—Fall of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH), and (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1814 (May—June).—Treaty of Paris.—Acquisition of Malta, the Isle of France and the Cape of Good Hope. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE).

A. D. 1814 (December).—The Treaty of Ghent, terminating war with the United

States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (DECEMBER).

A. D. 1814-1815.—The Congress of Vienna and its revision of the map of Europe. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1815 (March).—The Corn Law. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1815-1828.

A. D. 1815 (June).—The Waterloo campaign.—Defeat and final Overthrow of Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JUNE).

A. D. 1815 (July—August).—Surrender of Napoleon.—His confinement on the Island of St. Helena. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JUNE—AUGUST).

A. D. 1815 (July—November).—Wellington's army in Paris.—The Second Treaty. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JULY—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1815 (September).—The Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1816-1820.—Agitation for Parliamentary Reform.—Hampden Clubs.—Spencean philanthropists.—Trials of William Hone.—The Spa-fields meeting and riot.—March of the Blanketeers.—Massacre of Peterloo.—The Six Acts.—Death of George III.—Accession of George IV.—“From this time the name of Parliamentary Reform became, for the most part, a name of terror to the Government. . . . It passed away from the patronage of a few aristocratic lovers of popularity, to be advocated by writers of ‘two-penny trash,’ and to be discussed and organized by ‘Hampden Clubs’ of hungering philanthropists and unemployed ‘weaver-boys.’ Samuel Bamford, who thought it no disgrace to call himself ‘a Radical’ . . . says, ‘at this time (1816) the writings of William Cobbett suddenly became of great authority; they were read on nearly every cottage hearth in the manufacturing districts of South Lancashire, in those of Leicester, Derby, and Nottingham; also in many of the Scottish manufacturing towns. Their influence was speedily visible.’ Cobbett advocated Parliamentary Reform as the corrective of whatever miseries the lower classes suffered. A new order of politicians was called into action: ‘The Sunday-schools of the preceding thirty years had produced many working men of sufficient talent to become readers, writers, and speakers in the village meetings for Parliamentary Reform; some also were found to possess a rude poetic talent, which rendered their effusions popular, and bestowed an additional charm on their assemblages; and by such various means, anxious listeners at first, and then zealous proselytes, were drawn from the cottages of quiet nooks and dingles to the weekly readings and discussions of the Hampden Clubs.’ . . . In a Report of the Secret Committee of the House of Commons, presented on the 19th of February, 1817, the Hampden Clubs are described as ‘associated professedly for the purpose of Parliamentary Reform, upon the most extended principle of universal suffrage and annual parliaments;’ but that ‘in far the greater number of them . . . nothing short of a Revolution is the object expected and avowed.’ The testimony of Samuel Bamford shows that, in this early period of their history, the Hampden Clubs limited their object to the attainment of Parliamentary Reform. . . . Bamford, at the beginning of 1817, came to London as a delegate from the Middleton Club, to attend a great meeting of delegates to be assembled in

London. . . . The Middleton delegate was introduced, amidst the reeking tobacco-fog of a low tavern, to the leading members of a society called the 'Spencean Philanthropists.' They derived their name from that of a Mr. Spence, a school-master in Yorkshire, who had conceived a plan for making the nation happy, by causing all the lands of the country to become the property of the State, which State should divide all the produce for the support of the people. . . . The Committee of the Spenceans openly meddled with sundry grave questions besides that of a community in land; and, amongst other notable projects, petitioned Parliament to do away with machinery. Amongst these fanatics some dangerous men had established themselves, such as Thistlewood, who subsequently paid the penalty of five years of maniacal plotting." A meeting held at Spa-fields on the 2d of December, 1816, in the interest of the Spencean Philanthropists, terminated in a senseless outbreak of riot, led by a young fanatic named Watson. The mob plundered some gunsmiths' shops, shot one gentleman who remonstrated, and set out to seize the Tower; but was dispersed by a few resolute magistrates and constables. "It is difficult to imagine a more degraded and dangerous position than that in which every political writer was placed during the year 1817. In the first place, he was subject, by a Secretary of State's warrant, to be imprisoned upon suspicion, under the Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act. Secondly, he was open to an ex-officio information, under which he would be compelled to find bail, or be imprisoned. The power of ex-officio information had been extended so as to compel bail, by an Act of 1808; but from 1808 to 1811, during which three years forty such informations were laid, only one person was held to bail. In 1817 numerous ex-officio informations were filed, and the almost invariable practice then was to hold the alleged offender to bail, or, in default, to commit to prison. Under this Act Mr. Hone and others were committed to prison during this year. . . . The entire course of these proceedings was a signal failure. There was only one solitary instance of success—William Cobbett ran away. On the 28th of March he fled to America, suspending the publication of his 'Register' for four months. On the 12th of May earl Grey mentioned in the House of Lords that a Mr. Hone was proceeded against for publishing some blasphemous parody; but he had read one of the same nature, written, printed, and published, some years ago, by other people, without any notice having been officially taken of it. The parody to which earl Grey alluded, and a portion of which he recited, was Canning's famous parody, 'Praise Lepaux'; and he asked whether the authors, be they in the cabinet or in any other place, would also be found out and visited with the penalties of the law? This hint to the obscure publisher against whom these ex-officio informations had been filed for blasphemous and seditious parodies, was effectually worked out by him in the solitude of his prison, and in the poor dwelling where he had surrounded himself, as he had done from his earliest years, with a collection of odd and curious books. From these he had gathered an abundance of knowledge that was destined to perplex the technical acquirements of the Attorney-General, to whom the sword and buckler of his precedents would be wholly useless, and to change

the determination of the boldest judge in the land [Lord Ellenborough] to convict at any rate, into the prostration of helpless despair. Altogether, the three trials of William Hone are amongst the most remarkable in our constitutional history. They produced more distinct effects upon the temper of the country than any public proceedings of that time. They taught the Government a lesson which has never been forgotten, and to which, as much as to any other cause, we owe the prodigious improvement as to the law of libel itself, and the use of the law, in our own day,—an improvement which leaves what is dangerous in the press to be corrected by the remedial power of the press itself; and which, instead of lamenting over the newly-acquired ability of the masses to read seditious and irreligious works, depends upon the general diffusion of this ability as the surest corrective of the evils that are incident even to the best gift of heaven,—that of knowledge."—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 8, ch. 5.—In 1817 "there was widespread distress. There were riots in the counties of England arising out of the distress. There were riots in various parts of London. Secret Committees were appointed by both Houses of the Legislature to inquire into the alleged disaffection of part of the people. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended. The march of the Blanketeers from Manchester [March, 1817] caused panic and consternation through various circles in London. The march of the Blanketeers was a very simple and harmless project. A large number of the working-men in Manchester conceived the idea of walking to London to lay an account of their distress before the heads of the Government, and to ask that some remedy might be found, and also to appeal for the granting of Parliamentary reform. It was part of their arrangement that each man should carry a blanket with him, as they would, necessarily, have to sleep at many places along the way, and they were not exactly in funds to pay for first-class hotel accommodation. The nickname of Blanketeers was given to them because of their portable sleeping-arrangements. The whole project was simple, was touching in its simplicity. Even at this distance of time one cannot read about it without being moved by its pathetic childishness. These poor men thought they had nothing to do but to walk to London, and get to speech of Lord Liverpool, and justice would be done to them and their claims. The Government of Lord Liverpool dealt very roundly, and in a very different way, with the Blanketeers. If the poor men had been marching on London with pikes, muskets and swords, they could not have created a greater fury of panic and of passion in official circles. The Government, availing itself of the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, had the leaders of the movement captured and sent to prison, stopped the march by military force, and dispersed those who were taking part in it. . . . The 'Massacre of Peterloo,' as it is not inappropriately called, took place not long after. A great public meeting was held [August 16, 1819] at St. Peter's Field, then on the outskirts of Manchester, now the site of the Free Trade Hall, which many years later rang so often to the thrilling tones of John Bright. The meeting was called to petition for Parliamentary reform. It should be remembered that in those days Manchester, Birmingham, and other great cities were without any manner of representation

in Parliament. It was a vast meeting—some 80,000 men and women are stated to have been present. The yomanry [a mounted militia force], for some reason impossible to understand, endeavoured to disperse the meeting, and actually dashed in upon the crowd, spurring their horses and flourishing their sabres. Eleven persons were killed, and several hundreds were wounded. The Government brought in, as their panacea for popular trouble and discontent, the famous Six Acts. These Acts were simply measures to render it more easy for the authorities to put down or disperse meetings which they considered objectionable, and to suppress any manner of publication which they chose to call seditious. But among them were some Bills to prevent training and drilling, and the collection and use of arms. These measures show what the panic of the Government was. It was the conviction of the ruling classes that the poor and the working-classes of England were preparing a revolution. . . . During all this time, the few genuine Radicals in the House of Commons were bringing on motion after motion for Parliamentary reform, just as Grattan and his friends were bringing forward motion after motion for Catholic Emancipation. In 1818, a motion by Sir Francis Burdett for annual Parliaments and universal suffrage was lost by a majority of 106 to nobody. . . . The motion had only two supporters—Burdett himself, and his colleague, Lord Cochrane. . . . The forms of the House require two tellers on either side, and a compliance with this inevitable rule took up the whole strength of Burdett's party. . . . On January 29, 1820, the long reign of George III. came to an end. The life of the King closed in darkness of eyes and mind. Stone-blind, stone-deaf, and, except for rare lucid intervals, wholly out of his senses, the poor old King wandered from room to room of his palace, a touching picture, with his long, white, flowing beard, now repeating to himself the awful words of Milton—the 'dark, dark, dark, amid the blaze of noon—irrecoverably dark'—now, in a happier mood, announcing himself to be in the companionship of angels. George, the Prince Regent, succeeded, of course, to the throne; and George IV. at once announced his willingness to retain the services of the Ministry of Lord Liverpool. The Whigs had at one time expected much from the coming of George IV. to the throne, but their hopes had begun to be chilled of late."—J. McCarthy, *Sir Robert Peel*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: J. Routledge, *Chapters in the Hist. of Popular Progress*, ch. 12-19.—H. Martineau, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' Peace*, bk. 1, ch. 5-17 (v. 1).—E. Smith, *William Cobbett*, ch. 21-23 (v. 2).—See, also, **TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1815-1828.**

A. D. 1818.—Convention with the United States relating to Fisheries, etc. See **FISHERIES, NORTH AMERICAN: A. D. 1814-1818.**

A. D. 1820.—Accession of King George IV.

A. D. 1820-1822.—Congresses of Troppau, Laybach and Verona.—Projects of the Holy Alliance.—English protests.—Canning's policy towards Spain and the Spanish American colonies. See **VERONA, THE CONGRESS OF.**

A. D. 1820-1827.—The Cato Street Conspiracy.—Trial of Queen Caroline.—Canning in the Foreign Office.—Commercial Crisis of 1825.—Canning as Premier.—His death.—

"Riot and social misery had, during the Regency, heralded the Reign. They did not cease to afflict the country. At once we are plunged into the wretched details of a conspiracy. Secret intelligence reached the Home Office to the effect that a man named Thistlewood, who had been a year in jail for challenging Lord Sidmouth, had with several accomplices laid a plot to murder the Ministers during a Cabinet dinner, which was to come off at Lord Harrowby's. The guests did not go, and the police pounced on the gang, arming themselves in a stable in Cato Street, off the Edgeware Road. Thistlewood blew out the candle, having first stabbed a policeman to the heart. For that night he got off; but, being taken next day, he was soon hanged, with his four leading associates. This is called the Cato Street Conspiracy. . . . George IV., almost as soon as the crown became his own, began to stir in the matter of getting a divorce from his wife. He had married this poor Princess Caroline of Brunswick in 1795, merely for the purpose of getting his debts paid. Their first interview disappointed both. After some time of semi-banishment to Blackheath she had gone abroad to live chiefly in Italy, and had been made the subject of more than one 'delicate investigation' for the purpose of procuring evidence of infidelity against her. She now came to England (June 6, 1820), and passed from Dover to London through joyous and sympathizing crowds. The King sent a royal message to the Lords, asking for an inquiry into her conduct. Lord Liverpool and Lord Castlereagh laid before the Lords and Commons a green bag, stuffed with indecent and disgusting accusations against the Queen. Happily for her she had two champions, whose names shall not readily lose the lustre gained in her defence—Henry Brougham and Thomas Denman, her Attorney-General and Solicitor-General. After the failure of a negotiation, in which the Queen demanded two things that the Ministers refused—the insertion of her name in the Liturgy, and a proper reception at some foreign court—Lord Liverpool brought into the Upper House a 'Bill of Pains and Penalties,' which aimed at her degradation from the throne and the dissolution of her marriage. Through the fever-heat of a scorching summer the case went on, counsel and witnesses playing their respective parts before the Lords. . . . At length the Bill, carried on its third reading by a majority of only nine, was abandoned by the Ministry (November 10). And the country broke out into cheers and flaming windows. Had she rested content with the vindication of her fair fame, it would have been better for her own peace. But she went in public procession to St. Paul's to return thanks for her victory. And more rashly still in the following year she tried to force her way into Westminster Abbey during the Coronation of her husband (July 19, 1821). But mercy came a few days later from the King of kings. The people, true to her even in death, insisted that the hearse containing her remains should pass through the city; and in spite of bullets from the carbines of dragoons they gained their point, the Lord Mayor heading the procession till it had cleared the streets. . . . George Canning had resigned his office rather than take any part with the Liverpool Cabinet in supporting the 'Bill of Pains and Penalties,' and had gone to the Continent for the summer of the trial year.

Early in 1822 Lord Sidmouth . . . resigned the Home Office. He was succeeded by Robert Peel, a statesman destined to achieve eminence. Canning about the same time was offered the post of Governor-General of India," and accepted it; but this arrangement was suddenly changed by the death of Castlereagh, who committed suicide in August. Canning then became Foreign Secretary. "The spirit of Canning's foreign policy was diametrically opposed to that of Londonderry [Castlereagh]. . . . Refusing to interfere in Spanish affairs, he yet acknowledged the new-won freedom of the South American States, which had lately shaken off the Spanish yoke. To preserve peace and yet cut England loose from the Holy Alliance were the conflicting aims, which the genius of Canning enabled him to reconcile [see VERONA, CONGRESS OF]. . . . During the years 1824-25, the country, drunk with unusual prosperity, took that speculation fever which has afflicted her more than once during the last century and a half. . . . A crop of fungus companies sprang up temptingly from the heated soil of the Stock Exchange. . . . Shares were bought and gambled in. The winter passed; but spring shone on glutted markets, depreciated stock, no buyers, and no returns from the shadowy and distant investments in South America, which had absorbed so much capital. Then the crashing began—the weak broke first, the strong next, until banks went down by dozens, and commerce for the time was paralyzed. By causing the issue of one and two pound notes, by coining in great haste a new supply of sovereigns, and by inducing the Bank of England to lend money upon the security of goods—in fact to begin the pawnbroking business—the Government met the crisis, allayed the panic, and to some extent restored commercial credit. Apoplexy having struck down Lord Liverpool early in 1827, it became necessary to select a new Premier. Canning was the chosen man." He formed a Cabinet with difficulty in April, Wellington, Peel, Eldon, and others of his former colleagues refusing to take office with him. His administration was brought abruptly to an end in August by his sudden death.—W. F. Collier, *Hist. of Eng.*, pp. 526-529.

ALSO IN: Lord Brougham, *Life and Times, by Himself*, ch. 12-18 (v. 2).—A. G. Stapleton, *George Canning and His Times*, ch. 18-34.—The same, *Some Official Corr. of George Canning*, 2 v.—F. H. Hill, *George Canning*, ch. 19-22.—Sir T. Martin, *Life of Lord Lyndhurst*, ch. 7.

A. D. 1824-1826.—The first Burmese War. See INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833.

A. D. 1825-1830.—The beginning of railroads. See STEAM LOCOMOTION ON LAND.

A. D. 1827-1828.—Removal of Disabilities from the Dissenters.—Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts.—"Early in 1827 a private member, of little influence, unexpectedly raised a dormant question. For the best part of a century the Dissenters had passively submitted to the anomalous position in which they had been placed by the Legislature [see above: A. D. 1662-1665; 1672-1673; 1711-1714]. Nominally unable to hold any office under the Crown, they were annually 'whitewashed' for their infringement of the law by the passage of an Indemnity Act. The Dissenters had hitherto been assenting parties to this policy. They fancied that the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts would logically

lead to the emancipation of the Roman Catholics, and they preferred remaining under a disability themselves to running the risk of conceding relief to others. The tacit understanding, which thus existed between the Church on one side and Dissent on the other, was maintained unbroken and almost unchallenged till 1827. It was challenged in that year by William Smith, the member for Norwich. Smith was a London banker; he was a Dissenter; and he felt keenly the 'hard, unjust, and unnecessary' law which disabled him from holding 'any office, however insignificant, under the Crown, and from sitting 'as a magistrate in any corporation without violating his conscience.' Smith took the opportunity which the annual Indemnity Act afforded him of stating these views in the House of Commons. As he spoke the scales fell from the eyes of the Liberal members. The moment he sat down Harvey, the member for Colchester, twitted the Opposition with disregarding 'the substantial claims of the Dissenters,' while those of the Catholics were urged year after year 'with the vehemence of party,' and supported by 'the mightiest powers of energy and eloquence.' The taunt called up Lord John Russell, and elicited from him the declaration that he would bring forward a motion on the Test and Corporation Acts, 'if the Protestant Dissenters should think it to their interest that he should do so.' A year afterwards—on the 26th of February, 1828—Lord John Russell rose to redeem the promise which he thus gave." His motion "was carried by 237 votes to 193. The Ministry had sustained a crushing and unexpected reverse. For the moment it was doubtful whether it could continue in office. It was saved from the necessity of resigning by the moderation and dexterity of Peel. Peel considered that nothing could be more unfortunate for the Church than to involve the House of Commons in a conflict with the House of Lords on a religious question. . . . On his advice the Bishops consented to substitute a formal declaration for the test hitherto in force. The declaration, which contained a promise that the maker of it would 'never exert any power or any influence to injure or subvert the Protestant Established Church, was to be taken by the members of every corporation, and, at the pleasure of the Crown, by the holder of every office. Russell, though he disliked the declaration, assented to it for the sake of securing the success of his measure." The bill was modified accordingly and passed both Houses, though strenuously resisted by all the Tories of the old school.—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from 1815*, ch. 10 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: J. Stoughton, *Religion in Eng. from 1800 to 1850*, v. 1, ch. 2.—H. S. Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of Eng.*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1827-1828.—The administration of Lord Goderich.—Advent of the Wellington Ministry.—"The death of Mr. Canning placed Lord Goderich at the head of the government. The composition of the Cabinet was slightly altered. Mr. Huskisson became Colonial Secretary, Mr. Herries Chancellor of the Exchequer. The government was generally considered to be weak, and not calculated for a long endurance. . . . The differences upon financial measures between Mr. Herries . . . and Mr. Huskisson . . . could not be reconciled by Lord Goderich, and he therefore tendered his resignation to the king on the 9th of January, 1828. His majesty immedi-

ately sent to lord Lyndhurst to desire that he and the duke of Wellington should come to Windsor. The king told the duke that he wished him to form a government of which he should be the head. . . . It was understood that lord Lyndhurst was to continue in office. The duke of Wellington immediately applied to Mr. Peel, who, returning to his post of Secretary of State for the Home Department, saw the impossibility of re-uniting in this administration those who had formed the Cabinet of lord Liverpool. He desired to strengthen the government of the duke of Wellington by the introduction of some of the more important of Mr. Canning's friends into the Cabinet and to fill some of the lesser offices. The earl of Dudley, Mr. Huskisson, lord Palmerston, and Mr. Charles Grant, became members of the new administration. Mr. William Lamb, afterwards lord Melbourne, was appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland. The ultra-Tories were greatly indignant at these arrangements. They groaned and reviled as if the world was unchanged."—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 8, ch. 13.

ALSO IN: Sir T. Martin, *Life of Lord Lyndhurst*, ch. 9.—W. M. Torrens, *Life of Viscount Melbourne*, v. 1, ch. 15.

A. D. 1827-1829.—Intervention on behalf of Greece.—Battle of Navarino. See GREECE: A. D. 1821-1829.

A. D. 1828.—Corn Law amendment.—The Sliding Scale. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1815-1828.

A. D. 1829.—Catholic Emancipation. See IRELAND: A. D. 1811-1829.

A. D. 1830.—The state of the Parliamentary representation before Reform.—Death of George IV.—Accession of William IV.—Fall of the Wellington Ministry.—"Down to the year 1800, when the Union between Great Britain and Ireland was effected, the House consisted of 558 members; after 1800, it consisted of 658 members. In the earlier days of George III., it was elected by 160,000 voters, out of a population of a little more than eight millions; in the later days of that monarch, it was elected by about 440,000 voters, out of a population of twenty-two millions. . . . But the inadequacy of the representation will be even more striking if we consider the manner in which the electors were broken up into constituencies. The constituencies consisted either of counties, or of cities or boroughs. Generally speaking, the counties of England and Wales (and of Ireland, after the Union) were represented by two members, and the counties of Scotland by one member, and the voters were the forty-shilling freeholders. The number of cities and boroughs which returned members varied; but, from the date of the Union, there were about 217 in England and Wales, 14 in Scotland, and 39 in Ireland,—all the English and Welsh boroughs (with a few exceptions) returning two members, and the Scotch and Irish boroughs one member. How the particular places came to be Parliamentary boroughs is a question of much historic interest, which cannot be dealt with here in detail. Originally, the places to which writs were issued seem to have been chosen by the Crown, or, not unfrequently, by the Sheriffs of the counties. Probably, in the first instance, the more important places were selected; though other considerations, such as the political opinions of the owners of the soil, and the desire to recognise services

(often of a very questionable character) rendered by such owners to the King, no doubt had their weight. In the time of Cromwell, some important changes were made. In 1654, he disfranchised many small boroughs, increased the number of county members, and enfranchised Manchester, Leeds, and Halifax. All these reforms were cancelled after the Restoration; and from that time very few changes were made. . . . In the hundred and fifty years which followed the Restoration, however, there were changes in the condition of the country, altogether beyond the control of either kings or parliaments. Old towns disappeared or decayed, and new ones sprang up. Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds were remarkable examples of the latter,—Old Sarum was an example of the former. . . . At one time a place of some importance, it declined from the springing up of New Sarum (Salisbury); and, even so far back as the reign of Henry VII., it existed as a town only in imagination, and in the roll of the Parliamentary boroughs. . . . Many other places might be named [known as Rotten Boroughs and Pocket Boroughs]—such as Gatton in Surrey, and Ludgershall in Wiltshire—which represented only their owners. In fact, the representation of owners, and of owners only, was a very prominent feature of the electoral system now under consideration. Thus, the Duke of Norfolk was represented by eleven members, who sat for places forming a part of his estates; similarly, Lord Lonsdale was represented by nine members, Lord Darlington by seven, the Duke of Rutland and several other peers by six each; and it is stated by one authority that the Duke of Newcastle, at one time, returned one third of all the members for the boroughs, while, up to 1780, the members for the county of York—the largest and most influential of the counties—were always elected in Lord Rockingham's dining-room. But these are only selected instances. Many others might be cited. According to a statement made by the Duke of Richmond in 1780, 6,000 persons returned a clear majority of the House of Commons. In 1793, the Society of the Friends of the People asserted, and declared that they were able to prove, that 84 individuals returned 157 members; that 70 individuals returned 150 members; and that of the 154 individuals who thus returned 307 members—the majority of the House before the Union with Ireland—no fewer than 40 were peers. The same Society asserted in the same year, and declared that they were able to prove, that 70 members were returned by 35 places, in which there were scarcely any electors; that 90 members were returned by 46 places, in which there were fewer than 50 electors; that 37 members were returned by 19 places, with not more than 100 electors; and that 52 members were returned by 26 places, with not more than 200 electors: all these in England alone. Even in the towns which had a real claim to representation, the franchise rested upon no uniform basis. . . . In some cases the suffrage was practically household suffrage; in other cases the suffrage was extremely restricted. But they all returned their two members equally; it made no difference whether the voters numbered 3,000 or only three or four. Such being the state of the representation, corruption was inevitable. Bribery was practised to an inconceivable extent. Many of the smaller boroughs had a fixed price, and it

was by no means uncommon to see a borough advertised for sale in the newspapers. . . . As an example of cost in contesting a county election, it is on record that the joint expenses of Lord Milton and Mr. Lascelles, in contesting the county of York in 1807, were £200,000. . . . It is not to be supposed that a condition of things which appears to us so intolerable attracted no attention before what may be called the Reform era. So far back as 1745, Sir Francis Dashwood (afterwards Lord de Spencer) moved an amendment to the Address in favour of Reform; Lord Chatham himself, in 1766 and 1770, spoke of the borough representation as 'the rotten part of the constitution,' and likened it to a 'mortified limb'; the Duke of Richmond of that day, in 1780, introduced a bill into the House of Lords which would have given manhood suffrage and annual parliaments; and three times in succession, in 1782, 1783, and 1785, Mr. Pitt proposed resolutions in favour of Reform. . . . After Mr. Pitt had abandoned the cause, Mr. (afterwards Earl) Grey took up the subject. First, in 1792, he presented that famous petition from the Society of the Friends of the People, to which allusion has been already made, and founded a resolution upon it. He made further efforts in 1793, 1795, and 1797, but was on every occasion defeated by large majorities. . . . From the beginning of the 19th century to the year 1815—with the exception of a few months after the Peace of Amiens in 1802—England was at war. During that time Reform dropped out of notice. . . . In 1817, and again in 1818 and 1819, Sir Francis Burdett, who was at that time member for Westminster and a leading Reformer, brought the question of Reform before the House of Commons. On each occasion he was defeated by a tremendous majority. . . . The next ten years were comparatively uneventful, so far as the subject of this history is concerned. . . . Two events made the year 1830 particularly opportune for raising the question of Parliamentary Reform. The first of these events was the death of George IV. [June 26],—the second, the deposition of Charles X. of France. . . . For the deposition of Charles—followed as it was very soon by a successful insurrection in Belgium—produced an immense impression upon the Liberals of this country, and upon the people generally. In a few days or weeks there had been secured in two continental countries what the people of England had been asking for in vain for years. . . . We must not omit to notice one other circumstance that favoured the cause of Reform. This was the popular distress. Distress always favours agitation. The distress in 1830 was described in the House of Lords at the time as 'unparalleled in any previous part of our history.' Probably this was an exaggeration. But there can be no doubt that the distress was general, and that it was acute. . . . By the law as it stood when George IV. died, the demise of the Crown involved a dissolution of Parliament. The Parliament which was in existence in 1830 had been elected in 1826. Since the beginning of 1828 the Duke of Wellington had been Prime Minister, with Mr. (soon after Sir Robert) Peel as Home Secretary, and Leader of the House of Commons. They decided to dissolve at once. . . . In the Parliament thus dissolved, and especially in the session just brought to a close, the question of Reform had held a prominent place. At the

very beginning of the session, in the first week of February, the Marquis of Blandford (afterwards Duke of Marlborough) moved an amendment to the Address, in which, though a Tory, he affirmed the conviction 'that the State is at this moment in the most imminent danger, and that no effectual measures of salvation will or can be adopted until the people shall be restored to their rightful share in the legislation of the country.' . . . He was supported on very different grounds by Mr. O'Connell, but was defeated by a vote of 96 to 11. A few days later he introduced a specific plan of Reform—a very Radical plan indeed—but was again ignominiously defeated; then, on the 23d of February, Lord John Russell . . . asked for leave to bring in a bill for conferring the franchise upon Leeds, Manchester, and Birmingham, as the three largest unrepresented towns in the kingdom, but was defeated by 188 votes to 140; and finally, on the 28th of May—scarcely two months before the dissolution—Mr. O'Connell brought in a bill to establish universal suffrage, vote by ballot, and triennial parliaments, but found only 13 members to support him in a House of 332. . . . Thus, the question of Reform was now before the country, not merely as a popular but as a Parliamentary question. It is not too much to say that, when the dissolution occurred, it occupied all minds. . . . The whole of August and a considerable part of September, therefore, were occupied with the elections, which were attended by an unparalleled degree of excitement. . . . When all was over, and the results were reckoned up, it was found that, of the 28 members who represented the thirteen greatest cities in England (to say nothing of Wales, Scotland, or Ireland), only 3 were Ministerialists. . . . Of the 236 men who were returned by elections, more or less popular, in England, only 79 were Ministerialists. . . . The first Parliament of William IV. met on the 26th of October, but the session was not really opened till the 2d of November, when the King came down and delivered his Speech. . . . The occasion was made memorable, however, not by the King's Speech, but by a speech by the Duke of Wellington, who was then Prime Minister. . . . 'The noble Earl [Grey],' said the Duke, 'has alluded to something in the shape of a Parliamentary Reform, but he has been candid enough to acknowledge that he is not prepared with any measure of Reform; and I have as little scruple to say that his Majesty's Government is as totally unprepared as the noble lord. Nay, on my own part, I will go further, and say, that I have never read or heard of any measure, up to the present moment, which could in any degree satisfy my mind that the state of the representation could be improved, or be rendered more satisfactory to the country at large than at the present moment. . . . I am not only not prepared to bring forward any measure of this nature, but I will at once declare that, as far as I am concerned, as long as I hold any station in the government of the country, I shall always feel it my duty to resist such measures when proposed by others.' Exactly fourteen days after the delivery of this speech, the Duke's career as Prime Minister came for the time to a close. On the 16th of November he came down to Westminster, and announced that he had resigned office. In the meantime, there had been something like a panic in the city, because Ministers, apprehending

disturbance, had advised the King and Queen to abandon an engagement to dine, on the 9th, with the Lord Mayor at the Guildhall. On the 15th, too, the Government had sustained a defeat in the House of Commons, on a motion proposed by Sir Henry Parnell on the part of the Opposition, having reference to the civil list. This defeat was made the pretext for resignation. But it was only a pretext. After the Duke's declaration in regard to Reform, and in view of his daily increasing unpopularity, his continuance in office was impossible."—W. Heaton, *The Three Reforms of Parliament*, ch. 1-2.

ALSO IN: A. Paul, *Hist. of Reform*, ch. 1-6.—W. Bagehot, *Essays on Parliamentary Reform*, essay 2.—H. Cox, *Antient Parliamentary Elections*.—S. Walpole, *The Electorate and the Legislature*, ch. 4.—E. A. Freeman, *Decayed Boroughs* (*Hist. Essays*, 4th series).

A. D. 1830-1832.—The great Reform of Representation in Parliament, under the Ministry of Earl Grey.—"Earl Grey was the new Minister; and Mr. Brougham his Lord Chancellor. The first announcement of the premier was that the government would 'take into immediate consideration the state of the representation, with a view to the correction of those defects which have been occasioned in it, by the operation of time; and with a view to the reestablishment of that confidence upon the part of the people, which he was afraid Parliament did not at present enjoy, to the full extent that is essential for the welfare and safety of the country, and the preservation of the government.' The government were now pledged to a measure of parliamentary reform; and during the Christmas recess were occupied in preparing it. Meanwhile, the cause was eagerly supported by the people. . . . So great were the difficulties with which the government had to contend, that they needed all the encouragement that the people could give. They had to encounter the reluctance of the king,—the interests of the proprietors of boroughs, which Mr. Pitt, unable to overcome, had sought to purchase,—the opposition of two thirds of the House of Lords, and perhaps of a majority of the House of Commons,—and above all, the strong Tory spirit of the country. . . . On the 3d February, when Parliament reassembled, Lord Grey announced that the government had succeeded in framing 'a measure which would be effective, without exceeding the bounds of a just and well-advised moderation,' and which 'had received the unanimous consent of the whole government.' . . . On the 1st March, this measure was brought forward in the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, to whom,—though not in the cabinet,—this honorable duty had been justly confided. . . . On the 22d March, the second reading of the bill was carried by a majority of one only, in a House of 608,—probably the greatest number which, up to that time, had ever been assembled at a division. On the 19th of April, on going into committee, ministers found themselves in a minority of eight, on a resolution proposed by General Gascoyne, that the number of members returned for England ought not to be diminished. On the 21st, ministers announced that it was not their intention to proceed with the bill. On that same night, they were again defeated on a question of adjournment, by a majority of twenty-two. This last vote was decisive. The very next day, Parliament was pro-

rogued by the king in person, 'with a view to its immediate dissolution.' It was one of the most critical days in the history of our country. . . . The people were now to decide the question;—and they decided it. A triumphant body of reformers was returned, pledged to carry the reform bill; and on the 6th July, the second reading of the renewed measure was agreed to, by a majority of 136. The most tedious and irritating discussions ensued in committee,—night after night; and the bill was not disposed of until the 21st September, when it was passed by a majority of 109. That the peers were still adverse to the bill was certain; but whether, at such a crisis, they would venture to oppose the national will, was doubtful. On the 7th October, after a debate of five nights,—one of the most memorable by which that House has ever been distinguished, and itself a great event in history,—the bill was rejected on the second reading, by a majority of forty-one. The battle was to be fought again. Ministers were too far pledged to the people to think of resigning; and on the motion of Lord Ebrington, they were immediately supported by a vote of confidence from the House of Commons. On the 20th October, Parliament was prorogued; and after a short interval of excitement, turbulence, and danger [see BRISTOL: A. D. 1831], met again on the 6th December. A third reform bill was immediately brought in,—changed in many respects,—and much improved by reason of the recent census, and other statistical investigations. Amongst other changes, the total number of members was no longer proposed to be reduced. This bill was read a second time on Sunday morning, the 18th of December, by a majority of 162. On the 23d March, it was passed by the House of Commons, and once more was before the House of Lords. Here the peril of again rejecting it could not be concealed,—the courage of some was shaken,—the patriotism of others aroused; and after a debate of four nights, the second reading was affirmed by the narrow majority of nine. But danger still awaited it. The peers who would no longer venture to reject such a bill, were preparing to change its essential character by amendments. Meanwhile the agitation of the people was becoming dangerous. . . . The time had come, when either the Lords must be coerced, or the ministers must resign. This alternative was submitted to the king. He refused to create peers: the ministers resigned, and their resignation was accepted. Again the Commons came to the rescue of the bill and the reform ministry. On the motion of Lord Ebrington, an address was immediately voted by them, renewing their expressions of unaltered confidence in the late ministers, and imploring his Majesty 'to call to his councils such persons only as will carry into effect, unimpaired in all its essential provisions, that bill for reforming the representation of the people, which has recently passed this House.' . . . The public excitement was greater than ever; and the government and the people were in imminent danger of a bloody collision, when Earl Grey was recalled to the councils of his sovereign. The bill was now secure. The peers averted the threatened addition to their numbers by abstaining from further opposition; and the bill,—the Great Charter of 1832,—at length received the Royal Assent. It is now time to advert to the provisions of this famous statute; and to inquire how far it

corrected the faults of a system, which had been complained of for more than half a century. The main evil had been the number of nomination, or rotten boroughs enjoying the franchise. Fifty-six of these,—having less than 2,000 inhabitants, and returning 111 members,—were swept away. Thirty boroughs, having less than 4,000 inhabitants, lost each a member. Weymouth and Melcombe Regis lost two. This disfranchisement extended to 143 members. The next evil had been, that large populations were unrepresented; and this was now redressed. Twenty-two large towns, including metropolitan districts, received the privilege of returning two members; and 20 more of returning one. The large county populations were also regarded in the distribution of seats,—the number of county members being increased from 94 to 159. The larger counties were divided; and the number of members adjusted with reference to the importance of the constituencies. Another evil was the restricted and unequal franchise. This too was corrected. All narrow rights of election were set aside in Boroughs; and a £10 household franchise was established. The freemen of corporate towns were the only class of electors whose rights were reserved; but residence within the borough was attached as a condition to their right of voting. . . . The county constituency was enlarged by the addition of copyholders and leaseholders, for terms of years, and of tenants-at-will paying a rent of £50 a year. . . . The defects of the Scotch representation, being even more flagrant and indefensible than those of England, were not likely to be omitted from Lord Grey's general scheme of reform. . . . The entire representation was remodelled. Forty-five members had been assigned to Scotland at the Union; this number was now increased to 53 of whom 30 were allotted to counties, and 23 to cities and burghs. The county franchise was extended to all owners of property of £10 a year, and to certain classes of leaseholders; and the burgh franchise to all £10 householders. The representation of Ireland had many of the defects of the English system. . . . The right of election was taken away from the corporations, and vested in £10 householders; and large additions were made to the county constituency. The number of members in Ireland, which the Act of Union had settled at 100, was now increased to 105."—T. E. May, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, 1760-1860, ch. 6 (v. 1).

Also in: W. N. Molesworth, *Hist. of the Reform Bill of 1832*.—W. Jones, *Biog. Sketches of the Reform Ministers*.—Lord Brougham, *Life and Times*, by Himself, ch. 21-22.—S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from 1815*, ch. 11 (v. 2).

A. D. 1831.—First assumption of the name Conservatives by the Tories. See CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

A. D. 1831-1832.—Intervention in the Netherlands.—Creation of the kingdom of Belgium.—War with Holland. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1830-1832.

A. D. 1832-1833.—Abolition of Slavery in the West Indies.—Trade monopoly of the East India Company withdrawn.—Factory Bill.—Irish tithes.—"The period which succeeded the passing of the Reform Bill was one of immense activity and earnestness in legislation. . . . The first great reform was the complete abolition of the system of slavery in the British colonies. The slave trade had itself been sup-

pressed so far as we could suppress it long before that time, but now the whole system of West Indian slavery was brought to an end [see SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1834-1838]. . . . A long agitation of the small but energetic anti-slavery party brought about this practical result in 1833. . . . Granville Sharpe, Zachary Macaulay, father of the historian and statesman, Thomas Fowell Buxton, Wilberforce, Brougham, and many others, had for a long time been striving hard to rouse up public opinion to the abolition of the slave system." The bill which passed Parliament gave immediate freedom to all children subsequently born, and to all those who were then under six years of age; while it determined for all other slaves a period of apprenticeship, lasting five years in one class and seven years in another, after which they attained absolute freedom. It appropriated £20,000,000 for the compensation of the slave-owners. "Another reform of no small importance was accomplished when the charter of the East India Company came to be renewed in 1833. The clause giving them a commercial monopoly of the trade of the East was abolished, and the trade thrown open to the merchants of the world [see INDIA: A. D. 1823-1833]. There were other slaves in those days as well as the negro. There were slaves at home, slaves to all intents and purposes, who were condemned to a servitude as rigorous as that of the negro, and who, as far as personal treatment went, suffered more severely than negroes in the better class plantations. We speak now of the workers in the great mines and factories. No law up to this time regulated with anything like reasonable stringency the hours of labour in factories. . . . A commission was appointed to investigate the condition of those who worked in the factories. Lord Ashley, since everywhere known as the Earl of Shaftesbury, . . . brought forward the motion which ended in the appointment of the commission. The commission quickly brought together an immense amount of evidence to show the terrible effect, moral and physical, of the overworking of women and children, and an agitation set in for the purpose of limiting by law the duration of the hours of labour. . . . The principle of legislative interference to protect children working in factories was established by an Act passed in 1833, limiting the work of children to eight hours a day, and that of young persons under eighteen to 69 hours a week [see FACTORY LEGISLATION]. The agitation then set on foot and led by Lord Ashley was engaged for years after in endeavouring to give that principle a more extended application. . . . Irish tithes were one of the grievances which came under the energetic action of this period of reform. The people of Ireland complained with justice of having to pay tithes for the maintenance of the church establishment in which they did not believe, and under whose roofs they never bent in worship." In 1832, committees of both Houses of Parliament reported in favor of the extinction of tithes; but the Government undertook temporarily a scheme whereby it made advances to the Irish clergy and assumed the collection of tithes among its own functions. It only succeeded in making matters worse, and several years passed before the adoption (in 1838) of a bill which "converted the tithe composition into a rent charge."—J. McCarthy, *The Epoch of Reform*, ch. 7-8.

ALSO IN: C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 8, ch. 17.—H. Martineau, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' Peace*, bk. 4, ch. 6-9 (v. 2-3).

A. D. 1833-1840.—Turko-Egyptian question and its settlement.—The capture of Acre.—Bombardment of Alexandria. See TURKS: A. D. 1831-1840.

A. D. 1833-1845.—The Oxford or Tractarian Movement. See OXFORD OR TRACTARIAN MOVEMENT.

A. D. 1834-1837.—Resignation of Lord Grey and the Reform Ministry.—The first Melbourne Administration.—Peel's first Ministry and Melbourne's second.—Death of William IV.—Accession of Queen Victoria.—“On May 27th, Mr. Ward, member of St. Albans, brought forward . . . resolutions, that the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ireland much exceeded the spiritual wants of the Protestant population; that it was the right of the State, and of Parliament, to distribute church property, and that the temporal possessions of the Irish church ought to be reduced. The ministers determined to adopt a middle course and appoint a commission of inquiry; they hoped thereby to induce Mr. Ward to withdraw his motion, because the question was already in government hands. While the negotiations were going on, news was received of the resignation of four of the most conservative members of the Cabinet, who regarded any interference with church property with abhorrence; they were Mr. Stanley, Sir James Graham, the Duke of Richmond, and the Earl of Ripon. . . . Owing to the difference of opinion in the Cabinet on the Irish coercion bill, on July 9, 1834, Earl Grey placed his resignation as Prime Minister in the hands of the king. On the 10th the House of Commons adjourned for four days. On the 14th, Viscount Melbourne stated in the House of Lords that his Majesty had honored him with his commands for the formation of a ministry. He had undertaken the task, but it was not yet completed. There was very little change in the Cabinet; Lord Melbourne's place in the Home Department was filled by Lord Duncannon; Sir John Cam Hobhouse obtained a seat as First Commissioner of Woods and Forests, and Lord Carlisle surrendered the Privy Seal to Lord Mulgrave. The Irish Church Bill was again brought forward, and although it passed the Commons, was defeated in the Lords, August 1st. The king much disliked the church policy of the Whigs, and dreaded reform. He was eager to prevent the meeting of the House, and circumstances favored him. Before the session Lord Spencer died, and Lord Althorpe, his son, was thus removed to the upper House. There was no reason why this should have broken up the ministry, but the king seized the opportunity, sent for Lord Melbourne, asserted that the ministry depended chiefly on the personal influence of Lord Althorpe in the Commons, declared that, deprived of it as it now was, the government could not go on, and dismissed his ministers, instructing Melbourne at once to send for the Duke of Wellington. The sensation in London was great; the dismissal of the ministry was considered unconstitutional; the act of the king was wholly without precedent. . . . The Duke of Wellington, from November 15th to December 9th, was the First Lord of the Treasury, and the sole Secretary of State, having only one colleague, Lord Lyndhurst, who held the great seal,

while at the same time he sat as Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer. This temporary government was called a dictatorship. . . . On Sir Robert Peel's return from Italy, whence he had been called, he waited upon the king and accepted the office of First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. With the king's permission, he applied to Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham, entreating them to give him the benefit of their co-operation as colleagues in the Cabinet. They both declined. Prevented from forming a moderate Conservative ministry, he was reduced to fill his places with men of more pronounced opinions, which promised ill for any advance in reform. . . . The Foreign, Home, War, and Colonial offices were filled by Wellington, Goulburn, Herries, and Aberdeen; Lord Lyndhurst was Lord Chancellor; Harding, Secretary for Ireland; and Lord Wharnccliffe, Privy Seal. With this ministry Peel had to meet a hostile House of Commons. . . . The Prime Minister therefore thought it necessary to dissolve Parliament, and took the opportunity [in what was called ‘the Tamworth manifesto’] of declaring his policy. He declared his acceptance of the Reform Bill as a final settlement of the question. . . . The elections, though they returned a House, as is generally the case, more favorable to the existing government than that which had been dissolved, still gave a considerable majority to the Liberals. . . . Lord John Russell, on April 7th, proposed the resolution, ‘That it is the opinion of this House that no measure upon the subject of the tithes in Ireland can lead to satisfactory and final adjustment which does not embody the temporalities of the Church in Ireland.’ This was adopted by a majority of 27, and that majority was fatal to the ministry. On the following day the Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, stated that in consequence of the resolution in the House of Commons, the ministry had tendered their resignation. Sir Robert made a similar explanation in the Commons. Ten days later, Viscount Melbourne, in moving the adjournment of the House of Lords, stated that the king had been pleased to appoint him First Lord of the Treasury. . . . On June 9, 1837, a bulletin issued from Windsor Castle informing a loyal and really affectionate people that the king was ill. From the 12th they were regularly issued until the 19th, when the malady, inflammation of the lungs, had greatly increased. . . . On Tuesday, June 20th, the last of these official documents was issued. His Majesty had expired that morning at 2 o'clock. William died in the seventy-second year of his age and seventh year of his reign, leaving no legitimate issue. He was succeeded by his niece, Alexandrina Victoria.”—A. H. McCalman, *Abridged Hist. of England*, pp. 565-570.

ALSO IN: W. C. Taylor, *Life and Times of Sir Robert Peel*, v. 2, ch. 10-12.—W. M. Torrens, *Memoirs of Viscount Melbourne*, v. 2, ch. 1-8.—J. W. Croker, *Correspondence and Diaries*, ch. 18-20 (v. 2).

A. D. 1836-1839.—Beginning of the Anti-Corn-Law Agitation. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1836-1839.

A. D. 1837.—Separation of Hanover. See HANOVER: A. D. 1837.

A. D. 1837-1839.—Opening of the reign of Queen Victoria.—End of personal rule.—Beginning of purely constitutional government.

—Peel and the Bedchamber Question.—“The Duke of Wellington thought the accession of a woman to the sovereign's place would be fatal to the present hopes of the Tories [who were then expecting a turn of events in their favor, as against the Whig administration of Lord Melbourne]. ‘Peel,’ he said, ‘has no manners, and I have no small talk.’ He seemed to take it for granted that the new sovereign would choose her Ministers as a school-girl chooses her companions. He did not know, did not foresee, that with the accession of Queen Victoria the real reign of constitutional government in these islands was to begin. The late King had advanced somewhat on the ways of his predecessors, but his rule was still, to all intents and purposes, a personal rule. With the accession of Victoria the system of personal rule came to an end. The elections which at that time were necessary on the coming of a new sovereign went slightly in favour of the Tories. The Whigs had many troubles. They were not reformers enough for the great body of their supporters. . . . The Radicals had split off from them. They could not manage O’Connell. The Chartist fire was already burning. There was many a serious crisis in foreign policy—in China and in Egypt, for example. The Canadian Rebellion and the mission of Lord Durham involved the Whigs in fresh anxieties, and laid them open to new attacks from their enemies. On the top of all came some disturbances, of a legislative rather than an insurrectionary kind, in Jamaica, and the Government felt called upon to bring in a Bill to suspend for five years the Constitution of the island. A Liberal and reforming Ministry bringing in a Bill to suspend a Constitution is in a highly awkward and dangerous position. Peel saw his opportunity, and opposed the Bill. The Government won by a majority of only 5. Lord Melbourne accepted the situation, and resigned [May 7, 1839]. The Queen sent for the Duke of Wellington, and he, of course, advised her to send for Peel. When Peel came, the young Queen told him with all the frankness of a girl that she was sorry to part with her late Ministers, and that she did not disapprove of their conduct, but that she felt bound to act in accordance with constitutional usages. Peel accepted the task of forming an Administration. And then came the famous dispute known as the ‘Bedchamber Question’—the ‘question de jupons.’ The Queen wished to retain her ladies-in-waiting; Peel insisted that there must be some change. Two of these ladies were closely related to Whig statesmen whose policy was diametrically opposed to that of Peel on no less important a question than the Government of Ireland. Peel insisted that he could not undertake to govern under such conditions. The Queen, acting on the advice of her late Ministers, would not give way. The whole dispute created immense excitement at the time. There was a good deal of misunderstanding on both sides. It was quietly settled, soon after, by a compromise which the late Prince Consort suggested, and which admitted that Peel had been in the right. . . . Its importance to us now is that, as Peel would not give way, the Whigs had to come back again, and they came back discredited and damaged, having, as Mr. Molesworth puts it, got back ‘behind the petticoats of the ladies-in-waiting.’”—J. McCarthy, *Sir Robert Peel*, ch. 12.

Also in: W. N. Molesworth, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1830-1874, v. 2, ch. 1.—H. Dunckley, *Lord Melbourne*, ch. 11.

A. D. 1837.—The Victorian Age in Literature.—“It may perhaps be assumed without any undue amount of speculative venturesomeness that the age of Queen Victoria will stand out in history as the period of a literature as distinct from others as the age of Elizabeth or Anne, although not perhaps equal in greatness to the latter, and far indeed below the former. At the opening of Queen Victoria's reign a great race of literary men had come to a close. It is curious to note how sharply and completely the literature of Victoria separates itself from that of the era whose heroes were Scott, Byron, and Wordsworth. Before Queen Victoria came to the throne, Scott, Byron, Coleridge, and Keats were dead. Wordsworth lived, indeed, for many years after; so did Southey and Moore; and Savage Landor died much later still. But Wordsworth, Southey, Moore, and Landor had completed their literary work before Victoria came to the throne. Not one of them added a cubit or an inch to his intellectual stature from that time; some of them even did work which distinctly proved that their day was done. A new and fresh breath was soon after breathed into literature. Nothing, perhaps, is more remarkable about the better literature of the age of Queen Victoria than its complete severance from the leadership of that which had gone before it, and its evidence of a fresh and genuine inspiration. It is a somewhat curious fact, too, very convenient for the purposes of this history, that the literature of Queen Victoria's time thus far divides itself clearly enough into two parts. The poets, novelists, and historians who were making their fame with the beginning of the reign had done all their best work and made their mark before these later years, and were followed by a new and different school, drawing inspiration from wholly different sources, and challenging comparison as antagonists rather than disciples. We speak now only of literature. In science the most remarkable developments were reserved for the later years of the reign.”—J. McCarthy, *The Literature of the Victorian Reign* (Appletons' Journal, Jan., 1879, p. 498).—“The age of Queen Victoria is as justly entitled to give name to a literary epoch as any of those periods on which this distinction has been conferred by posterity. A new tone of thought and a new colour of style are discernible from about the date of the Queen's accession, and, even should these characteristics continue for generations without apparent break, it will be remembered that the Elizabethan age did not terminate with Elizabeth. In one important respect, however, it differs from most of those epochs which derive their appellation from a sovereign. The names of Augustus, Lorenzo, Louis XIV., Anne, are associated with a literary advance, a claim to have bequeathed models for imitation to succeeding ages. This claim is not preferred on behalf of the age of Victoria. It represents the fusion of two currents which had alternately prevailed in successive periods. Delight and Utility met, Truth and Imagination kissed each other. Practical reform awoke the enthusiasm of genius, and genius put poetry to new use, or made a new path for itself in prose. The result has been much gain, some loss, and an originality of aspect which would alone render our

Queen's reign intellectually memorable. Looking back to the 18th century in England, we see the spirit of utility entirely in the ascendant. Intellectual power is as great as ever, immortal books are written as of old, but there is a general incapacity not only for the production, but for the comprehension of works of the imagination. Minds as robust as Johnson's, as acute as Hume's, display neither strength nor intelligence in their criticism of the Elizabethan writers, and their professed regard for even the masterpieces of antiquity is evidently in the main conventional. Conversely, when the spell is broken and the capacity for imaginative composition returns, the half-century immediately preceding her Majesty's accession does not, outside the domain of the ideal, produce a single work of the first class. Hallam, the elder Mill, and others compose, indeed, books of great value, but not great books. In poetry and romantic fiction, on the other hand, the genius of that age reaches a height unattained since Milton, and probably not destined to be rivalled for many generations. In the age of Victoria we witness the fusion of its predecessors."—R. Garnett, *Literature (The Reign of Queen Victoria, ed. by T. H. Ward, v. 2, pp. 445-446)*.—"The most conspicuous of the substantial distinctions between the literature of the present day and that of the first quarter or third of the century may be described as consisting in the different relative positions at the two dates of Prose and Verse. In the Georgian era verse was in the ascendant; in the Victorian era the supremacy has passed to prose. It is not easy for any one who has grown up in the latter to estimate aright the universal excitement which used to be produced in the former by a new poem of Scott's, or Byron's, or Moore's, or Campbell's, or Crabbe's, or the equally fervid interest that was taken throughout a more limited circle in one by Wordsworth, or Southey, or Shelley. There may have been a power in the spirit of poetry which that of prose would in vain aspire to. Probably all the verse ages would be found to have been of higher glow than the prose ones. The age in question, at any rate, will hardly be denied by any one who remembers it to have been in these centuries, perhaps from the mightier character of the events and circumstances in the midst of which we were then placed, an age in which the national heart beat more strongly than it does at present in regard to other things as well as this. Its reception of the great poems that succeeded one another so rapidly from the first appearance of Scott till the death of Byron was like its reception of the succession of great victories that, ever thickening, and almost unbroken by a single defeat, filled up the greater part of the ten years from Trafalgar to Waterloo—from the last fight of Nelson to the last of Wellington. No such buzzas, making the welkin ring with the one voice of a whole people, and ascending alike from every city and town and humblest village in the land, have been heard since then. . . . Of course, there was plenty of prose also written throughout the verse era; but no book in prose that was then produced greatly excited the public mind, or drew any considerable amount of attention, till the Waverley novels began to appear; and even that remarkable series of works did not succeed in at once reducing poetry to the second place, however chief a share it may have had in hastening that result. Of the other prose

writing that then went on what was most effective was that of the periodical press,—of the Edinburgh Review and Cobbett's Register, and, at a later date, of Blackwood's Magazine and the London Magazine (the latter with Charles Lamb and De Quincey among its contributors),—much of it owing more or less of its power to its vehement political partisanship. A descent from poetry to prose is the most familiar of all phenomena in the history of literature. Call it natural decay or degeneracy, or only a relaxation which the spirit of a people requires after having been for a certain time on the wing or on the stretch, it is what a period of more than ordinary poetical productiveness always ends in."—G. L. Craik, *Compendious Hist. of Eng. Literature, v. 2, pp. 553-555*.—"What . . . are the specific channels of Victorian utterance in verse? To define them is difficult, because they are so subtly varied and so inextricably interwoven. Yet I think they may be superficially described as the idyll and the lyric. Under the idyll I should class all narrative and descriptive poetry, of which this age has been extraordinarily prolific; sometimes assuming the form of minstrelsy, as in the lays of Scott; sometimes approaching to the classic style, as in the Hellenics of Landor; sometimes rivalling the novелlette, as in the work of Tennyson; sometimes aiming at psychological analysis, as in the portraits drawn by Robert Browning; sometimes confining art to bare history, as in Crabbe; sometimes indulging flights of pure artistic fancy, as in Keats' "Endymion" and "Lamia." Under its many metamorphoses the narrative and descriptive poetry of our century bears the stamp of the idyll, because it is fragmentary and because it results in a picture. . . . No literature and no age has been more fertile of lyric poetry than English literature in the age of Victoria. The fact is apparent. I should superfluously burden my readers if I were to prove the point by reference to Byron, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Wordsworth, Rossetti, Clough, Swinburne, Arnold, Tennyson, and I do not know how many of less illustrious but splendid names, in detail. The causes are not far to seek. Without a comprehensive vehicle like the epic, which belongs to the first period of national life, or the drama, which belongs to its secondary period, our poets of a later day have had to sing from their inner selves, subjectively, introspectively, obeying impulses from nature and the world, which touched them not as they were Englishmen, but as they were this man or that woman. . . . When they sang, they sang with their particular voice; and the lyric is the natural channel for such song. But what a complex thing is this Victorian lyric! It includes Wordsworth's sonnets and Rossetti's ballads, Coleridge's 'Ancient Mariner' and Keats' odes, Clough's 'Easter day' and Tennyson's 'Maud,' Swinburne's 'Songs before Sunrise' and Browning's 'Dramatis Personæ,' Thomson's 'City of Dreadful Night' and Mary Robinson's 'Handful of Honeysuckles,' Andrew Lang's Ballades and Sharp's 'Weird of Michael Scot,' Dobson's dealings with the eighteenth century and Noel's 'Child's Garland,' Barnes's Dorsetshire Poems and Buchanan's London Lyrics, the songs from Empedocles on Etna and Ebenezer Jones's 'Pagan's Drinking Chant,' Shelley's Ode to the West Wind and Mrs. Browning's 'Pan is Dead,' Newman's hymns and Gosse's Chant Royal. The kaleidoscope presented by this lyric is so inex-

haustible that any man with the fragment of a memory might pair off scores of poems by admired authors, and yet not fall upon the same parallels as those which I have made. The genius of our century, debarred from epic, debarred from drama, falls back upon idyllic and lyrical expression. In the idyll it satisfies its objective craving after art. In the lyric it pours forth personality. It would be wrong, however, to limit the wealth of our poetry to these two branches. Such poems as Wordsworth's 'Excursion,' Byron's 'Don Juan' and 'Childe Harold,' Mrs. Browning's 'Aurora Leigh,' William Morris's 'Earthly Paradise,' Clough's 'Amours de Voyage,' are not to be classified in either species. They are partly autobiographical, and in part the influence of the tale makes itself distinctly felt in them. Nor again can we omit the translations, of which so many have been made; some of them real masterpieces and additions to our literature."—J. A. Symonds, *A Comparison of Elizabethan with Victorian Poetry* (*Fortnightly Rev.*, Jan. 1, 1889, pp. 62-64).—The difference between the drama and the novel "is one of perspective; and it is this which in a wide sense distinguishes the Elizabethan and the Victorian views of life, and thence of art. . . . It is . . . the present aim of art to throw on life all manner of side-lights, such as the stage can hardly contrive, but which the novel professes to manage for those who can read. The round unvarnished tale of the early novelists has been dead for over a century, and in its place we have fiction that seeks to be as complete as life itself. . . . There is, then, in each of these periods an excellence and a relative defect: in the Elizabethan, roundness and balance, but, to us, a want of fullness; in the Victorian, amplified knowledge, but a falling short of comprehensiveness. And adapted to each respectively, the drama and the novel are its most expressive literary form. The limitations and scope of the drama are those of its time, and so of the novel. Even as the Elizabethan lived with all his might and was not troubled about many things, his art was intense and round, but restricted; and as the Victorian commonly views life by the light of a patent reading-lamp, and so, sitting apart, sees much to perplex, the novel gives a more complex treatment of life, with rarer success in harmony. This rareness is not, however, due to the novel itself, but to the minds of its makers. In possibility it is indeed the greater of the two, being more epical; for it is as capable of grandeur, and is ampler. This largeness in Victorian life and art argues in the great novelists a quality of spirit which it is difficult to name without being misunderstood, and which is peculiarly non-Elizabethan. It argues what Burns would call a castigated pulse, a supremacy over passion. Yet they are not Lucretian gods, however calm their atmosphere; their minds are not built above humanity, but, being rooted deep in it, rise high. . . . Both periods are at heart earnest, and the stamp on the great literature of each is that of reality, heightened and made powerful by romance. Nor is their agreement herein greatly shaken by the novel laying considerable stress on the outside of life, while the drama is almost heedless of it; for they both seek to break into the kernel, their variance being chiefly one of method, dictated by difference of knowledge, taste, and perception."—T. D. Robb, *The Eliza-*

bethan Drama and the Victorian Novel (Lippincott's *Monthly Magazine*, April, 1891, pp. 520-522).

A. D. 1838-1842.—The Chartist agitation.—"When the Parliament was opened by the Queen on the 5th of February, 1839, a passage in the Royal Speech had reference to a state of domestic affairs which presented an unhappy contrast to the universal loyalty which marked the period of the Coronation. Her Majesty said: 'I have observed with pain the persevering efforts which have been made in some parts of the country to excite my subjects to disobedience and resistance to the law, and to recommend dangerous and illegal practices.' Chartist, which for ten subsequent years occasionally agitated the country, had then begun to take root. On the previous 12th of December a proclamation had been issued against illegal Chartist assemblies, several of which had been held, says the proclamation, 'after sunset by torchlight.' The persons attending these meetings were armed with guns and pikes; and demagogues, such as Feargus O'Connor and the Rev. Mr. Stephens at Bury, addressed the people in the most inflammatory language. . . . The document called 'The People's Charter,' which was embodied in the form of a bill in 1838, comprised six points:—universal suffrage, excluding, however, women; division of the United Kingdom into equal electoral districts; vote by ballot; annual parliaments; no property qualification for members; and a payment to every member for his legislative services. These principles so quickly recommended themselves to the working-classes that in the session of 1839 the number of signatures to a petition presented to Parliament was upwards of a million and a quarter. The middle classes almost universally looked with extreme jealousy and apprehension upon any attempt for an extension of the franchise. The upper classes for the most part regarded the proceedings of the Chartists with a contempt which scarcely concealed their fears. This large section of the working population very soon became divided into what were called physical-force Chartists and moral-force Chartists. As a natural consequence, the principles and acts of the physical-force Chartists disgusted every supporter of order and of the rights of property."—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 8, ch. 23.—"Nothing can be more unjust than to represent the leaders and promoters of the movement as mere factious and self-seeking demagogues. Some of them were men of great ability and eloquence; some were impassioned young poets, drawn from the class whom Kingsley has described in his 'Alton Locke'; some were men of education; many were earnest and devoted fanatics; and, so far as we can judge, all, or nearly all, were sincere. Even the man who did the movement most harm, and who made himself most odious to all reasonable outsiders, the once famous, now forgotten, Feargus O'Connor, appears to have been sincere, and to have personally lost more than he gained by his Chartism. . . . He was of commanding presence, great stature, and almost gigantic strength. He had education; he had mixed in good society; he belonged to an old family. . . . There were many men in the movement of a nobler moral nature than poor, huge, wild Feargus O'Connor. There were men like Thomas Cooper, . . . devoted, impassioned, full of poetic aspiration, and no

scant measure of poetic inspiration as well. Henry Vincent was a man of unimpeachable character. . . . Ernest Jones was as sincere and self-sacrificing a man as ever joined a sinking cause. . . . It is necessary to read such a book as Thomas Cooper's Autobiography to understand how genuine was the poetic and political enthusiasm which was at the heart of the Chartist movement, and how bitter was the suffering which drove into its ranks so many thousands of stout working men who, in a country like England, might well have expected to be able to live by the hard work they were only too willing to do. One must read the Anti-Corn-Law Rhymes of Ebenezer Elliott to understand how the 'bread tax' became identified in the minds of the very best of the working class, and identified justly, with the system of political and economical legislation which was undoubtedly kept up, although not of conscious purpose, for the benefit of a class. . . . A whole literature of Chartist newspapers sprang up to advocate the cause. The 'Northern Star,' owned and conducted by Feargus O'Connor, was the most popular and influential of them; but every great town had its Chartist press. Meetings were held at which sometimes very violent language was employed. . . . A formidable riot took place in Birmingham, where the authorities endeavoured to put down a Chartist meeting. . . . Efforts were made at times to bring about a compromise with the middle-class Liberals and the Anti-Corn-Law leaders; but all such attempts proved failures. The Chartists would not give up their Charter; many of them would not renounce the hope of seeing it carried by force. The Government began to prosecute some of the orators and leaders of the Charter movement; and some of these were convicted, imprisoned and treated with great severity. Henry Vincent's imprisonment at Newport, in Wales, was the occasion of an attempt at rescue [November 4, 1839] which bore a very close resemblance indeed to a scheme of organised and armed rebellion." A conflict occurred in which ten of the Chartists were killed, and some 50 were wounded. Three of the leaders, named Frost, Williams, and Jones, were tried and convicted on the charge of high treason, and were sentenced to death; but the sentence was commuted to one of transportation. "The trial and conviction of Frost, Williams, and Jones, did not put a stop to the Chartist agitation. On the contrary, that agitation seemed rather to wax and strengthen and grow broader because of the attempt at Newport and its consequences. . . . There was no lack of what were called energetic measures on the part of the Government. The leading Chartists all over the country were prosecuted and tried, literally by hundreds. In most cases they were convicted and sentenced to terms of imprisonment. . . . The working classes grew more and more bitter against the Whigs, who they said had professed Liberalism only to gain their own ends. . . . There was a profound distrust of the middle class and their leaders," and it was for that reason that the Chartists would not join hands with the Anti-Corn-Law movement, then in full progress. "It is clear that at that time the Chartists, who represented the bulk of the artisan class in most of the large towns, did in their very hearts believe that England was ruled for the benefit of aristocrats and millionaires who were

absolutely indifferent to the sufferings of the poor. It is equally clear that most of what are called the ruling class did really believe the English working men who joined the Chartist movement to be a race of fierce, unmanageable, and selfish communists, who, if they were allowed their own way for a moment, would prove themselves determined to overthrow throne, altar, and all established securities of society."—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of Our Own Times*, ch. 5 (v. 1).—Among the measures of coercion advocated in the councils of the Chartists was that of appointing and observing what was to be called a "sacred month," during which the working classes throughout the whole kingdom were to abstain from every kind of labour, in the hope of compelling the governing classes to concede the charter."—W. N. Molesworth, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1830-1874, v. 2, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: T. Cooper, *Life, by himself*, ch. 14-23.—W. Lovett, *Life and Struggles*, ch. 8-15.—T. Frost, *Forty Years' Recollections*, ch. 3-11.—H. Jephson, *The Platform*, pt. 4, ch. 17 and 19 (v. 2).

A. D. 1839-1842.—The Opium War with China. See CHINA: A. D. 1839-1842.

A. D. 1840.—Adoption of Penny-Postage.—"In 1837 Mr. Rowland Hill had published his plan of a cheap and uniform postage. A Committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1837, which continued its inquiries throughout the session of 1838, and arrived at the conviction that the plan was feasible, and deserving of a trial under legislative sanction. After much discussion, and the experiment of a varying charge, the uniform rate for a letter not weighing more than half an ounce became, by order of the Treasury, one penny. This great reform came into operation on the 10th of January, 1840. Its final accomplishment is mainly due to the sagacity and perseverance of the man who first conceived the scheme."—C. Knight, *Crown Hist. of Eng.*, p. 883.—"Up to this time the rates of postage on letters were very heavy, and varied according to the distance. For instance, a single letter conveyed from one part of a town to another cost 2d.; a letter from Reading, to London 7d.; from Brighton, 8d.; from Aberdeen, 1s. 3d.; from Belfast, 1s. 4d. If the letter was written on more than a single sheet, the rate of postage was much higher."—W. N. Molesworth, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1830-1874, v. 2, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: G. B. Hill, *Life of Sir Rowland Hill*.

A. D. 1840.—The Queen's marriage.—"On January 16, 1840, the Queen, opening Parliament in person, announced her intention to marry her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha—a step which she trusted would be 'conducive to the interests of my people as well as to my own domestic happiness.' . . . It was indeed a marriage founded on affection. . . . The Queen had for a long time loved her cousin. He was nearly her own age, the Queen being the elder by three months and two or three days. Francis Charles Augustus Albert Emmanuel was the full name of the young Prince. He was the second son of Ernest, Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld, and of his wife Louisa, daughter of Augustus, Duke of Saxe-Gotha-Altenberg. Prince Albert was born at the Rosenau, one of his father's residences, near Coburg, on August 26, 1819. . . . A marriage between the Princess Victoria and Prince Albert had been thought of as desirable among the families on both sides, but it was always

wisely resolved that nothing should be said to the young Princess on the subject unless she herself showed a distinct liking for her cousin. In 1836, Prince Albert was brought by his father to England, and made the personal acquaintance of the Princess, and she seems at once to have been drawn toward him in the manner which her family and friends would most have desired. . . . The marriage of the Queen and the Prince took place on February 10, 1840."—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of Our Own Times*, ch. 7 (v. 1).

A. D. 1841-1842.—Interference in Afghanistan.—The first Afghan War. See AFGHANISTAN: A. D. 1803-1838; 1838-1842; 1842-1869.

A. D. 1841-1842.—Fall of the Melbourne Ministry.—Opening of the second administration of Sir Robert Peel.—In 1841, the Whig Ministry (Melbourne's) determined "to do something for freedom of trade. . . . Colonial timber and sugar were charged with a duty lighter than was imposed on foreign timber and sugar; and foreign sugar paid a lighter or a heavier duty according as it was imported from countries of slave labour or countries of free labour. It was resolved to raise the duty on colonial timber, but to lower the duty on foreign timber and foreign sugar, and at the same time to replace the sliding scale of the Corn Laws then in force [see TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1815-1828] with a fixed duty of 8s. per quarter. . . . The concessions offered by the Ministry, too small to excite the enthusiasm of the free traders, were enough to rally all the threatened interests around Peel. Baring's revision of the sugar duties was rejected by a majority of 36. Everybody expected the Ministers to resign upon this defeat; but they merely announced the continuance of the former duties. Then Peel gave notice of a vote of want of confidence, and carried it on the 4th of June by a single vote in a House of 623 members. Instead of resigning, the Ministers appealed to the country. The elections went on through the last days of June and the whole of July. When the new Parliament was complete, it appeared that the Conservatives could count upon 367 votes in the House of Commons. The Ministry met Parliament on the 24th of August. Peel in the House of Commons and Ripon in the House of Lords moved amendments to the Address, which were carried by majorities of 91 and 72 respectively." The Ministry resigned and a Conservative Government was formed, with Peel at its head, as First Lord of the Treasury. "Wellington entered the Cabinet without office, and Lyndhurst assumed for the third time the honours of Lord Chancellor." Among the lesser members of the Administration—not in the Cabinet—was Mr. Gladstone, who became Vice-President of the Board of Trade. "This time Peel experienced no difficulty with regard to the Queen's Household. It had been previously arranged that in the case of Lord Melbourne's resignation three Whig Ladies, the Duchess of Bedford, the Duchess of Sutherland, and Lady Normanby, should resign of their own accord. One or two other changes in the Household contented Peel, and these the Queen accorded with a frankness which placed him entirely at his ease. . . . During the recess Peel took a wide survey of the ills affecting the commonwealth, and of the possible remedies. To supply the deficiency in the revenue without laying new burthens upon the humbler class; to revive our fainting manufactures

by encouraging the importation of raw material; to assuage distress by making the price of provisions lower and more regular, without taking away that protection which he still believed essential to British agriculture; these were the tasks which Peel now bent his mind to compass. . . . Having solved [the problems] to his own satisfaction, he had to persuade his colleagues that they were right. Only one proved obstinate. The Duke of Buckingham would hear of no change in the degree of protection afforded to agriculture. He surrendered the Privy Seal, which was given to the Duke of Buccleugh. . . . The Queen's Speech recommended Parliament to consider the state of the laws affecting the importation of corn and other commodities. It announced the beginning of a revolution which few persons in England thought possible, although it was to be completed in little more than ten years."—F. C. Montague, *Life of Sir Robert Peel*, ch. 7-8.

ALSO IN: J. R. Thursfield, *Peel*, ch. 7-8.—W. C. Taylor, *Life and Times of Sir Robert Peel*, v. 3, ch. 3-5.—J. W. Croker, *Correspondence and Diaries*, ch. 22 (v. 2).

A. D. 1842.—The Ashburton Treaty. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1842.

A. D. 1844.—The Bank Charter Act. See MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1844.

A. D. 1845-1846.—Repeal of the Corn Laws. See TARIFF LEGISLATION: A. D. 1845-1846.

A. D. 1845-1846.—First war with the Sikhs. See INDIA: A. D. 1845-1849.

A. D. 1846.—Settlement of the Oregon Boundary Question with the United States. See OREGON: A. D. 1844-1846.

A. D. 1846.—The vengeance of the Tory-Protectionists.—Overthrow of Peel.—Advent of Disraeli.—Ministry of Lord John Russell.—"Strange to say, the day when the Bill [extinguishing the duties on corn] was read in the House of Lords for the third time [June 25] saw the fall of Peel's Ministry. The fall was due to the state of Ireland. The Government had been bringing in a Coercion Bill for Ireland. It was introduced while the Corn Bill was yet passing through the House of Commons. The situation was critical. All the Irish followers of Mr. O'Connell would be sure to oppose the Coercion Bill. The Liberal party, at least when out of office, had usually made it their principle to oppose Coercion Bills, if they were not attended with some promises of legislative reform. The English Radical members, led by Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, were certain to oppose coercion. If the protectionists should join with these other opponents of the Coercion Bill, the fate of the measure was assured, and with it the fate of the Government. This was exactly what happened. Eighty Protectionists followed Lord George Bentinck into the lobby against the Bill, in combination with the Free Traders, the Whigs, and the Irish Catholic and national members. The division took place on the second reading of the Bill on Thursday, June 25, and there was a majority of 73 against the Ministry."—J. McCarthy, *The Epoch of Reform*, p. 183.—The revengeful Tory-Protectionist attack on Peel was led by Sir George Bentinck and Benjamin Disraeli, then just making himself felt in the House of Commons. It was distinctly grounded upon no objection in principle to the Irish Coercion Bill, but on the declaration that they could "no longer trust Peel, and, 'must therefore refuse to give him unconsti-

tutional powers.' . . . He had twice betrayed the party who had trusted his promises. . . . 'The gentlemen of England,' of whom it had once been Sir Robert's proudest boast to be the leader, declared against him. He was beaten by an overpowering majority, and his career as an English Minister was closed. Disraeli's had been the hand which dethroned him, and to Disraeli himself, after three years of anarchy and uncertainty, descended the task of again building together the shattered ruins of the Conservative party. Very unwillingly they submitted to the unwelcome necessity. Canning and the elder Pitt had both been called adventurers, but they had birth and connection, and they were at least Englishmen. Disraeli had risen out of a despised race; he had never sued for their favours; he had voted and spoken as he pleased, whether they liked it or not. . . . He was without Court favour, and had hardly a powerful friend except Lord Lyndhurst. He had never been tried on the lower steps of the official ladder. He was young, too—only 42—after all the stir that he had made. There was no example of a rise so sudden under such conditions. But the Tory party had accepted and cheered his services, and he stood out alone among them as a debater of superior power. Their own trained men had all deserted them. Lord George remained for a year or two as nominal chief: but Lord George died; the conservatives could only consolidate themselves under a real leader, and Disraeli was the single person that they had who was equal to the situation. . . . He had overthrown Peel and succeeded to Peel's honours."—J. A. Froude, *Lord Beaconsfield*, ch. 9.—Although the Tory-Protectionists had accomplished the overthrow of Peel, they were not prepared to take the Government into their own hands. The new Ministry was formed under Lord John Russell, as First Lord of the Treasury, with Lord Palmerston in the Foreign Office, Sir George Grey in the Home Department, Earl Grey Colonial Secretary, Sir C. Wood Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Macaulay Paymaster-General.—W. C. Taylor, *Life and Times of Sir Robert Peel*, v. 3, ch. 11.—The most important enactment of the Coercion Bill "(which subsequently gave it the name of the Curfew Act) was that which conferred on the executive Government the power in proclaimed districts of forbidding persons to be out of their dwellings between sunset and sunrise. The right of proclaiming a district as a disturbed district was placed in the hands of the Lord-Lieutenant, who might station additional constabulary there, the whole expense of which was to be borne by the district."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period 4*, p. 137.

ALSO IN: S. Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell*, ch. 16 (v. 1).—B. Disraeli, *Lord George Bentinck*, ch. 14-16.

A. D. 1846.—Difference with France on the Spanish marriages. See FRANCE: A. D. 1841-1848.

A. D. 1848.—The last Chartist demonstration.—"The more violent Chartists had broken from the Radical reformers, and had themselves divided into two sections; for their nominal leader, Feargus O'Connor, was at bitter enmity with more thoroughgoing and earnest leaders such as O'Brien and Cooper. O'Connor had not proved a very efficient guide. He had entered into a land scheme of a somewhat doubtful char-

acter. . . . He had also injudiciously taken up a position of active hostility to the free-traders, and while thus appearing as the champion of a falling cause had alienated many of his supporters. Yet the Parliament elected in 1846 contained several representatives of the Chartist principles, and O'Connor himself had been returned for Nottingham by a large majority over Hobhouse, a member of the new Ministry. The revolution in France gave a sudden and enormous impulse to the agitation. The country was filled with meetings at which violent speeches were uttered and hints, not obscure, dropped of the forcible establishment of a republic in England. A new Convention was summoned for the 6th of April, a vast petition was prepared, and a meeting, at which it was believed that half a million of people would have been present, was summoned to meet on Kennington Common on the 10th of April for the purpose of carrying the petition to the House in procession. The alarm felt in London was very great. It was thought necessary to swear in special constables, and the wealthier classes came forward in vast numbers to be enrolled. There are said to have been no less than 170,000 special constables. The military arrangements were entrusted to the Duke of Wellington; the public offices were guarded and fortified; public vehicles were forbidden to pass the streets lest they should be employed for barricades; and measures were taken to prevent the procession from crossing the bridges. . . . Such a display of determination seemed almost ridiculous when compared with what actually occurred. But it was in fact the cause of the harmless nature of the meeting. Instead of half a million, about 30,000 men assembled on Kennington Common. Feargus O'Connor was there; Mr. Maine, the Commissioner of Police, called him aside, told him he might hold his meeting, but that the procession would be stopped, and that he would be held personally responsible for any disorder that might occur. His heart had already begun to fail him, and he . . . used all his influence to put an end to the procession. His prudent advice was followed, and no disturbance of any importance took place. . . . The air of ridicule thrown over the Chartist movement by the abortive close of a demonstration which had been heralded with so much violent talk was increased by the disclosures attending the presentation of the petition." There were found to be only 2,000,000 names appended to the document, instead of 5,000,000 as claimed, and great numbers of them were manifestly spurious. "This failure proved a deathblow to Chartism."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of Eng., period 4*, pp. 176-178.

ALSO IN: S. Walpole, *Hist. of Eng. from 1815*, ch. 20 (v. 4).

A. D. 1848-1849.—Second war with the Sikhs.—Conquest and annexation of the Punjab. See INDIA: A. D. 1845-1849.

A. D. 1849.—Repeal of the Navigation Laws. See NAVIGATION LAWS: A. D. 1849.

A. D. 1849-1850.—The Don Pacifico Affair.—Lord Palmerston's speech.—The little difficulty with Greece which came to a crisis in the last weeks of 1849 and the first of 1850 (see GREECE: A. D. 1846-1850), and which was commonly called the Don Pacifico Affair, gave occasion for a memorable speech in Parliament by Lord Palmerston, defending his foreign policy

against attacks. The speech (June 24, 1850), which occupied five hours, "from the dusk of one day till the dawn of another," was greatly admired, and proved immensely effective in raising the speaker's reputation. "The Don Pacifico debate was unquestionably an important landmark in the life of Lord Palmerston. Hitherto his merits had been known only to a select few; for the British public does not read Blue Books, and as a rule troubles itself very little about foreign politics at all. . . . But the Pacifico speech caught the ear of the nation, and was received with a universal verdict of approval. From that hour Lord Palmerston became the man of the people, and his rise to the premiership only a question of time."—L. C. Sanders, *Life of Viscount Palmerston*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: Marquis of Lorne, *Viscount Palmerston*, ch. 7.—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of Our Own Times*, ch. 19 (v. 2).—J. Morley, *Life of Cobden*, v. 2, ch. 3.—T. Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, ch. 38 (v. 2).

A. D. 1850.—The so-called Clayton-Bulwer Treaty with the United States, establishing a joint protectorate over the projected Nicaragua Canal. See NICARAGUA: A. D. 1850.

A. D. 1850.—Restoration of the Roman Episcopate.—The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. See PAPACY: A. D. 1850.

A. D. 1850-1852.—The London protocol and treaty on the Schleswig-Holstein Question. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK): A. D. 1848-1862.

A. D. 1851.—The Great Exhibition.—"The first of May, 1851, will always be memorable as the day on which the Great Exhibition was opened in Hyde Park. . . . Many exhibitions of a similar kind have taken place since. Some of these far surpassed that of Hyde Park in the splendour and variety of the collections brought together. Two of them at least—those of Paris in 1867 and 1878—were infinitely superior in the array and display of the products, the dresses, the inhabitants of far-divided countries. But the impression which the Hyde Park Exhibition made upon the ordinary mind was like that of the boy's first visit to the play—an impression never to be equalled. . . . It was the first organised to gather all the representatives of the world's industry into one great fair. . . . The Hyde Park Exhibition was often described as the festival to open the long reign of Peace. It might, as a mere matter of chronology, be called without any impropriety the festival to celebrate the close of the short reign of Peace. From that year, 1851, it may be said fairly enough that the world has hardly known a week of peace. . . . The first idea of the Exhibition was conceived by Prince Albert; and it was his energy and influence which succeeded in carrying the idea into practical execution. . . . Many persons were disposed to sneer at it; many were sceptical about its doing any good; not a few still regarded Prince Albert as a foreigner and a pedant, and were slow to believe that anything really practical was likely to be developed under his impulse and protection. . . . There was a great deal of difficulty in selecting a plan for the building. . . . Happily, a sudden inspiration struck Mr. (afterward Sir Joseph) Paxton, who was then in charge of the Duke of Devonshire's superb grounds at Chatsworth. Why not try glass and iron? he asked himself. . . . Mr. Pax-

ton sketched out his plan hastily, and the idea was eagerly accepted by the Royal Commissioners. He made many improvements afterwards in his design; but the palace of glass and iron arose within the specified time on the green turf of Hyde Park."—J. McCarthy, *Hist. of Our Own Times*, ch. 21 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: T. Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, ch. 33-36, 39, 42-43 (v. 2).

A. D. 1851-1852.—The Coup d'État in France and Lord Palmerston's dismissal from the Cabinet.—Defeat and resignation of Lord John Russell.—The first Derby-Disraeli Ministry and the Aberdeen coalition Ministry.—The "coup d'état" of December 2nd, 1851, by which Louis Napoleon made himself master of France (see FRANCE: A. D. 1851) brought about the dismissal of Lord Palmerston from the British Ministry, followed quickly by the overthrow of the Ministry which expelled him. "Lord Palmerston not only expressed privately to Count Walewski [the French ambassador] his approval of the 'coup d'état,' but on the 16th of December wrote a despatch to Lord Normanby, our representative in Paris, expressing in strong terms his satisfaction at the success of the French President's arbitrary action. This despatch was not submitted either to the Prime Minister or to the Queen, and of course the offence was of too serious a character to be passed over. A great deal of correspondence ensued, and as Palmerston's explanations were not deemed satisfactory, and he had clearly broken the undertaking he gave some time previously, he was dismissed from office. . . . There were some who thought him irretrievably crushed from this time forward; but a very short time only elapsed before he retrieved his fortunes and was as powerful as ever. In February 1852 Lord John Russell brought in a Militia Bill which was intended to develop a local militia for the defence of the country. Lord Palmerston strongly disapproved of the scope of the measure, and in committee moved an amendment to omit the word 'local,' so as to constitute a regular militia, which should be legally transportable all over the kingdom, and thus be always ready for any emergency. The Government were defeated by eleven votes, and as the Administration had been very weak for some time, Lord John resigned. Lord Derby formed a Ministry, and invited the co-operation of Palmerston, but the offer was declined, as the two statesmen differed on the question of imposing a duty on the importation of corn, and other matters."—G. B. Smith, *The Prime Ministers of Queen Victoria*, pp. 264-265.—"The new Ministry [in which Mr. Disraeli became Chancellor of the Exchequer] took their seats on the 27th of February, but it was understood that a dissolution of Parliament would take place in the summer, by which the fate of the new Government would be decided, and that in the meantime the Opposition should hold its hand. The raw troops [of the Tory Party in the House of Commons], notwithstanding their inexperience, acquitted themselves with credit, and some good Bills were passed, the Militia Bill among the number, while a considerable addition to the strength of the Navy was effected by the Duke of Northumberland. No doubt, when the general election began, the party had raised itself considerably in public estimation. But for one consideration the country would probably

have been quite willing to entrust its destinies to their hands. But that one consideration was all important. . . . The Government was obliged to go to the country, to some extent, on Protectionist principles. It was known that a Derbyite majority meant a moderate import duty; and the consequence was that Lord Derby just lost the battle, though by a very narrow majority. When Parliament met in November, Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli had a very difficult game to play. . . . Negotiations were again opened with Palmerston and the Peelites, and on this occasion Gladstone and Mr. Sidney Herbert were willing to join if Lord Palmerston might lead in the House of Commons. But the Queen put her veto on this arrangement, which accordingly fell to the ground; and Lord Derby had to meet the Opposition attack without any reinforcements. . . . On the 16th of December, . . . being defeated on the Budget by a majority of 19, Lord Derby at once resigned."—T. E. Kebbel, *Life of the Earl of Derby*, ch. 6.—"The new Government [which succeeded that of Derby] was a coalition of Whigs and Peelites, with Sir William Molesworth thrown in to represent the Radicals. Lord Aberdeen became Prime Minister, and Mr. Gladstone Chancellor of the Exchequer. The other Peelites in the Cabinet were the Duke of Newcastle, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Sidney Herbert."—G. W. E. Russell, *The Rt. Hon. William Ewart Gladstone*, ch. 5.

A. D. 1852.—Second Burmese War.—Annexation of Pegu. See INDIA: A. D. 1852.

A. D. 1852-1853.—Abandonment of Protection by the Conservatives.—Further progress in Free Trade. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1846-1879; and TRADE.

A. D. 1853-1855.—Civil-Service Reform. See CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN ENGLAND.

A. D. 1853-1856.—The Crimean War. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1853-1854, to 1854-1856.

A. D. 1855.—Popular discontent with the management of the war.—Fall of the Aberdeen Ministry.—Palmerston's first premiership.—A brightening of prospects.—"Our army system entirely broke down [in the Crimea], and Lord Aberdeen and the Duke of Newcastle were made the scapegoats of the popular indignation. . . . But England was not only suffering from unpreparedness and want of administrative power in the War department; there were dissensions in the Cabinet. . . . Lord John Russell gave so much trouble, that Lord Aberdeen, after one of the numerous quarrels and reconciliations which occurred at this juncture, wrote to the Queen that nothing but a sense of public duty and the necessity for avoiding the scandal of a rupture kept him at his post. . . . At a little later stage . . . the difficulties were renewed. Mr. Roebuck gave notice of his motion for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the condition of the army before Sebastopol, and Lord John definitively resigned. The Ministry remained in office to await the fate of Mr. Roebuck's motion, which was carried against them by the very large majority of 157. Lord Aberdeen now placed the resignation of the Cabinet in the hands of the Queen [Jan. 31, 1855]. . . . Thus fell the Coalition Cabinet of Lord Aberdeen. In talent and parliamentary influence it was apparently one of the strongest Governments ever seen, but it suffered from a fatal want of cohesion."—G. B. Smith,

Prime Ministers of Queen Victoria, pp. 227-230.

—"Lord Palmerston had passed his 70th year when the Premiership came to him for the first time. On the fall of the Coalition Government the Queen sent for Lord Derby, and upon his failure for Lord John Russell. Palmerston was willing at the express request of her Majesty to serve once more under his old chief, but Clarendon and many of the Whigs not unnaturally positively refused to do so. Palmerston finally undertook and successfully achieved the task of forming a Government out of the somewhat heterogeneous elements at his command. Lord Clarendon continued at the Foreign Office, and Gladstone was still Chancellor of the Exchequer. The War Department was reorganised, the office of Secretary at War disappearing, and being finally merged in that of Secretary of State for War. Although Palmerston objected to Roebuck's Committee, he was practically compelled to accept it, and this led to the resignation of Gladstone, Graham and Herbert; their places being taken by Sir G. C. Lewis, Sir Charles Wood, and Lord John Russell."—Marquis of Lorne, *Viscount Palmerston*, ch. 10.—"It was a dark hour in the history of the nation when Lord Palmerston essayed the task which had been abandoned by the tried wisdom of Derby, Lansdowne, and John Russell. Far away in the Crimea the war was dragging on without much hope of a creditable solution, though the winter of discontent and mismanagement was happily over. The existence of the European concert was merely nominal. The Allies had discovered, many months previously, that, though Austria was staunch, Prussia was a faithless friend. . . . Between the belligerent powers the cloud of suspicion and distrust grew thicker; for Abd-el-Medjid was known to be freely squandering his war loans on seraglios and palaces while Kars was starving; and though there was no reason for distrusting the present good faith of the Emperor of the French, his policy was straightforward only as long as he kept himself free from the influence of the gang of stock-jobbers and adventurers who composed his Ministry. Nor was the horizon much brighter on the side of England. A series of weak cabinets, and the absence of questions of organic reform, had completely relaxed the bonds of Party. If there was no regular Opposition, still less was there a regular majority. . . . And the hand that was to restore order out of chaos was not so steady as of yore. . . . Lord Palmerston was not himself during the first weeks of his leadership. But the prospect speedily brightened. Though Palmerston was considerably over seventy, he still retained a wonderful vigour of constitution. He was soon restored to health, and was always to be found at his post. . . . His generalship secured ample majorities for the Government in every division during the session. Of the energy which Lord Palmerston inspired into the operations against Sebastopol, there can hardly be two opinions."—L. C. Sanders, *Life of Viscount Palmerston*, ch. 10.

A. D. 1855.—Mr. Gladstone's Commission to the Ionian Islands. See IONIAN ISLANDS: A. D. 1815-1862.

A. D. 1856-1860.—War with China.—French alliance in the war.—Capture of Canton.—Entrance into Peking.—Destruction of the Summer Palace. See CHINA: A. D. 1856-1860.

A. D. 1857-1858.—The Sepoy Mutiny in India. See INDIA: A. D. 1857, to 1857-1858 (JULY—JUNE).

A. D. 1858.—Assumption of the government of India by the Crown.—End of the rule of the East India Co. See INDIA: A. D. 1858.

A. D. 1858-1859.—The Conspiracy Bill.—Fall of Palmerston's government.—Second Ministry of Derby and Disraeli.—Lord Palmerston again Premier.—“On January 14, 1858, an attempt was made to assassinate Napoleon III. by a gang of desperadoes, headed by Orsini, whose head-quarters had previously been in London. Not without some reason it was felt in France that such men ought not to be able to find shelter in this country, and the French Minister was ordered to make representations to that effect. Lord Palmerston, always anxious to cultivate the good feeling of the French nation, desired to pass a measure which should give to the British Government the power to banish from England any foreigner conspiring in Britain against the life of a foreign sovereign. . . . An unfortunate outburst of vituperation against England in the French press, and the repetition of such language by officers of the French army who were received by the Emperor when they waited on him as a deputation, aroused very angry English feeling. Lord Palmerston had already introduced the Bill he desired to pass, and it had been read the first time by a majority of 200. But the foolish action of the French papers changed entirely the current of popular opinion. Lord Derby saw his advantage. An amendment to the second reading, which was practically a vote of censure, was carried against Lord Palmerston, and to his own surprise no less than to that of the country, he was obliged to resign. Lord Derby succeeded to Palmerston's vacant office. . . . Lord Derby's second Ministry was wrecked upon the fatal rock of Reform early in 1859, and at once appealed to the country. . . . The election of 1859 failed to give the Conservatives a majority, and soon after the opening of the session they were defeated upon a vote of want of confidence moved by Lord Hartington. Earl Granville was commissioned by the Queen to form a Ministry, because her Majesty felt that ‘to make so marked a distinction as is implied in the choice of one or other as Prime Minister of two statesmen so full of years and honour as Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell would be a very invidious and unwelcome task.’ Each of these veterans was willing to serve under the other, but neither would follow the lead of a third. And so Granville failed, and to Palmerston was entrusted the task. He succeeded in forming what was considered the strongest Ministry of modern times, so far as the individual ability of its members was concerned. Russell went to the Foreign Office and Gladstone to the Exchequer.”—Marquis of Lorne, *Viscount Palmerston*, ch. 10-11.

Also in: T. Martin, *Life of the Prince Consort*, ch. 82-84, 91-92, and 94 (v. 4).—T. E. Kebbel, *Life of the Earl of Derby*, ch. 7.

A. D. 1860.—The Cobden-Chevalier commercial treaty with France. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (FRANCE): A. D. 1858-1860.

A. D. 1861 (May).—The Queen's Proclamation of Neutrality with reference to the American Civil War. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (APRIL—MAY).

A. D. 1861 (October).—The allied intervention in Mexico. See MEXICO: A. D. 1861-1867.

A. D. 1861 (November).—The Trent Affair.—Seizure of Mason and Slidell. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1861-1865.—The Cotton Famine.—“Upon a population, containing half a million of cotton operatives, in a career of rapid prosperity, the profits of 1860 reaching in some instances from 30 to 40 per cent upon the capital engaged; and with wages also at the highest point which they had ever touched, came the news of the American war, with the probable stoppage of 85 per cent of the raw material of their manufacture. A few wise heads hung despondently down, or shook with fear for the fate of ‘the freest nation under heaven,’ but the great mass of traders refused to credit a report which neither suited their opinions nor their interests. . . . There was a four months' supply held on this side the water at Christmas (1860), and there had been three months' imports at the usual rate since that time, and there would be the usual twelve months' supply from other sources; and by the time this was consumed, and the five months' stock of goods held by merchants sold, all would be right again. That this was the current opinion was proved by the most delicate of all barometers, the scale of prices; for during the greater part of the year 1861 the market was dull, and prices scarcely moved upwards. But towards the end of the year the aspect of affairs began to change. . . . The Federals had declared a blockade of the Southern ports, and, although as yet it was pretty much a ‘paper blockade,’ yet the newly established Confederate government was doing its best to render it effective. They believed that cotton was king in England, and that the old country could not do without it, and would be forced, in order to secure its release, to side with those who kept it prisoner. Mills began to run short time or to close in the month of October, but no noise was made about it; and the only evidence of anything unusual was at the boards of guardians, where the applications had reached the mid-winter height three months earlier than usual. The poor-law guardians in the various unions were aware that the increase was not of the usual character—it was too early for out-door labourers to present themselves; still the difference was not of serious amount, being only about 3,000 in the whole twenty-eight unions. In November, 7,000 more presented themselves, and in December the increase was again 7,000; so that the recipients of relief were at this time 12,000 (or about 25 per cent) more than in the January previous. And now serious thoughts began to agitate many minds; cotton was very largely held by speculators for a rise, the arrivals were meagre in quantity, and the rates of insurance began to show that, notwithstanding the large profits on imports, the blockade was no longer on paper alone. January, 1862, added 16,000 more to the recipients of relief, who were now 70 per cent above the usual number for the same period of the year. But from the facts as afterwards revealed, the statistics of boards of guardians were evidently no real measure of the distress prevailing. . . . The month of February usually lessens the dependents on the poor-rates, for out-door labour begins again as soon as the signs of spring appear; but in 1862 it added nearly 8,000 to the already large number of extra cases, the recipients

being now 105 per cent above the average for the same period of the year. But this average gives no idea of the pressure in particular localities. . . . The cotton operatives were now, if left to themselves, like a ship's crew upon short provisions, and those very unequally distributed, and without chart or compass, and no prospect of getting to land. In Ashton there were 3,197; in Stockport, 8,588; and in Preston, 9,488 persons absolutely foodless; and who nevertheless declined to go to the guardians. To have forced the high-minded heads of these families to hang about the work-house lobbies in company with the idle, the improvident, the dirty, the diseased, and the vicious, would have been to break their heaving hearts, and to hurl them headlong into despair. Happily there is spirit enough in this country to appreciate nobility, even when dressed in fustian, and pride and sympathy enough to spare even the poorest from unnecessary humiliation; and organisations spring up for any important work so soon as the necessity of the case becomes urgent in any locality. Committees arose almost simultaneously in Ashton, Stockport, and Preston; and in April, Blackburn followed in the train, and the guardians and the relief committees of these several places divided an extra 6,000 dependents between them. The month of May, which usually reduces pauperism to almost its lowest ebb, added 6,000 more to the recipients from the guardians, and 5,000 to the dependents on the relief committees, which were now six in number, Oldham and Prestwich (a part of Manchester) being added to the list. . . . The month of June sent 6,000 more applicants to sue for bread to the boards of guardians, and 5,000 additional to the six relief committees; and these six committees had now as many dependents as the whole of the boards of guardians in the twenty-eight unions supported in ordinary years. . . . In the month of July, when all unemployed operatives would ordinarily be lending a hand in the hay harvest, and picking up the means of living whilst improving in health and enjoying the glories of a summer in the country, the distress increased like a flood, 13,000 additional applicants being forced to appeal for poor-law relief; whilst 11,000 others were adopted by the seven relief committees. . . . In August the flood had become a deluge, at which the stoutest heart might stand appalled. The increased recipients of poor-law relief were in a single month 33,000, being nearly as many as the total number chargeable in the same month of the previous year, whilst a further addition of more than 34,000 became chargeable to the relief committees. . . . Most of the cotton on hand at this period was of Indian growth, and needed alterations of machinery to make it workable at all, and in good times an employer might as well shut up his mill as try to get it spun or manufactured. But oh! how glad would the tens of thousands of unwilling idlers have been now, to have had a chance even of working at Surats, although they knew that it required much harder work for one-third less than normal wages. . . . Another month is past, and October has added to the number under the guardians no less than 55,000, and to the charge of the relief committees 39,000 more. . . . And now dread winter approaches, and the authorities have to deal not only with hundreds of thousands who are compulsorily idle, and consequently foodless, but

who are wholly unprepared for the inclemencies of the season; who have no means of procuring needful clothing, nor even of making a show of cheerfulness upon the hearth by means of the fire, which is almost as useful as food. . . . The total number of persons chargeable at the end of November, 1862, was, under boards of guardians, 258,357, and on relief committees, 200,084; total 458,441. . . . There were not wanting men who saw, or thought they saw, a short way out of the difficulty, viz., by a recognition on the part of the English government of the Southern confederacy in America. And meetings were called in various places to memorialise the government to this effect. Such meetings were always balanced by counter meetings, at which it was shown that simple recognition would be waste of words; that it would not bring to our shores a single shipload of cotton, unless followed up by an armed force to break the blockade, which course if adopted would be war; war in favour of the slave confederacy of the South, and against the free North and North-west, whence comes a large proportion of our imported corn. In addition to the folly of interfering in the affairs of a nation 3,000 miles away, the cotton, if we succeeded in getting it, would be stained with blood and cursed with the support of slavery, and would also prevent our getting the food which we needed from the North equally as much as the cotton from the South. . . . These meetings and counter meetings perhaps helped to steady the action of the government (notwithstanding the sympathy of some of its members towards the South), to confirm them in the policy of the royal proclamation, and to determine them to enforce the provisions of the Foreign Enlistment Act against all offenders. . . . The maximum pressure upon the relief committees was reached early in December, 1862, but, as the tide had turned before the end of the month, the highest number chargeable at any one time is nowhere shown. The highest number exhibited in the returns is for the last week in the year 1862, viz.: 485,434 persons; but in the previous weeks of the same month some thousands more were relieved."—J. Watts, *The Facts of the Cotton Famine*, ch. 8 and 12.

ALSO IN: R. A. Arnold, *Hist. of the Cotton Famine*.—E. Waugh, *Factory Folk during the Cotton Famine*.

A. D. 1862 (July).—The fitting out of the Confederate cruiser Alabama at Liverpool. See ALABAMA CLAIMS: A. D. 1862-1864.

A. D. 1865.—Governor Eyre and the Jamaica Insurrection. See JAMAICA: A. D. 1865.

A. D. 1865-1868.—Death of Palmerston.—Ministry of Lord John Russell.—Its unsatisfactory Reform Bill and its resignation.—Triumph of the Adullamites.—Third administration of Derby and Disraeli, and its Reform Bills.—"On the death of Lord Palmerston [which occurred October 18, 1865], the premiership was intrusted for the second time to Earl Russell, with Mr. Gladstone as leader in the House of Commons. The queen opened her seventh parliament (February 6, 1866), in person, for the first time since the prince consort's death. On March 12th Mr. Gladstone brought forward his scheme of reform, proposing to extend the franchise in counties and boroughs, but the opposition of the moderate Liberals, and their joining the Conservatives, proved fatal to the measure, and in consequence the ministry of Earl

Russell resigned. The government had been personally weakened by the successive deaths of Mr. Sidney Herbert, Sir George Cornwall Lewis, the Duke of Newcastle, Earl of Elgin, and Lord Palmerston. The queen sent for the Earl of Derby to form a Cabinet, who, although the Conservative party was in the minority in the House of Commons, accepted the responsibility of undertaking the management of the government: he as Premier and First Lord of the Treasury; Mr. Disraeli, Chancellor of the Exchequer."

—A. H. McCalman, *Abridged Hist. of England*, p. 603.—"The measure, in fact, was too evidently a compromise. The Russell and Gladstone section of the Cabinet wanted reform: the remnants of Palmerston's followers still thought it unnecessary. The result was this wretched, tinkering measure, which satisfied nobody, and disappointed the expectation of all earnest Reformers."

... The principal opposition came not from the Conservatives, as might have been expected, but from Mr. Horsman and Mr. Robert Lowe, both members of the Liberal party, who from the very first declared they would have none of it."

... Mr. Bright denounced them furiously as 'Adullamites'; all who were in distress, all who were discontented, had gathered themselves together in the political cave of Adullam for the attack on the Government. But Mr. Lowe, all unabashed by denunciation or sarcasm, carried the war straight into the enemy's camp in a swift succession of speeches of extraordinary brilliance and power. ... The party of two, which in its origin reminded Mr. Bright of 'the Scotch terrier which was so covered with hair that you could not tell which was the head and which was the tail of it,' was gradually reinforced by deserters from the ranks of the Government until at last the Adullamites were strong enough to turn the scale of a division. Then one wild night, after a hot and furious debate, the combined armies of the Adullamites and Conservatives carried triumphantly an amendment brought forward by one of the Adullamite chiefs, Lord Dunkellin, to the effect that a rating be substituted for a rental qualification; and the Government was at an end. ... The failure of the bill brought Lord Russell's official career to its close. He formally handed over the leadership of the party to Mr. Gladstone, and from this time took but little part in politics. Lord Derby, his opponent, was soon to follow his example, and then the long-standing duel between Gladstone and Disraeli would be pushed up to the very front of the parliamentary stage, right in the full glare of the footlights. Meanwhile, however, Lord Derby had taken office [July 9, 1866]. Disraeli and Gladstone were changing weapons and crossing the stage. ... The exasperated Liberals, however, were rousing a widespread agitation throughout the country in favour of Reform: monster meetings were held in Hyde Park; the Park railings were pulled down and trampled on by an excited mob, and the police regulations proved as unable to bear the unusual strain as police regulations usually do on such occasions. The result was that Mr. Disraeli became convinced that a Reform Bill of some kind or other was inevitable, and Mr. Disraeli's opinion naturally carried the day. The Government, however, did not go straight to the point at once. They began by proposing a number of resolutions on the subject, which were

very soon laughed out of existence. Then they brought a bill founded on them, which, however, was very shortly afterwards withdrawn after a very discouraging reception. Finally, the Ministry, lightened by the loss of three of its members—the Earl of Carnarvon, Viscount Cranborne, and General Peel—announced their intention of bringing in a comprehensive measure. The measure in question proposed household suffrage in the boroughs subject to the payment of rates, and occupation franchise for the counties subject to the same limitation, and a variety of fanciful clauses, which would have admitted members of the liberal professions, graduates of the universities, and a number of other classes to the franchise. The most novel feature was a clause which permitted a man to acquire two votes if he possessed a double qualification by rating and by profession. The great objection to the bill was that it excluded 'the compound householder.' The compound householder is now as extinct an animal as the pot-walloper found in earlier parliamentary strata, but he was the hero of the Reform debates of 1867, and as such deserves more than a passing reference. He was, in fact, an occupier of a small house who did not pay his rates directly and in person, but paid them through his landlord. Now the occupiers of these very small houses were naturally by far the most numerous class of occupiers in the boroughs, and the omission of them implied a large exclusion from the franchise. The Liberal party, therefore, rose in defence of the compound householder, and the struggle became fierce and hot. It must be remembered, however, that neither Mr. Gladstone nor Mr. Bright wished to lower the franchise beyond a certain point, and a meeting was held in consequence, in which it was agreed that the programme brought forward in committee should begin by an alteration of the rating laws, so that the compound householder above a certain level should pay his own rates and be given a vote, and that all occupiers below the level should be excluded from the rates and the franchise alike. On what may be described roughly as 'the great drawing-the-line question,' however, the Liberal party once more split up. The advanced section were determined that all occupiers should be admitted, and they would have no 'drawing the line.' Some fifty or sixty of them held a meeting in the tea-room of the House of Commons and decided on this course of action: in consequence they acquired the name of the 'Tea-Room Party.' The communication of their views to Mr. Gladstone made him excessively indignant. He denounced them in violent language, and his passion was emulated by Mr. Bright. ... Mr. Gladstone had to give in, and his surrender was followed by that of Mr. Disraeli. The Tea-Room Party, in fact, were masters of the day, and were able to bring sufficient pressure to bear on the Government to induce them to admit the principle of household suffrage pure and simple, and to abolish all distinctions of rating. ... Not only was the household suffrage clause considerably extended, the dual vote abolished, and most of the fancy franchises swept away, but there were numerous additions which completely altered the character of the bill, and transformed it from a balanced attempt to enlarge the franchise without shifting the balance of power to a sweeping measure of

reform."—B. C. Skottowe, *Short Hist. of Parliament*, ch. 22.—The Reform Bill for England "was followed in 1868 by measures for Scotland and Ireland. By these Acts the county franchise in England was extended to all occupiers of lands or houses of the yearly value of £12, and in Scotland to all £5 property owners and £14 property occupiers; while that in Ireland was not altered. The borough franchise in England and Scotland was given to all ratepaying householders and to lodgers occupying lodgings of the annual value of £10; and in Ireland to all ratepaying £4 occupiers. Thus the House of Commons was made nearly representative of all taxpaying commoners, except agricultural labourers and women."—D. W. Rannie, *Hist. Outline of the Eng. Const.*, ch. 12, sect. 4.

ALSO IN: W. BAGEHOT, *Essays on Parliamentary Reform*, 3.—G. B. Smith, *Life of Gladstone*, ch. 17-18 (v. 2).—W. Robertson, *Life and Times of John Bright*, ch. 39-40.

A. D. 1865-1869.—Discussion of the Alabama Claims of the United States.—The Johnson-Clarendon Treaty and its rejection. See ALABAMA CLAIMS: A. D. 1862-1869.

A. D. 1867-1868.—Expedition to Abyssinia. See ABYSSINIA: A. D. 1854-1889.

A. D. 1868-1870.—Disestablishment of the Irish Church.—Retirement of the Derby-Disraeli Ministry.—Mr. Gladstone in power.—His Irish Land Bill.—"On March 16, 1868, a remarkable debate took place in the House of Commons. It had for its subject the condition of Ireland, and it was introduced by a series of resolutions which Mr. John Francis Maguire, an Irish member, proposed. . . . It was on the fourth night of the debate that the importance of the occasion became fully manifest. Then it was that Mr. Gladstone spoke, and declared that in his opinion the time had come when the Irish Church as a State institution must cease to exist. Then every man in the House knew that the end was near. Mr. Maguire withdrew his resolutions. The cause he had to serve was now in the hands of one who, though not surely more earnest for its success, had incomparably greater power to serve it. There was probably not a single Englishman capable of forming an opinion who did not know that from the moment when Mr. Gladstone made his declaration, the fall of the Irish State Church had become merely a question of time. Men only waited to see how Mr. Gladstone would proceed to procure its fall. Public expectation was not long kept in suspense. A few days after the debate on Mr. Maguire's motion, Mr. Gladstone gave notice of three resolutions on the subject of the Irish State Church. The first declared that in the opinion of the House of Commons it was necessary that the Established Church of Ireland should cease to exist as an Establishment, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual rights of property. The second resolution pronounced it expedient to prevent the creation of new personal interests by the exercise of any public patronage; and the third asked for an address to the Queen, praying that her Majesty would place at the disposal of Parliament her interest in the temporalities of the Irish Church. The object of these resolutions was simply to prepare for the actual disestablishment of the Church, by providing that no further appointments should be made, and that the action of patronage should be stayed,

until Parliament should decide the fate of the whole institution. On March 30, 1868, Mr. Gladstone proposed his resolutions. Not many persons could have had much doubt as to the result of the debate. But if there were any such, their doubts must have begun to vanish when they read the notice of amendment to the resolutions which was given by Lord Stanley. The amendment proclaimed even more surely than the resolutions the impending fall of the Irish Church. Lord Stanley must have been supposed to speak in the name of the Government and the Conservative party; and his amendment merely declared that the House, while admitting that considerable modifications in the temporalities of the Church in Ireland might appear to be expedient, was of opinion 'that any proposition tending to the disestablishment or disendowment of the Church ought to be reserved for the decision of the new Parliament.' Lord Stanley's amendment asked only for delay. . . . The debate was one of great power and interest. . . . When the division was called there were 270 votes for the amendment, and 331 against it. The doom of the Irish Church was pronounced by a majority of 61. An interval was afforded for agitation on both sides. . . . Mr. Gladstone's first resolution came to a division about a month after the defeat of Lord Stanley's amendment. It was carried by a majority somewhat larger than that which had rejected the amendment—330 votes were given for the resolution; 265 against it. The majority for the resolution was therefore 65. Mr. Disraeli quietly observed that the Government must take some decisive step in consequence of that vote; and a few days afterwards it was announced that as soon as the necessary business could be got through, Parliament would be dissolved and an appeal made to the country. On the last day of July the dissolution took place, and the elections came on in November. Not for many years had there been so important a general election. The keenest anxiety prevailed as to its results. The new constituencies created by the Reform Bill were to give their votes for the first time. The question at issue was not merely the existence of the Irish State Church. It was a general struggle of advanced Liberalism against Toryism. . . . The new Parliament was to all appearance less marked in its Liberalism than that which had gone before it. But so far as mere numbers went the Liberal party was much stronger than it had been. In the new House of Commons it could count upon a majority of about 120, whereas in the late Parliament it had but 60. Mr. Gladstone it was clear would now have everything in his own hands, and the country might look for a career of energetic reform. . . . Mr. Disraeli did not meet the new Parliament as Prime Minister. He decided very properly that it would be a mere waste of public time to wait for the formal vote of the House of Commons, which would inevitably command him to surrender. He at once resigned his office, and Mr. Gladstone was immediately sent for by the Queen, and invited to form an Administration. Mr. Gladstone, it would seem, was only beginning his career. He was nearly sixty years of age, but there were scarcely any evidences of advancing years to be seen on his face. . . . The Government he formed was one of remarkable strength. . . . Mr. Gladstone went to work at once with his Irish policy. On March 1, 1869, the Prime

Minister introduced his measure for the disestablishment and partial disendowment of the Irish State Church. The proposals of the Government were, that the Irish Church should almost at once cease to exist as a State Establishment, and should pass into the condition of a free Episcopal Church. As a matter of course the Irish bishops were to lose their seats in the House of Lords. A synodal, or governing body, was to be elected from the clergy and laity of the Church and was to be recognised by the Government, and duly incorporated. The union between the Churches of England and Ireland was to be dissolved, and the Irish Ecclesiastical Courts were to be abolished. There were various and complicated arrangements for the protection of the life interests of those already holding positions in the Irish Church, and for the appropriation of the fund which would return to the possession of the State when all these interests had been fairly considered and dealt with. . . . Many amendments were introduced and discussed; and some of these led to a controversy between the two Houses of Parliament; but the controversy ended in compromise. On July 26, 1869, the measure for the disestablishment of the Irish Church received the royal assent. Lord Derby did not long survive the passing of the measure which he had opposed with such fervour and so much pathetic dignity. He died before the Irish State Church had ceased to live. . . . When the Irish Church had been disposed of, Mr. Gladstone at once directed his energies to the Irish land system. . . . In a speech delivered by him during his electioneering campaign in Lancashire, he had declared that the Irish upas-tree had three great branches: the State Church, the Land Tenure System, and the System of Education, and that he meant to hew them all down if he could. On February 15, 1870, Mr. Gladstone introduced his Irish Land Bill into the House of Commons. . . . It recognised a certain property or partnership of the tenant in the land which he tilled. Mr. Gladstone took the Ulster tenant-right as he found it, and made it a legal institution. In places where the Ulster practice, or something analogous to it, did not exist, he threw upon the landlord the burden of proof as regarded the right of eviction. The tenant disturbed in the possession of his land could claim compensation for improvements, and the bill reversed the existing assumption of the law by presuming all improvements to be the property of the tenant, and leaving it to the landlord, if he could, to prove the contrary. The bill established a special judiciary machinery for carrying out its provisions. . . . It put an end to the reign of the landlord's absolute power; it reduced the landlord to the level of every other proprietor, of every other man in the country who had anything to sell or hire. . . . The bill passed without substantial alteration. On August 1, 1870, the bill received the Royal assent. The second branch of the upas-tree had been hewn down. . . . Mr. Gladstone had dealt with Church and land; he had yet to deal with university education. He had gone with Irish Ideas thus far."—J. McCarthy, *Short Hist. of Our Own Times*, ch. 23.

ALSO IN: W. N. Molesworth, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1830-1874, v. 3, ch. 6.—*Annual Register*, 1869, pt. 1: *Eng. Hist.*, ch. 2-3, and 1870, ch. 1-2.

A. D. 1870.—The Education Bill. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—ENGLAND: A. D. 1699-1870.

A. D. 1871.—Abolition of Army Purchase and University Religious Tests.—Defeat of the Ballot Bill.—"The great measure of the Session [of 1871] was of course the Army Bill, which was introduced by Mr. Cardwell, on the 16th of February. It abolished the system by which rich men obtained by purchase commissions and promotion in the army, and provided £8,000,000 to buy all commissions, as they fell in, at their regulation and over-regulation value [the regulation value being a legal price, fixed by a Royal Warrant, but which in practice was never regarded]. In future, commissions were to be awarded either to those who won them by open competition, or who had served as subalterns in the Militia, or to deserving non-commissioned officers. . . . The debate, which seemed interminable, ended in an anti-climax that astonished the Tory Opposition. Mr. Disraeli threw over the advocates of Purchase, evidently dreading an appeal to the country. . . . The Army Regulation Bill thus passed the Second Reading without a division," and finally, with some amendments passed the House. "In the House of Lords the Bill was again obstructed. . . . Mr. Gladstone met them with a bold stroke. By statute it was enacted that only such terms of Purchase could exist as her Majesty chose to permit by Royal Warrant. The Queen, therefore, acting on Mr. Gladstone's advice, cancelled her warrant permitting Purchase, and thus the opposition of the Peers was crushed by what Mr. Disraeli indignantly termed 'the high-handed though not illegal' exercise of the Royal Prerogative. The rage of the Tory Peers knew no bounds." They "carried a vote of censure on the Government, who ignored it, and then their Lordships passed the Army Regulation Bill without any alterations. . . . The Session of 1871 was also made memorable by the struggle over the Ballot Bill, in the course of which nearly all the devices of factious obstruction were exhausted. . . . When the Bill reached the House of Lords, the real motive which dictated the . . . obstruction of the Conservative Opposition in the House of Commons was quickly revealed. The Lords rejected the Bill on the 18th of August, not merely because they disliked and dreaded it, but because it had come to them too late for proper consideration. Ministers were more successful with some other measures. In spite of much conservative opposition they passed a Bill abolishing religious tests in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and throwing open all academic distinctions and privileges except Divinity Degrees and Clerical Fellowships to students of all creeds and faiths."—R. Wilson, *Life and Times of Queen Victoria*, v. 2, ch. 16.

ALSO IN: G. W. E. Russell, *The Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1871-1872.—Renewed negotiations with the United States.—The Treaty of Washington and the Geneva Award. See ALABAMA CLAIMS: A. D. 1869-1871; 1871; and 1871-1872.

A. D. 1873-1879.—Rise of the Irish Home Rule Party and organization of the Land League. See IRELAND: A. D. 1873-1879.

A. D. 1873-1880.—Decline and fall of the Gladstone government.—Disraeli's Ministry.—His rise to the peerage, as Earl of Beaconsfield.—The Eastern Question.—Overthrow of the administration.—The Second Gladstone

Ministry.—"One of the little wars in which we had to engage broke out with the Ashantees, a misunderstanding resulting from our purchase of the Dutch possessions (1873) in their neighbourhood. Troops and marines under Wolseley . . . were sent out to West Africa. Crossing the Prah River, January 20th, 1874, he defeated the Ashantees on the last day of that month at a place called Amoafu, entered and burnt their capital, Coomassie, and made a treaty with their King, Koffee, by which he withdrew all claims of sovereignty over the tribes under our protection. The many Liberal measures carried by the Ministry caused moderate men to wish for a halt. Some restrictions on the licensed vintners turned that powerful body against the Administration, which, on attempting to carry an Irish University Bill in 1873, became suddenly aware of its unpopularity, as the second reading was only carried by a majority of three. Resignation followed. The erratic, but astute, Disraeli declined to undertake the responsibility of governing the country with the House of Commons then existing, consequently Mr. Gladstone resumed office; yet Conservative reaction progressed. He in September became Chancellor of the Exchequer (still holding the Premiership) and 23rd January, 1874, he suddenly dissolved Parliament, promising in a letter to the electors of Greenwich the final abolition of the income tax, and a reduction in some other 'imposts.' The elections went against him. The 'harassed' interests overturned the Ministry (17th February, 1874). . . . On the accession of the Conservative Government under Mr. Disraeli (February, 1874), the budget showed a balance of six millions in favour of the reduction of taxation. Consequently the sugar duties were abolished and the income tax reduced to 2d. in the pound. This, the ninth Parliament of Queen Victoria, sat for a little over six years. . . . Mr. Disraeli, now the Earl of Beaconsfield, was fond of giving the country surprises. One of these consisted in the purchase of the interest of the Khedive of Egypt in the Suez Canal for four millions sterling (February, 1876). Another was the acquisition of the Turkish Island of Cyprus, handed over for the guarantee to Turkey of her Asiatic provinces in the event of any future Russian encroachments. . . . As war had broken out in several of the Turkish provinces (1876), and as Russia had entered the lists for the insurgents against the Sultan, whom England was bound to support by solemn treaties, we were treated to a third surprise by the conveyance, in anticipation of a breach with Russia, of 7,000 troops from India to Malta. The Earl of Derby, looking upon this manoeuvre as a menace to that Power, resigned his office, which was filled by Lord Salisbury (1878). . . . The war proving disastrous to Turkey, the treaty of St. Stephano (February, 1878), was concluded with Russia, by which the latter acquired additional territory in Asia Minor in violation of the treaty of Paris (1856). Our Government strongly remonstrated, and war seemed imminent. Through the intercession, however, of Bismarck, the German Chancellor, war was averted, and a congress soon met in Berlin, at which Britain was represented by Lords Salisbury and Beaconsfield; the result being the sanction of the treaty already made, with the exception that the town of Erzeroum was handed back to Turkey. Our ambassadors

returned home rather pompously, the Prime Minister loftily declaring, that they had brought back 'peace with honour.' . . . Our expenses had rapidly increased, the wealthy commercial people began to distrust a Prime Minister who had brought us to the brink of war, the Irish debates, Irish poverty, and Irish outrages had brought with them more or less discredit on the Ministry. . . . The Parliament was dissolved March 24th, but the elections went so decisively in favour of the Liberals that Beaconsfield resigned (April 23rd). Early in the following year he appeared in his place in the House of Peers, but died April 19th. Though Mr. Gladstone had in 1875 relinquished the political leadership in favour of Lord Hartington yet the 'Bulgarian Atrocities' and other writings brought him again so prominent before the public that his leadership was universally acknowledged by the party. . . . He now resumed office, taking the two posts so frequently held before by Prime Ministers since the days of William Pitt, who also held them. . . . The result of the general election of 1880 was the return of more Liberals to Parliament than Conservatives and Home Rulers together. The farming interest continued depressed both in Great Britain and Ireland, resulting in thousands of acres being thrown on the landlords' hands in the former country, and numerous harsh evictions in the latter for non-payment of rent. Mr. Gladstone determined to legislate anew on the Irish Land Question: and (1881) carried through both Houses that admirable measure known as the Irish Land Act, which for the first time in the history of that country secured to the tenant remuneration for his own industry. A Land Commission Court was established to fix Fair Rents for a period of 15 years. After a time leaseholders were included in this beneficent legislation."—R. Johnston, *A Short Hist. of the Queen's Reign*, pp. 49-57.

ALSO IN: J. A. Froude, *Lord Beaconsfield*, ch. 16-17.—G. B. Smith, *Life of Gladstone*, ch. 22-28 (v. 2).—H. Jephson, *The Platform*, ch. 21-22 (v. 2).

A. D. 1877.—Assumption by the Queen of the title of Empress of India. See INDIA: A. D. 1877.

A. D. 1877-1878.—The Eastern Question again.—Bulgarian atrocities.—Excitement over the Russian successes in Turkey.—War-clamor of "the Jingoists."—The fleet sent through the Dardanelles.—Arrangement of the Berlin Congress. See BALKAN AND DANUBIAN STATES: A. D. 1875-1878; and TURKS: A. D. 1878.

A. D. 1877-1881.—Annexation of the Transvaal.—The Boer War. See SOUTH AFRICA: A. D. 1806-1881.

A. D. 1878.—The Congress of Berlin.—Acquisition of the control of Cyprus. See TURKS: A. D. 1878.

A. D. 1878-1880.—The second Afghan War. See AFGHANISTAN: A. D. 1869-1881.

A. D. 1880.—Breach between the Irish Party and the English Liberals.—Coercion Bill and Land Act. See IRELAND: A. D. 1880; and 1881-1882.

A. D. 1882.—War in Egypt. See EGYPT: A. D. 1875-1882, and 1882-1883.

A. D. 1883.—The Act for Prevention of Corrupt and Illegal Practices at Parliamentary

Elections.—"Prior to the General Election of 1880 there were those who hoped and believed that Corrupt Practices at Elections were decreasing. These hopes were based upon the growth of the constituencies and their increased political intelligence, and also upon the operation of the Ballot Act. The disclosures following the General Election proved to the most sanguine that this belief was an error. Corrupt practices were found to be more prevalent than ever. If in olden times larger aggregate sums were expended in bribery and treating, never probably had so many persons been bribed and treated as at the General Election of 1880. After that election nineteen petitions against returns on the ground of corrupt practices were presented. In eight instances the Judges reported that those practices had extensively prevailed, and in respect of seven of these the reports of the Commissioners appointed under the Act of 1852 demonstrated the alarming extent to which corruption of all kinds had grown. . . . A most serious feature in the Commissioners' Reports was the proof they afforded that bribery was regarded as a meritorious not as a disgraceful act. Thirty magistrates were reported as guilty of corrupt practices and removed from the Commission of the Peace by the Lord Chancellor. Mayors, aldermen, town-councillors, solicitors, the agents of the candidates, and others of a like class were found to have dealt with bribery as if it were a part of the necessary machinery for conducting an election. Worst of all, some of these persons had actually attained municipal honours, not only after they had committed these practices, but even after their misdeeds had been exposed by public inquiry. The Reports also showed, and a Parliamentary Return furnished still more conclusive proof, that election expenses were extravagant even to absurdity, and moreover were on the increase. The lowest estimate of the expenditure during the General Election of 1880 amounts to the enormous sum of two and a half millions. With another Reform Bill in view, the prospects of future elections were indeed alarming. . . . The necessity for some change was self-evident. Public opinion insisted that the subject should be dealt with, and the evil encountered. . . . The Queen's Speech of the 6th of January, 1881, announced that a measure 'for the repression of corrupt practices' would be submitted to Parliament, and on the following day the Attorney-General (Sir Henry James), in forcible and eloquent terms, moved for leave to introduce his Bill. His proposals (severe as they seemed) were received with general approval and sympathy, both inside and outside the House of Commons, at a time when members and constituents alike were ashamed of the excesses so recently brought to light. It is true that the two and a half years' delay that intervened between the introduction of the Bill and its finally becoming law (a delay caused by the necessities of Irish legislation), sufficed very considerably to cool the enthusiasm of Parliament and the public. Yet enough desire for reform remained to carry in July 1883 the Bill of January 1881, modified indeed in detail, but with its principles intact and its main provisions unaltered. The measure which has now become the Parliamentary Elections Act of 1883, was in its conception pervaded by two principles. The first was to strike hard and home at corrupt practices; the

second was to prohibit by positive legislation any expenditure in the conduct of an election which was not absolutely necessary. Bribery, undue influence, and personation, had long been crimes for which a man could be fined and imprisoned. Treating was now added to the same class of offences, and the punishment for all rendered more deterrent by a liability to hard labour. . . . Besides punishment on conviction, incapacities of a serious character are to result from a person being reported guilty of corrupt practices by Election Judges or Election Commissioners. . . . A candidate reported personally guilty of corrupt practices can never sit again for the same constituency, and is rendered incapable of being a member of the House of Commons for seven years. All persons, whether candidates or not, are, on being reported, rendered incapable of holding any public office or exercising any franchise for the same period. Moreover, if any persons so found guilty are magistrates, barristers, solicitors, or members of other honourable professions, they are to be reported to the Lord Chancellor, Inns of Court, High Court of Justice, or other authority controlling their profession, and dealt with as in the case of professional misconduct. Licensed victuallers are, in a similar manner, to be reported to the licensing justices, who may on the next occasion refuse to renew their licenses. . . . The employment of all paid assistants except a very limited number is forbidden; no conveyances are to be paid for, and only a restricted number of committee rooms are to be engaged. Unnecessary payments for the exhibition of bills and addresses, and for flags, bands, torches, and the like are declared illegal. But these prohibitions of specific objects were not considered sufficient. Had these alone been enacted, the money of wealthy and reckless candidates would have found other channels in which to flow. . . . And thus it was that the 'maximum scale' was adopted as at once the most direct and the most efficacious means of limiting expenditure. Whether by himself or his agents, by direct payment or by contract, the candidate is forbidden to spend more in 'the conduct and management of an election' than the sums permitted by the Act, sums which depend in each case on the numerical extent of the constituency."—H. Hobhouse, *The Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1883*, pp. 1-8.

A. D. 1884-1885.—The Third Reform Bill and the Redistribution Bill.—The existing qualifications and disqualifications of the Suffrage.—"Soon after Mr. Gladstone came into power in 1880, Mr. Trevelyan became a member of his Administration. Already the Premier had secured the co-operation of two other men new to office—Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke. . . . Their presence in the Administration was looked upon as a good augury by the Radicals, and the augury was not destined to prove misleading. It was understood from the first that, with such men as his coadjutors, Mr. Gladstone was pledged to a still further Reform. He was pledged already, in fact, by his speeches in Midlothian. . . . On the 17th of October, 1883, a great Conference was held at Leeds, for the purpose of considering the Liberal programme for the ensuing season. The Conference was attended by no fewer than 2,000 delegates, who represented upwards of 500 Liberal Associations.

It was presided over by Mr. John Morley. . . . To a man the delegates agreed as to the imperative necessity of household suffrage being extended to the counties; and almost to a man they agreed also as to the necessity of the measure being no longer delayed. . . . When Parliament met on the 5th of the following February . . . a measure for 'the enlargement of the occupation franchise in Parliamentary Elections throughout the United Kingdom' was distinctly promised in the Royal Speech; and the same evening Mr. Gladstone gave notice that 'on the first available day,' he would move for leave to bring in the bill. So much was the House of Commons occupied with affairs in Egypt and the Soudan, however, that it was not till the 29th of February that the Premier was able to fulfil his pledge. Four months were occupied in the passage of the bill through the House of Commons, and when it reached the Lords it was rejected. This roused "an intense feeling throughout the country. On the 21st of July, a great meeting was held in Hyde Park, attended, it was believed, by upwards of 100,000 persons. . . . On the 30th of July, a great meeting of delegates was held in St. James's Hall, London. . . . Mr. John Morley, who presided, used some words respecting the House that had rejected the bill which were instantly caught up by Reformers everywhere. 'Be sure,' he said, 'that no power on earth can separate henceforth the question of mending the House of Commons from the question of mending, or ending, the House of Lords.' On the 4th of August, Mr. Bright, speaking at Birmingham, referred to the Lords as 'many of them the spawn of the plunder and the wars and the corruption of the dark ages of our country'; and his colleague, Mr. Chamberlain, used even bolder words: 'During the last one hundred years the House of Lords has never contributed one iota to popular liberties or popular freedom, or done anything to advance the common weal; and during that time it has protected every abuse and sheltered every privilege. . . . It is irresponsible without independence, obstinate without courage, arbitrary without judgment, and arrogant without knowledge.' . . . In very many instances, a strong disposition was manifested to drop the agitation for the Reform of the House of Commons for a time, and to concentrate the whole strength of the Liberal party on one final struggle for the Reform (or, preferably, the extinction) of the Upper House." But Mr. Gladstone gave no encouragement to this inclination of his party. The outcome of the agitation was the passage of the Franchise Bill a second time in the House of Commons, in November, 1884, and by the Lords soon afterwards. A concession was made to the latter by previously satisfying them with regard to the contemplated redistribution of seats in the House of Commons, for which a separate bill was framed and introduced while the Franchise Bill was yet pending. The Redistribution Bill passed the Commons in May and the Lords in June, 1885.—W. Heaton, *The Three Reforms of Parliament*, ch. 6.—"In regard to electoral districts, the equalization, in other words, the radical refashioning of electoral districts, having about the same number of inhabitants, is carried out. For this purpose, 79 towns, having less than 15,000 inhabitants, are divested of the right of electing a separate member; 36 towns, with less than 50,000, return only one member; 14 large towns obtain an increase

of the number of the members in proportion to the population; 35 towns, of nearly 50,000, obtain a new franchise. The counties are throughout parcelled-out into 'electoral districts' of about the like population, to elect one member each. This single-seat system is, regularly, carried out in towns, with the exception of 28 middle-sized towns, which have been left with two members. The County of York forms, for example, 26 electoral districts; Liverpool 9. To sum up, the result stands thus:—the counties choose 253 members (formerly 187), the towns 237 (formerly 297). The average population of the county electoral districts is now 52,800 (formerly 70,800); the average number of the town electoral districts 52,700 (formerly 41,200). . . . The number of the newly-enfranchised is supposed, according to an average estimate, to be 2,000,000."—Dr. R. Gneist, *The English Parliament in its Transformations*, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: J. Murdoch, *Hist. of Const. Reform in Gt. Britain and Ireland*, pp. 277-398.—H. Jephson, *The Platform*, ch. 23 (v. 2).

The following is the text of the "Third Reform Act," which is entitled "The Representation of the People Act, 1884":

An Act to amend the Law relating to the Representation of the People of the United Kingdom. [6th December, 1884.]

Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. This Act may be cited as the Representation of the People Act, 1884.

2. A uniform household franchise and a uniform lodger franchise at elections shall be established in all counties and boroughs throughout the United Kingdom, and every man possessed of a household qualification or a lodger qualification shall, if the qualifying premises be situate in a county in England or Scotland, be entitled to be registered as a voter, and when registered to vote at an election for such county, and if the qualifying premises be situate in a county or borough in Ireland, be entitled to be registered as a voter, and when registered to vote at an election for such county or borough.

3. Where a man himself inhabits any dwelling-house by virtue of any office, service, or employment, and the dwelling-house is not inhabited by any person under whom such man serves in such office, service, or employment, he shall be deemed for the purposes of this Act and of the Representation of the People Acts to be an inhabitant occupier of such dwelling-house as a tenant.

4. Subject to the saving in this Act for existing voters, the following provisions shall have effect with reference to elections: (1.) A man shall not be entitled to be registered as a voter in respect of the ownership of any rentcharge except the owner of the whole of the tithe rentcharge of a rectory, vicarage, chapelry, or benefice to which an apportionment of tithe rentcharge shall have been made in respect of any portion of tithes. (2.) Where two or more men are owners either as joint tenants or as tenants in common of an estate in any land or tenement, one of such men, but not more than one, shall, if his interest is sufficient to confer a qualification as a voter in respect of the ownership of such estate, be entitled (in the like cases and subject to the like

conditions as if he were the sole owner) to be registered as a voter, and when registered to vote at an election. Provided that where such owners have derived their interest by descent, succession, marriage, marriage settlement, or will, or where they occupy the land or tenement, and are bonâ fide engaged as partners carrying on trade or business thereon, each of such owners whose interest is sufficient to confer on him a qualification as a voter shall be entitled (in the like cases and subject to the like conditions as if he were sole owner) to be registered as a voter in respect of such ownership, and when registered to vote at an election, and the value of the interest of each such owner where not otherwise legally defined shall be ascertained by the division of the total value of the land or tenement equally among the whole of such owners.

5. Every man occupying any land or tenement in a county or borough in the United Kingdom of a clear yearly value of not less than ten pounds shall be entitled to be registered as a voter and when registered to vote at an election for such county or borough in respect of such occupation subject to the like conditions respectively as a man is, at the passing of this Act, entitled to be registered as a voter and to vote at an election for such county in respect of the county occupation franchise, and at an election for such borough in respect of the borough occupation franchise.

6. A man shall not by virtue of this Act be entitled to be registered as a voter or to vote at any election for a county in respect of the occupation of any dwelling-house, lodgings, land, or tenement, situate in a borough.

7. (1.) In this Act the expression "a household qualification" means, as respects England and Ireland, the qualification enacted by the third section of the Representation of the People Act, 1867 [see comments appended to this text], and the enactments amending or affecting the same, and the said section and enactments so far as they are consistent with this Act, shall extend to counties in England and to counties and boroughs in Ireland. (2.) In the construction of the said enactments, as amended and applied to Ireland, the following dates shall be substituted for the dates therein mentioned, that is to say, the twentieth day of July for the fifteenth day of July, the first day of July for the twentieth day of July, and the first day of January for the fifth day of January. (3.) The expression "a lodger qualification" means the qualification enacted, as respects England, by the fourth section of the Representation of the People Act, 1867 [see comments appended to this text], and the enactments amending or affecting the same, and as respects Ireland, by the fourth section of the Representation of the People (Ireland) Act, 1868, and the enactments amending or affecting the same, and the said section of the English Act of 1867, and the enactments amending or affecting the same, shall, so far as they are consistent with this Act, extend to counties in England, and the said section of the Irish Act of 1868, and the enactments amending or affecting the same, shall, so far as they are consistent with this Act, extend to counties in Ireland; and sections five and six and twenty-two and twenty-three of the Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Act, 1878, so far as they relate to lodgings, shall apply to Ire-

land, and for the purpose of such application the reference in the said section six to the Representation of the People Act, 1867, shall be deemed to be made to the Representation of the People (Ireland) Act, 1868, and in the said section twenty-two of the Parliamentary and Municipal Registration Act, 1878, the reference to section thirteen of the Parliamentary Registration Act, 1843, shall be construed to refer to the enactments of the Registration Acts in Ireland relating to the making out, signing, publishing, and otherwise dealing with the lists of voters, and the reference to the Parliamentary Registration Acts shall be construed to refer to the Registration Acts in Ireland, and the following dates shall be substituted in Ireland for the dates in that section mentioned, that is to say, the twentieth day of July for the last day of July, and the fourteenth day of July for the twenty-fifth day of July, and the word "overseers" shall be construed to refer in a county to the clerk of the peace, and in a borough to the town clerk. (4.) The expression "a household qualification" means, as respects Scotland, the qualification enacted by the third section of the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act, 1868, and the enactments amending or affecting the same, and the said section and enactments shall, so far as they are consistent with this Act, extend to counties in Scotland, and for the purpose of the said section and enactments the expression "dwelling-house" in Scotland means any house or part of a house occupied as a separate dwelling, and this definition of a dwelling-house shall be substituted for the definition contained in section fifty-nine of the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act, 1868. (5.) The expression "a lodger qualification" means, as respects Scotland, the qualification enacted by the fourth section of the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act, 1868, and the enactments amending or affecting the same, and the said section and enactments, so far as they are consistent with this Act, shall extend to counties in Scotland. (6.) The expression "county occupation franchise" means, as respects England, the franchise enacted by the sixth section of the Representation of the People Act, 1867 [see comments appended to this text]; and, as respects Scotland, the franchise enacted by the sixth section of the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act, 1868; and, as respects Ireland, the franchise enacted by the first section of the Act of the session of the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter sixty-nine. (7.) The expression "borough occupation franchise" means, as respects England, the franchise enacted by the twenty-seventh section of the Act of the session of the second and third years of the reign of King William the Fourth, chapter forty-five [see comments appended to this text]; and as respects Scotland, the franchise enacted by the eleventh section of the Act of the session of the second and third years of the reign of King William the Fourth, chapter sixty-five; and as respects Ireland the franchise enacted by section five of the Act of the session of the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter sixty-nine, and the third section of the Representation of the People (Ireland) Act, 1868. (8.) Any enactments amending or relating to the county occupation franchise or borough occupation franchise other than the sections in

this Act in that behalf mentioned shall be deemed to be referred to in the definition of the county occupation franchise and the borough occupation franchise in this Act mentioned.

8. (1.) In this Act the expression "the Representation of the People Acts" means the enactments for the time being in force in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively relating to the representation of the people, inclusive of the Registration Acts as defined by this Act. (2.) The expression "the Registration Acts" means the enactments for the time being in force in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively, relating to the registration of persons entitled to vote at elections for counties and boroughs, inclusive of the Rating Acts as defined by this Act. (3.) The expressions "the Representation of the People Acts" and "the Registration Acts" respectively, where used in this Act, shall be read distributively in reference to the three parts of the United Kingdom as meaning in the case of each part the enactments for the time being in force in that part. (4.) All enactments of the Registration Acts which relate to the registration of persons entitled to vote in boroughs in England in respect of a household or a lodger qualification, and in boroughs in Ireland in respect of a lodger qualification, shall, with the necessary variations and with the necessary alterations of precepts, notices, lists, and other forms, extend to counties as well as to boroughs. (5.) All enactments of the Registration Acts which relate to the registration in counties and boroughs in Ireland of persons entitled to vote in respect of the county occupation franchise and the borough occupation franchise respectively, shall, with the necessary variations and with the necessary alterations of precepts, notices, lists, and other forms, extend respectively to the registration in counties and boroughs in Ireland of persons entitled to vote in respect of the household qualification conferred by this Act. (6.) In Scotland all enactments of the Registration Acts which relate to the registration of persons entitled to vote in burghs, including the provisions relating to dates, shall, with the necessary variations, and with the necessary alterations of notices and other forms, extend and apply to counties as well as to burghs; and the enactments of the said Acts which relate to the registration of persons entitled to vote in counties shall, so far as inconsistent with the enactments so applied, be repealed: Provided that in counties the valuation rolls, registers, and lists shall continue to be arranged in parishes as heretofore.

9. (1.) In this Act the expression "the Rating Acts" means the enactments for the time being in force in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively, relating to the placing of the names of occupiers on the rate book, or other enactments relating to rating in so far as they are auxiliary to or deal with the registration of persons entitled to vote at elections; and the expression "the Rating Acts" where used in this Act shall be read distributively in reference to the three parts of the United Kingdom as meaning in the case of each part the Acts for the time being in force in that part. (2.) In every part of the United Kingdom it shall be the duty of the overseers annually, in the months of April and May, or one of them, to inquire or ascertain with respect to every hereditament which comprises any dwelling-house or dwelling-houses within

the meaning of the Representation of the People Acts, whether any man, other than the owner or other person rated or liable to be rated in respect of such hereditament, is entitled to be registered as a voter in respect of his being an inhabitant occupier of any such dwelling-house, and to enter in the rate book the name of every man so entitled, and the situation or description of the dwelling-house in respect of which he is entitled, and for the purposes of such entry a separate column shall be added to the rate book. (3.) For the purpose of the execution of such duty the overseers may serve on the person who is the occupier or rated or liable to be rated in respect of such hereditament, or on some agent of such person concerned in the management of such hereditament, the requisition specified in the Third Schedule of this Act requiring that the form in that notice be accurately filled up and returned to the overseers within twenty-one days after such service; and if any such person or agent on whom such requisition is served fails to comply therewith, he shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding forty shillings, and any overseer who fails to perform his duty under this section shall be deemed guilty of a breach of duty in the execution of the Registration Acts, and shall be liable to be fined accordingly a sum not exceeding forty shillings for each default. (4.) The notice under this section may be served in manner provided by the Representation of the People Acts with respect to the service on occupiers of notice of non-payment of rates, and, where a body of persons, corporate or unincorporate, is rated, shall be served on the secretary or agent of such body of persons; and where the hereditament by reason of belonging to the Crown or otherwise is not rated, shall be served on the chief local officer having the superintendence or control of such hereditament. (5.) In the application of this section to Scotland the expression rate book means the valuation roll, and where a man entered on the valuation roll by virtue of this section inhabits a dwelling-house by virtue of any office, service, or employment, there shall not be entered in the valuation roll any rent or value against the name of such man as applicable to such dwelling-house, nor shall any such man by reason of such entry become liable to be rated in respect of such dwelling-house. (6.) The proviso in section two of the Act for the valuation of lands and heritages in Scotland passed in the session of the seventeenth and eighteenth years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ninety-one, and section fifteen of the Representation of the People (Scotland) Act, 1868, shall be repealed: Provided that in any county in Scotland the commissioners of supply, or the parochial board of any parish, or any other rating authority entitled to impose assessments according to the valuation roll, may, if they think fit, levy such assessments in respect of lands and heritages separately let for a shorter period than one year or at a rent not amounting to four pounds per annum in the same manner and from the same persons as if the names of the tenants and occupiers of such lands and heritages were not inserted in the valuation roll. (7.) In Ireland where the owner of a dwelling-house is rated instead of the occupier, the occupier shall nevertheless be entitled to be registered as a voter, and to vote under the same conditions under which

an occupier of a dwelling-house in England is entitled in pursuance of the Poor Rate Assessment and Collection Act, 1869, and the Acts amending the same, to be registered as a voter, and to vote where the owner is rated, and the enactments referred to in the First Schedule to this Act shall apply to Ireland accordingly, with the modifications in that schedule mentioned.

(8.) Both in England and Ireland where a man inhabits any dwelling-house by virtue of any office, service, or employment, and is deemed for the purposes of this Act and of the Representation of the People Acts to be an inhabitant occupier of such dwelling-house as a tenant, and another person is rated or liable to be rated for such dwelling-house, the rating of such other person shall for the purposes of this Act and of the Representation of the People Acts be deemed to be that of the inhabitant occupier; and the several enactments of the Poor Rate Assessment and Collection Act, 1869, and other Acts amending the same referred to in the First Schedule to this Act shall for those purposes apply to such inhabitant occupier, and in the construction of those enactments the word "owner" shall be deemed to include a person actually rated or liable to be rated as aforesaid. (9.) In any part of the United Kingdom where a man inhabits a dwelling-house in respect of which no person is rated by reason of such dwelling-house belonging to or being occupied on behalf of the Crown, or by reason of any other ground of exemption, such person shall not be disentitled to be registered as a voter, and to vote by reason only that no one is rated in respect of such dwelling-house, and that no rates are paid in respect of the same, and it shall be the duty of the persons making out the rate book or valuation roll to enter any such dwelling-house as last aforesaid in the rate book or valuation roll, together with the name of the inhabitant occupier thereof.

10. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any person (who at the date of the passing of this Act is registered in respect of any qualification to vote for any county or borough), of his right to be from time to time registered and to vote for such county or borough in respect of such qualification in like manner as if this Act had not passed. Provided that where a man is so registered in respect of the county or borough occupation franchise by virtue of a qualification which also qualifies him for the franchise under this Act, he shall be entitled to be registered in respect of such latter franchise only. Nothing in this Act shall confer on any man who is subject to any legal incapacity to be registered as a voter or to vote, any right to be registered as a voter or to vote.

11. This Act, so far as may be consistently with the tenor thereof, shall be construed as one with the Representation of the People Acts as defined by this Act; and the expressions "election," "county," and "borough," and other expressions in this Act and in the enactments applied by this Act, shall have the same meaning as in the said Acts. Provided that in this Act and the said enactments—The expression "overseers" includes assessors, guardians, clerks of unions, or other persons by whatever name known, who perform duties in relation to rating or to the registration of voters similar to those performed in relation to such matters by overseers in England. The expression "rentcharge"

includes a fee farm rent, a feu duty in Scotland, a rent seck, a chief rent, a rent of assize, and any rent or annuity granted out of land. The expression "land or tenement" includes any part of a house separately occupied for the purpose of any trade, business, or profession, and that expression, and also the expression "hereditament" when used in this Act, in Scotland includes "lands and heritages." The expressions "joint tenants" and "tenants in common" shall include "pro indiviso proprietors." The expression "clear yearly value" as applied to any land or tenement means in Scotland the annual value as appearing in the valuation roll, and in Ireland the net annual value at which the occupier of such land or tenement was rated under the last rate for the time being, under the Act of the session of the first and second years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter fifty-six, or any Acts amending the same.

12. Whereas the franchises conferred by this Act are in substitution for the franchises conferred by the enactments mentioned in the first and second parts of the Second Schedule hereto, be it enacted that the Acts mentioned in the first part of the said Second Schedule shall be repealed to the extent in the third column of that part of the said schedule mentioned except in so far as relates to the rights of persons saved by this Act; and the Acts mentioned in the second part of the said Second Schedule shall be repealed to the extent in the third column of that part of the said schedule mentioned, except in so far as relates to the rights of persons saved by this Act and except in so far as the enactments so repealed contain conditions made applicable by this Act to any franchise enacted by this Act.

13. This Act shall commence and come into operation on the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five: Provided that the register of voters in any county or borough in Scotland made in the last-mentioned year shall not come into force until the first day of January one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, and until that day the previous register of voters shall continue in force.

The following comments upon the foregoing act afford explanations which are needed for the understanding of some of its provisions:

"The introduction of the household franchise into counties is the main work of the Representation of the People Act, 1884. . . . The county household franchise is . . . made identical with the borough franchise created by the Reform Act of 1867 (30 & 31 Vict., c. 102), to which we must, therefore, turn for the definition of the one household franchise now established in both counties and boroughs throughout the United Kingdom. The third section of the Act in question provides that 'Every man shall in and after the year 1868 be entitled to be registered as a voter, and when registered to vote, for a member or members to serve in Parliament for a borough [we must now add "or for a county or division of a county"] who is qualified as follows:—(1.) Is of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity; (2.) Is on the last day of July [now July 15th] in any year, and has during the whole of the preceding twelve calendar months been an inhabitant occupier as owner or tenant of any dwelling house within the borough [or within a county or division of a county]; (3.) Has during the time of such occupation been rated as an ordinary

occupier in respect of the premises so occupied by him within the borough to all rates (if any) made for the relief of the poor in respect of such premises; and, (4.) Has on or before the 20th day of July in the same year bona fide paid an equal amount in the pound to that payable by other ordinary occupiers in respect of all poor rates that have been payable by him in respect of the said premises up to the preceding 5th day of January: Provided that no man shall under this section be entitled to be registered as a voter by reason of his being a joint occupier of any dwelling house. . . . The lodger franchise was the creation of the Reform Act of 1867 (30 & 31 Vict., c. 102), the 4th section of which conferred the suffrage upon lodgers who, being of full age and not subject to any legal incapacity, have occupied in the same borough lodgings 'of a clear yearly value, if let unfurnished, of £10 or upwards' for twelve months preceding the last day of July, and have claimed to be registered as voters at the next ensuing registration of voters. By this clause certain limitations or restrictions were imposed on the lodger franchise; but these were swept away by the 41 & 42 Vict., c. 26, the 6th section of which considerably enlarged the franchise by enacting that:—(1.) Lodgings occupied by a person in any year or two successive years shall not be deemed to be different lodgings by reason only that in that year or either of those years he has occupied some other rooms or place in addition to his original lodgings. (2.) For the purpose of qualifying a lodger to vote the occupation in immediate succession of different lodgings of the requisite value in the same house shall have the same effect as continued occupation of the same lodgings. (3.) Where lodgings are jointly occupied by more than one lodger, and the clear yearly value of the lodgings if let unfurnished is of an amount which, when divided by the number of the lodgers, gives a sum of not less than £10 for each lodger, then each lodger (if otherwise qualified and subject to the conditions of the Representation of the People Act, 1867) shall be entitled to be registered and when registered to vote as a lodger, provided that not more than two persons being such joint lodgers shall be entitled to be registered in respect of such lodgings. . . . Until the passing of the Representation of the People Act, 1884, no householder was qualified to vote unless he not only occupied a dwelling house, but occupied it either as owner or as the tenant of the owner. And where residence in an official or other house was necessary, or conducive to the efficient discharge of a man's duty or service, and was either expressly or impliedly made a part of such duty or service then the relation of landlord or tenant was held not to be created. The consequence was that a large number of persons who as officials, as employés, or as servants are required to reside in public buildings, on the premises of their employers or in houses assigned to them by their masters were held not to be entitled to the franchise. In future such persons will . . . be entitled to vote as inhabitant occupiers and tenants (under Section 3 of the recent Act), notwithstanding that they occupy their dwelling houses 'by virtue of any office, service or employment.' But this is subject to the condition that a subordinate cannot qualify or obtain a vote in respect of a dwelling house which is also inhabited by any person under whom 'such man serves in

such office, service or employment.' . . . Persons seized of (i. e., owning) an estate of inheritance (i. e., in fee simple or fee-tail) of freehold tenure, in lands or tenements, of the value of 40s. per annum, are entitled to a vote for the county or division of the county in which the estate is situated. This is the class of electors generally known as 'forty shilling freeholders.' Originally all freeholders were entitled to county votes, but by the 8 Henry VI., c. 7, it was provided that no freehold of a less annual value than 40s. should confer the franchise. Until the Reform Act of 1832, 40s. freeholders, whether their estate was one of inheritance or one for life or lives, were entitled to county votes. That Act, however, restricted the county freehold franchise by drawing a distinction between (1) freeholds of inheritance, and (2) freeholds not of inheritance. While the owners of the first class of freeholds were left in possession of their former rights (except when the property is situated within a Parliamentary borough), the owners of the latter were subjected to a variety of conditions and restrictions. . . . Before the passing of the Representation of the People Act, 1884, any number of persons might qualify and obtain county votes as joint owners of a freehold of inheritance, provided that it was of an annual value sufficient to give 40s. for each owner. But . . . this right is materially qualified by Section 4 of the recent Act. . . . Persons seized of an estate for life or lives of freehold tenure of the annual value of 40s., but of less than £5, are entitled to a county vote, provided that they (1) actually and bona fide occupy the premises, or (2) were seized of the property at the time of the passing of the 2 Will. IV., c. 45 (June 7th, 1832), or (3) have acquired the property after the date by marriage, marriage settlement, devise, or promotion to a benefice or office. . . . Persons seized of an estate for life or lives or of any larger estate in lands or tenements of any tenure whatever of the yearly value of £5 or upwards: This qualification is not confined to the ownership of freehold lands. Under the words 'of any tenure whatever' (30 & 31 Vict., c. 102, s. 5) copyholders have county votes if their property is of the annual value of £5. . . . The electoral qualifications in Scotland are defined by the 2 & 3 Will. IV., c. 65, the 31 & 32 Vict., c. 48, and the Representation of the People Act, 1884 (48 Vict., c. 3). The effect of the three Acts taken together is that the County franchises are as follows:—1. Owners of Land, &c., of the annual value of £5, after deducting feu duty, ground annual, or other considerations which an owner may be bound to pay or to give an account for as a condition of his right. 2. Leaseholders under a lease of not less than 57 years or for the life of the tenant of the clear yearly value of £10, or for a period of not less than 19 years when the clear yearly value is not less than £50, or the tenant is in actual personal occupancy of the land. 3. Occupiers of land, &c., of the clear yearly value of £10. 4. Householders. 5. Lodgers. 6. The service franchise. Borough franchises.—1. Occupiers of land or tenements of the annual value of £10. 2. Householders. 3. Lodgers. 4. The service franchise. The qualification for these franchises is in all material respects the same as for the corresponding franchises in the Scotch counties, and in the counties and boroughs of England and Wales. . . . The Acts relating to

the franchise in Ireland are 2 & 3 Will. IV., c. 88, 13 & 14 Vict., c. 69, the representation of the People (Ireland) Act, 1868, and the Representation of the People Act, 1884. Read together they give the following qualifications:—County franchisees.—1. Owners of freeholds of inheritance or of freeholds for lives renewable for ever rated to the poor at the annual value of £5. 2. Freeholders and copyholders of a clear annual value of £10. 3. Leaseholders of various terms and value. 4. Occupiers of land or a tenement of the clear annual value of £10. 5. Householders. 6. The lodger franchise. 7. The service franchise. Borough franchisees.—1. Occupiers of lands and tenements of the annual value of £10. 2. Householders. . . . 3. Lodgers. 4. The service franchise. 5. Freemen in certain boroughs. . . . All the franchises we have described . . . are subject to this condition, that no one, however qualified, can be registered or vote in respect of them if he is subjected to any legal incapacity to become or act as elector. . . . No alien unless certificated or naturalised, no minor, no lunatic or idiot, nor any person in such a state of drunkenness as to be incapable—is entitled to vote. Police magistrates in London and Dublin, and police officers throughout the country, including the members of the Royal Irish Constabulary, are disqualified from voting either generally or for constituencies within which their duties lie. In the case of the police the disqualification continues for six months after an officer has left the force. . . . Persons are disqualified who are convicted of treason or treason-felony, for which the sentence is death or penal servitude, or any term of imprisonment with hard labour or exceeding twelve months, until they have suffered their punishment (or such as may be substituted by competent authority), or until they receive a free pardon. Peers are disqualified from voting at the election of any member to serve in Parliament. A returning officer may not vote at any election for which he acts, unless the numbers are equal, when he may give a casting vote. No person is entitled to be registered in any year as a voter for any county or borough who has within twelve calendar months next previous to the last day of July in such year received parochial relief or other alms which by the law of Parliament disqualify from voting. Persons employed at an election for reward or payment are disqualified from voting thereat although they may be on the register. . . . The Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act, 1883, disqualifies a variety of offenders.”—W. A. Holdsworth, *The New Reform Act*, pp. 20-36.

A. D. 1884-1885.—Campaign in the Soudan for the relief of General Gordon. See EGYPT: A. D. 1884-1885.

A. D. 1884-1895.—Acquisitions in Africa. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884-1895, and after.

A. D. 1885.—The fall of the Gladstone government.—The brief first Ministry of Lord Salisbury.—“Almost simultaneously with the assembling of Parliament [February 19, 1885] had come the news of the fall of Khartoum and the death of General Gordon [see EGYPT: A. D. 1884-1885]. These terrible events sent a thrill of horror and indignation throughout the country, and the Government was severely condemned in many quarters for its procrastination. Mr. Gladstone, who was strongly moved by Gordon's death, rose to the situation, and announced that

it was necessary to overthrow the Mahdi at Khartoum, to renew operations against Osman Digma, and to construct a railway from Suakim to Berber with a view to a campaign in the autumn. A royal proclamation was issued calling out the reserves. Sir Stafford Northcote initiated a debate on the Soudan question with a motion affirming that the risks and sacrifices which the Government appeared to be ready to encounter could only be justified by a distinct recognition of our responsibility for Egypt, and those portions of the Soudan which are necessary to its security. Mr. John Morley introduced an amendment to the motion, waiving any judgment on the policy of the Ministry, but expressing regret at its decision to continue the conflict with the Mahdi. Mr. Gladstone skilfully dealt with both motion and amendment. Observing that it was impossible to give rigid pledges as to the future, he appealed to the Liberal party, if they had not made up their minds to condemn and punish the Government, to strengthen their hands by an unmistakable vote of confidence. The Government obtained a majority of 14, the votes being 302 in their favour with 288 against; but many of those who supported the Government had also voted for the amendment by Mr. Morley. . . . Financial questions were extremely embarrassing to the Government, and it was not until the 30th of April that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was ready with his financial statement. He was called upon to deal with a deficit of upwards of a million, with a greatly depressed revenue, and with an estimated expenditure for the current year—including the vote of credit—of no less than £100,000,000. Amongst Mr. Childers's proposals was one to levy upon land an amount of taxation proportioned to that levied on personal property. There was also an augmentation of the spirit duties and of the beer duty. The country members were dissatisfied and demanded that no new charges should be thrown on the land till the promised relief of local taxation had been carried out. The agricultural and the liquor interests were discontented, as well as the Scotch and Irish members with the whiskey duty. The Chancellor made some concessions, but they were not regarded as sufficient, and on the Monday after the Whitsun holidays, the Opposition joined battle on a motion by Sir M. Hicks Beach. . . . Mr. Gladstone stated at the close of the debate that the Government would resign if defeated. The amendment was carried against them by 264 to 252, and the Ministry went out. . . . Lord Salisbury became Premier. . . . The general election . . . [was] fixed for November 1885.”—G. B. Smith, *The Prime Ministers of Queen Victoria*, pp. 373-377.

A. D. 1885-1886.—The partition of East Africa with Germany. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884-1891.

A. D. 1885-1886.—Mr. Gladstone's return to power.—His Home Rule Bill for Ireland and his Irish Land Bill.—Their defeat.—Division of the Liberal Party.—Lord Salisbury's Ministry.—“The House of Commons which had been elected in November and December, 1885, was the first House of Commons which represented the whole body of the householders and lodgers of the United Kingdom. The result of the appeal to new constituencies and an enlarged electorate had taken all parties by surprise. The Tories found themselves, by the help of their Irish

allies, successful in the towns beyond all their hopes; the Liberals, disappointed in the boroughs, had found compensation in unexpected successes in the counties; and the Irish Nationalists had almost swept the board. . . . The English representation — exclusive of one Irish Nationalist for Liverpool — gave a liberal majority of 28 in the English constituencies; which Wales and Scotland swelled to 106. The Irish representation had undergone a still more remarkable change. Of 103 members for the sister island, 85 were Home Rulers and only 18 were Tories. . . . The new House of Commons was exactly divided between the Liberals on one side and the Tories with their Irish allies on the other. Of its 670 members just one-half, or 335, were Liberals, 249 were Tories, and 86 were Irish Nationalists [for Home Rulers]. . . . It was soon clear enough that the alliance between the Tory Ministers and the Irish Nationalists was at an end." On the 25th of January 1886, the Government was defeated on an amendment to the address, and on the 28th it resigned. Mr. Gladstone was invited to form a Ministry and did so with Lord Herschell for Lord Chancellor, Sir William Harcourt for Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Childers for Home Secretary, Lord Granville for Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. John Morley for Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Mr. Chamberlain for President of the Local Government Board. On the 29th of March "Mr. Gladstone announced in the House of Commons that on the 8th of April he would ask for leave to bring in a bill 'to amend the provision for the future government of Ireland'; and that on the 15th he would ask leave to bring in a measure 'to make amended provision for the sale and purchase of land in Ireland.'" The same day Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan (Secretary for Ireland) resigned their seats in the Cabinet, and it was generally understood that differences of opinion on the Irish bills had arisen. On the 8th of April the House of Commons was densely crowded when Mr. Gladstone introduced his measure for giving Home Rule to Ireland. In a speech which lasted three hours and a half he set forth the details of his plan and the reasons on which they were based. The essential conditions observed in the framing of the measure, as he defined them, were these: "The unity of the Empire must not be placed in jeopardy; the minority must be protected; the political equality of the three countries must be maintained, and there must be an equitable distribution of Imperial burdens. He then discussed some proposals which had been made for the special treatment of Ulster — its exclusion from the bill, its separate autonomy or the reservation of certain matters, such as education, for Provincial Councils; all of which he rejected. The establishment of an Irish legislature involved the removal of Irish peers from the House of Lords and the Irish representatives from the House of Commons. But if Ireland was not represented at Westminster, how was it to be taxed? The English people would never force on Ireland taxation without representation. The taxing power would be in the hands of the Irish legislature, but Customs and Excise duties connected with Customs would be solely in the control of the Imperial Parliament, Ireland's share in these being reserved for Ireland's use. Ireland must have security against her Magna Charta being tampered with; the provision of the Act would

therefore only be capable of modification with the concurrence of the Irish legislature, or after the recall of the Irish members to the two Houses of Parliament. The Irish legislature would have all the powers which were not specially reserved from it in the Act. It was to consist of two orders, though not two Houses. It would be subject to all the prerogatives of the Crown; it would have nothing to do with Army or Navy, or with Foreign or Colonial relations; nor could it modify the Act on which its own authority was based. Contracts, charters, questions of education, religious endowments and establishments, would be beyond its authority. Trade and navigation, coinage, currency, weights and measures, copyright, census, quarantine laws, and some other matters, were not to be within the powers of the Irish Parliament. The composition of the legislature was to be first, the 103 members now representing Ireland with 101, elected by the same constituencies, with the exception of the University, with power to the Irish legislature to give two members to the Royal University if it chose; then the present Irish members of the House of Lords, with 75 elected by the Irish people under a property qualification. The Viceroyalty was to be left, but the Viceroy was not to quit office with an outgoing government, and no religious disability was to affect his appointment. He would have a Privy Council, and the executive would remain as at present, but might be changed by the action of the legislative body. The present judges would preserve their lien on the Consolidated Fund of Great Britain, and the Queen would be empowered to antedate their pensions if it was seen to be desirable. Future judges, with the exception of two in the Court of Exchequer, would be appointed by the Irish government, and, like English judges, would hold their office during good behaviour. The Constabulary would remain under its present administration, Great Britain paying all charges over a million. Eventually, however, the whole police of Ireland would be under the Irish government. The civil servants would have two years' grace, with a choice of retirement on pension before passing under the Irish executive. Of the financial arrangements Mr. Gladstone spoke in careful and minute detail. He fixed the proportion of Imperial charges Ireland should pay at one-fifteenth, or in other words she would pay one part and Great Britain fourteen parts. More than a million of duty is paid on spirits in Ireland which come to Great Britain, and this would be practically a contribution towards the Irish revenue. So with Irish porter and with the tobacco manufactured in Ireland and sold here. Altogether the British taxpayers would contribute in this way £1,400,000 a year to the Irish Exchequer; reducing the actual payment of Ireland itself for Imperial affairs to one-twenty-sixth." On the 16th of April Mr. Gladstone introduced his Irish Land Bill, connecting it with the Home Rule Bill as forming part of one great measure for the pacification of Ireland. In the meantime the opposition to his policy within the ranks of the Liberal party had been rapidly taking form. It was led by Lord Hartington, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Trevelyan, Sir Henry James, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Goschen, and Mr. Courtney. It soon received the support of Mr. John Bright. The debate in the House, which lasted until the 3rd of June, was passionate and bitter. It ended in

the defeat of the Government by a majority of 30 against the bill. The division was the largest which had ever been taken in the House of Commons, 657 members being present. The majority was made up of 249 Conservatives and 94 Liberals. The minority consisted of 223 Liberals and 85 Nationalists. Mr. Gladstone appealed to the country by a dissolution of Parliament. The elections were adverse to him, resulting in the return to Parliament of members representing the several parties and sections of parties as follows: Home Rule Liberals, or Gladstonians, 194, Irish Nationalists 85—total 279; seceding Liberals 75, Conservatives 316—total 391. Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues resigned and a new Ministry was formed under Lord Salisbury. The Liberals, in alliance with the Conservatives and giving their support to Lord Salisbury's Government, became organized as a distinct party under the leadership of Lord Hartington, and took the name of Liberal Unionists.—P. W. Clayden, *England under the Coalition*, ch. 1-6.

ALSO IN: H. D. Traill, *The Marquis of Salisbury*, ch. 12.—*Annual Register*, 1885, 1886.

A. D. 1885-1888.—Termination of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington.—Renewed controversies with the United States.—The rejected Treaty. See FISHERIES, NORTH AMERICAN: A. D. 1877-1888.

A. D. 1886.—Defeat of Mr. Parnell's Tenants' Relief Bill.—The plan of campaign in Ireland. See IRELAND: A. D. 1886.

A. D. 1886-1893.—The Bering Sea Controversy and Arbitration. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1886-1893.

A. D. 1890.—Settlement of African questions with Germany.—Cession of Heligoland. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884-1889.

A. D. 1891.—The Free Education Bill. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—ENGLAND: A. D. 1891.

A. D. 1892-1893.—The fourth Gladstone Ministry.—Passage of the Irish Home Rule Bill by the House of Commons.—Its defeat by the Lords.—On the 28th of June, 1892, Parliament was dissolved, having been in existence since 1886, and a new Parliament was summoned to meet on the 4th of August. Great excitement prevailed in the ensuing elections, which turned almost entirely on the question of Home Rule for Ireland. The Liberal or Gladstonian party, favoring Home Rule, won a majority of 42 in the House of Commons; but in the representation of England alone there was a majority of 70 returned against it. In Ireland, the representation returned was 103 for Home Rule, and 23 against; in Scotland, 51 for and 21 against; in Wales, 28 for and 2 against. Conservatives and Liberal Unionists (opposing Home Rule) lost little ground in the boroughs, as compared with the previous Parliament, but largely in the counties. As the result of the election, Lord Salisbury and his Ministry resigned August 12, and Mr. Gladstone was summoned to form a Government. In the new Cabinet, which was announced four days later, Earl Rosebery became Foreign Secretary; Baron Herschell, Lord Chancellor; Sir William Vernon Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer; Mr. Herbert H. Asquith, Home Secretary; and Mr. John Morley, Chief Secretary for Ireland. Although the new Parliament assembled in August, 1892, it was not until the 13th of February following that Mr. Gladstone introduced his bill

to establish Home Rule in Ireland. The bill was under debate in the House of Commons until the night of September 1, 1893, when it passed that body by a vote of 301 to 267. "The bill provides for a Legislature for Ireland, consisting of the Queen and of two Houses—the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly. This Legislature, with certain restrictions, is authorized to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Ireland in respect of matters exclusively relating to Ireland or some part thereof. The bill says that the powers of the Irish Legislature shall not extend to the making of any law respecting the establishment or endowment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or imposing any disability or conferring any privilege on account of religious belief, or whereby any person may be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or whereby private property may be taken without just compensation. According to the bill the executive power in Ireland shall continue vested in her Majesty the Queen, and the Lord Lieutenant, on behalf of her Majesty, shall exercise any prerogatives or other executive power of the Queen the exercise of which may be delegated to him by her Majesty, and shall in the Queen's name summon, prorogue, and dissolve the Legislature. An Executive Committee of the Privy Council of Ireland is provided for, which 'shall aid and advise in the government of Ireland.' The Lord Lieutenant, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, is authorized to give or withhold the assent of her Majesty to bills passed by the houses of the Legislature. The Legislative Council by the terms of the bill shall consist of forty-eight Councillors. Every man shall be entitled to vote for a Councillor who owns or occupies any land or tenement of a rateable value of £20. The term of office of the Councillors is to be for eight years, which is not to be affected by dissolution, but one-half of the Councillors shall retire in every fourth year and their seats be filled by a new election. The Legislative Assembly is to consist of 103 members returned by the Parliamentary constituencies existing at present in Ireland. This Assembly, unless sooner dissolved, may exist for five years. The bill also provides for 80 Irish members in the House of Commons. In regard to finance, the bill provides that for the purposes of this act the public revenue shall be divided into general revenue and special revenue, and general revenue shall consist of the gross revenue collected in Ireland from taxes; the portion due to Ireland of the hereditary revenues of the crown which are managed by the Commissioners of Woods, an annual sum for the customs and excise duties collected in Great Britain on articles consumed in Ireland, provided that an annual sum of the customs and excise duties collected in Ireland on articles consumed in Great Britain shall be deducted from the revenue collected in Ireland and treated as revenue collected in Great Britain; these annual sums to be determined by a committee appointed jointly by the Irish Government and the Imperial Treasury. It is also provided that one-third of the general revenue of Ireland and also that portion of any imperial miscellaneous revenue to which Ireland may claim to be entitled shall be paid into the Treasury of the United Kingdom as the contribution of Ireland to imperial liabilities and expenditures; this plan to continue for a term of

six years, at the end of which time a new scheme of tax division shall be devised. The Legislature, in order to meet expenses of the public service, is authorized to impose taxes other than those now existing in Ireland. Ireland should also have charged up against her and be compelled to pay out of her own Treasury all salaries and pensions of Judges and liabilities of all kinds which Great Britain has assumed for her benefit. The bill further provides that appeal from courts in Ireland to the House of Lords shall cease and that all persons having the right of appeal shall have a like right to appeal to the Queen in coun-

ENGLE.—ENGLISH. See **ANGLÉS AND JUTES**; also, **ENGLAND**: A. D. 547-633.

ENGLISH PALE, The. See **PALE, THE ENGLISH**.

ENGLISH SWEAT, The. See **SWEATING SICKNESS**.

ENGLISHRY.—To check the assassination of his tyrannical Norman followers by the exasperated English, William the Conqueror ordained that the whole Hundred within which one was slain should pay a heavy penalty. "In connexion with this enactment there grew up the famous law of 'Englishry,' by which every murdered man was presumed to be a Norman, unless proofs of 'Englishry' were made by the four nearest relatives of the deceased. 'Presentments of Englishry,' as they were technically termed, are recorded in the reign of Richard I., but not later."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist.*, p. 68.

ENNISKILLEN, The defence of. See **IRELAND**: A. D. 1688-1689.

ENOMOTY, The.—In the Spartan military organization the enomoty "was a small company of men, the number of whom was variable, being given differently at 25, 32, or 36 men,—drilled and practised together in military evolutions, and bound to each other by a common oath. Each Enomoty had a separate captain or enomotarch, the strongest and ablest soldier of the company."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 8.

ENRIQUE. See **HENRY**.

ENSISHEIM, Battle of (1674). See **NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND)**: A. D. 1674-1678.

EORL AND CEORL.—"The modern English forms of these words have completely lost their ancient meaning. The word 'Earl,' after several fluctuations, has settled down as the title of one rank in the Peerage; the word 'Churl' has come to be a word of moral reprobation, irrespective of the rank of the person who is guilty of the offence. But in the primary meaning of the words, 'Eorl' and 'Ceorl'—words whose happy jingle causes them to be constantly opposed to each other—form an exhaustive division of the free members of the state. The distinction in modern language is most nearly expressed by the words 'Gentle' and 'Simple.' The 'Ceorl' is the simple freeman, the mere unit in the army or in the assembly, whom no distinction of birth or office marks out from his fellows."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of the Norman Conq. of Eng.*, ch. 3, sect. 2.—See, also, **ETHEL**; and **ENGLAND**: A. D. 958.

EORMEN STREET. See **ERMYN STREET**.

EPAMINONDAS, and the greatness of Thebes. See **GREECE**: B. C. 379-371, and 371-362; also **THEBES**: B. C. 378.

EPEIROS. See **EPÍROS**.

cil. The term of office of the Lord Lieutenant is fixed at six years. Ultimately the Royal Irish Constabulary shall cease to exist and no force other than the ordinary civil police shall be permitted to be formed. "The Irish Legislature shall be summoned to meet on the first Tuesday in September, 1894, and the first election for members shall be held at such time before that day as may be fixed by her Majesty in council." In the House of Lords, the bill was defeated on the 8th of September—the second reading postponed to a day six months from that date—by the overwhelming vote of 419 to 41.

EPHAH, The.—"The ephah, or bath, was the unit of measures of capacity for both liquids and grain [among the ancient Jews]. The ephah is considered by Queipo to have been the measure of water contained in the ancient Egyptian cubic foot, and thus equivalent to 29.376 litres, or 6.468 imperial gallons, and to have been nearly identical with the ancient Egyptian artaba and the Greek metretres. For liquids, the ephah was divided into six hin, and the twelfth part of the hin was the log. As a grain measure, the ephah was divided into ten omers, or gomers. The omer measure of manna gathered by the Israelites in the desert as a day's food for each adult person was thus equal to 2.6 imperial quarts. The largest measure of capacity both for liquids and dry commodities was the cor of twelve ephahs."—H. W. Chisholm, *On the Science of Weighing and Measuring*, ch. 2.

EPHES-DAMMIM, Battle of.—The battle which followed David's encounter with Goliath, the gigantic Philistine.—1 *Sam.*, xvii.

EPHESIA, The. See **IONIC (PAN-IONIC) AMPHIKTYONY**.

EPHESUS.—The Ephesian Temple.—"The ancient city of Ephesus was situated on the river Cayster, which falls into the Bay of Scala Nova, on the western coast of Asia Minor. Of the origin and foundation of Ephesus we have no historical record. Stories were told which ascribed the settlement of the place to Androklos, the son of the Athenian king, Codrus. . . . With other Ionian cities of Asia Minor, Ephesus fell into the hands of Cræsus, the last of the kings of Lydia, and, on the overthrow of Cræsus by Cyrus, it passed under the heavier yoke of the Persian despot. Although from that time, during a period of at least five centuries, to the conquest by the Romans, the city underwent great changes of fortune, it never lost its grandeur and importance. The Temple of Artemis (Diana), whose splendour has almost become proverbial, tended chiefly to make Ephesus the most attractive and notable of all the cities of Asia Minor. Its magnificent harbour was filled with Greek and Phœnician merchantmen, and multitudes flocked from all parts to profit by its commerce and to worship at the shrine of its tutelary goddess. The City Port was fully four miles from the sea, which has not, as has been supposed, receded far. . . . During the generations which immediately followed the conquest of Lydia and the rest of Asia Minor by the Persian kings, the arts of Greece attained their highest perfection, and it was within this short period of little more than two centuries that the great Temple of Artemis was three times built upon the same site, and, as recent researches have found, each

time on the same grand scale."—J. T. Wood, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, ch. 1.—The excavations which were carried on at Ephesus by Mr. Wood, for the British Museum, during eleven years, from 1863 until 1874, resulted in the uncovering of a large part of the site of the great Temple and the determining of its architectural features, besides bringing to light many inscriptions and much valuable sculpture. The account given in the work named above is exceedingly interesting.

Ionian conquest and occupation. See **ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES.**

Ancient Commerce.—"The spot on the Asiatic coast which corresponded most nearly with Corinth on the European, was Ephesus, a city which, in the time of Herodotus, had been the starting point of caravans for Upper Asia, but which, under the change of dynasties and ruin of empires, had dwindled into a mere provincial town. The mild sway of Augustus restored it to wealth and eminence, and as the official capital of the province of Asia, it was reputed to be the metropolis of no less than 500 cities."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 40.

A. D. 267.—Destruction by the Goths of the Temple of Diana. See **GOths**: A. D. 258–267.

A. D. 431 and 449.—The General Council and the "Robber Synod." See **NESTORIAN AND MONOPHYSITE CONTROVERSY.**

EPHETÆ, The.—A board of fifty-one judges instituted by the legislation of Draco, at Athens, for the trial of crimes of bloodshed upon the Areopagus.—G. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

EPHORS.—"Magistrates, called by the name of Ephors, existed in many Dorian as well as in other States [of ancient Greece], although our knowledge with regard to them extends no further than to the fact of their existence; while the name, which signifies quite generally 'overseers,' affords room for no conclusion as to their political position or importance. In Sparta, however, the Board of Five Ephors became, in the course of time, a magistracy of such dignity and influence that no other can be found in any free State with which it can be compared. Concerning its first institution nothing certain can be ascertained. . . . The following appears to be a probable account:—The Ephors were originally magistrates appointed by the kings, partly to render them special assistance in the judicial decision of private disputes,—a function which they continued to exercise in later times,—partly to undertake, as lieutenants of the kings, other of their functions, during their absence in military service, or through some other cause. . . . When the monarchy and the Gerousia wished to re-establish their ancient influence in opposition to the popular assembly, they were obliged to agree to a concession which should give some security to the people that this power should not be abused to their detriment. This concession consisted in the fact that the Ephors were independently authorized to exercise control over the kings themselves. . . . The Ephors were enabled to interfere in every department of the administration, and to remove or punish whatever they found to be contrary to the laws or adverse to the public interest."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 1, sect. 8.—See, also, **SPARTA: THE CONSTITUTION**, &c.

EPHTHALITES, The. See **HUNS, THE WHITE.**

EPIDAMNUS. See **GREECE**: B. C. 435–432; and **KORKYRA.**

EPIDII, The. See **BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.**

EPIGAMIA.—The right of marriage in ancient Athens.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

EPIGONI, The. See **BEOTIA.**

EPIPOLÆ.—One of the parts or divisions of the ancient city of Syracuse, Sicily.

EPIROT LEAGUE, The.—"The temporary greatness of the Molossian kingdom [of Epeiros, or Epirus] under Alexander and Pyrrhus is matter of general history. Our immediate business is with the republican government which succeeded on the bloody extinction of royalty and the royal line [which occurred B. C. 239]. Epeiros now became a republic; of the details of its constitution we know nothing, but its form can hardly fail to have been federal. The Epeirots formed one political body; Polybios always speaks of them, like the Achæians and Akarnanians, as one people acting with one will. Decrees are passed, ambassadors are sent and received, in the name of the whole Epeirot people, and Epeiros had, like Akarnania, a federal coinage bearing the common name of the whole nation."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Govt.*, bk. 4, sect. 1.

EPIRUS.—THE EPIROTS.—"Passing over the borders of Akarnania [in ancient western Greece] we find small nations or tribes not considered as Greeks, but known, from the fourth century B. C. downwards, under the common name of Epirots. This word signifies, properly, inhabitants of a continent, as opposed to those of an island or a peninsula. It came only gradually to be applied by the Greeks as their comprehensive denomination to designate all those diverse tribes, between the Ambrakian Gulf on the south and west, Pindus on the east, and the Illyrians and Macedonians to the north and north-east. Of these Epirots the principal were—the Chaonians, Thesprotians, Kassopians, and Molossians, who occupied the country inland as well as maritime along the Ionian Sea, from the Akroeraunian mountains to the borders of Ambrakia in the interior of the Ambrakian Gulf. . . . Among these various tribes it is difficult to discriminate the semi-Hellenic from the non-Hellenic; for Herodotus considers both Molossians and Thesprotians as Hellenic,—and the oracle of Dôdôna, as well as the Nekyomanteion (or holy cavern for evoking the dead) of Acheron, were both in the territory of the Thesprotians, and both (in the time of the historian) Hellenic. Thucydides, on the other hand, treats both Molossians and Thesprotians as barbaric. . . . Epirus is essentially a pastoral country: its cattle as well as its shepherds and shepherds' dogs were celebrated throughout all antiquity; and its population then, as now, found divided village residence the most suitable to their means and occupations. . . . Both the Chaonians and Thesprotians appear, in the time of Thucydides, as having no kings: there was a privileged kingly race, but the presiding chief was changed from year to year. The Molossians, however, had a line of kings, succeeding from father to son, which professed to trace its descent through fifteen generations downward from Achilles and Neoptolemus to Tharypas about the year 400

B. C."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 24.—The Molossian kings subsequently extended their sovereignty over the whole country and styled themselves kings of Epirus. Pyrrhus, whose war with Rome (see **ROME**: B. C. 282–275) is one of the well known episodes of history, was the most ambitious and energetic of the dynasty (see **MACEDONIA**: B. C. 297–280); Hannibal reckoned him among the greatest of soldiers. In the next century Epirus fell under the dominion of Rome. Subsequently it formed part of the Byzantine empire; then became a separate principality, ruled by a branch of the imperial Comnenian family; was conquered by the Turks in 1466 and is now represented by the southern half of the province of Turkey, called Albania.—See, also, **CENOTRIANS**.

A. D. 1204–1350.—The Greek Despotat.—From the ruins of the Byzantine empire, overthrown by the Crusaders and the Venetians in 1204, "that portion . . . situated to the west of the range of Pindus was saved from feudal domination by Michael, a natural son of Constantine Angelos, the uncle of the Emperors Isaac II. and Alexius III. After the conquest of Constantinople, he escaped into Epirus, where his marriage with a lady of the country gave him some influence; and assuming the direction of the administration of the whole country from Dyrrachium to Naupactus, he collected a considerable military force, and established the seat of his authority generally at Ioannina or Arta. . . . History has unfortunately preserved very little information concerning the organisation and social condition of the different classes and races which inhabited the dominions of the princes of Epirus. Almost the only facts that have been preserved relate to the wars and alliances of the despots and their families with the Byzantine emperors and the Latin princes. . . . They all assumed the name of Angelos Komnenos Dukas; and the title of despot, by which they are generally distinguished, was a Byzantine honorary distinction, never borne by the earlier members of the family until it had been conferred on them by the Greek emperor. Michael I, the founder of the despotat, distinguished himself by his talents as a soldier and a negotiator. He extended his authority over all Epirus, Acarnania and Etolia, and a part of Macedonia and Thessaly. Though virtually independent, he acknowledged Theodore I. (Laskaris), [at Nicæa] as the lawful emperor of the East." The able and unscrupulous brother of Michael, Theodore, who became his successor in 1214, extinguished by conquest the Lombard kingdom of Saloniki, in Macedonia (A. D. 1222), and assumed the title of emperor, in rivalry with the Greek emperor at Nicæa, establishing his capital at Thessalonica. The empire of Thessalonica was short lived. Its capital was taken by the emperor of Nicæa, in 1234, and Michael's son John, then reigning, was forced to resign the imperial title. The despotat of Epirus survived for another century, much torn and distracted by wars and domestic conflicts. In 1350 its remaining territory was occupied by the king of Servia, and finally it was swallowed up in the conquests of the Turks.—G. Finlay, *Hist. of Greece from its Conquest by the Crusaders*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: Sir J. E. Tennent, *Hist. of Modern Greece*, ch. 3.

Modern History. See **ALBANIANS**.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH. See **CHURCH OF ENGLAND**.

EPISTATES.—The presiding officer of the ancient Athenian council and popular assembly.

EPONYM.—**EPONYMUS.**—The name-giver,—the name-giving hero of primitive myths, in which tribes and races of people set before themselves, partly by tradition, partly by imagination, an heroic personage who is supposed to be their common progenitor and the source of their name.

EPONYM CANON OF ASSYRIA. See **ASSYRIA**, **EPONYM CANON OF**.

EPHING FOREST.—Once so extensive that it covered the whole county of Essex, England, and was called the Forest of Essex. Subsequently, when diminished in size, it was called Waltham Forest. Still later, when further entrenched, it took the name of Epping, from a town that is embraced in it. It is still quite large, and within recent years it has been formally declared by the Queen "a people's park."—J. C. Brown, *Forests of Eng.*

EPULONES, The.—"The epulones [at Rome] formed a college for the administration of the sacred festivals."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 31.

EQUADOR. See **ECUADOR**.

EQUAL RIGHTS PARTY. See **NEW YORK**: A. D. 1835–1837.

EQUESTRIAN ORDER, Roman.—"The selection of the burgess cavalry was vested in the censors. It was, no doubt, the duty of these to make the selection on purely military grounds, and at their musters to insist that all horsemen incapacitated by age or otherwise, or at all unserviceable, should surrender their public horse; but it was not easy to hinder them from looking to noble birth more than to capacity, and from allowing men of standing, who were once admitted, senators particularly, to retain their horse beyond the proper time. Accordingly it became the practical rule for the senators to vote in the eighteen equestrian centuries, and the other places in these were assigned chiefly to the younger men of the nobility. The military system, of course, suffered from this, not so much through the unfitness for effective service of no small part of the legionary cavalry, as through the destruction of military equality to which the change gave rise; the noble youth more and more withdrew from serving in the infantry, and the legionary cavalry became a close aristocratic corps."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 3, ch. 11.—"The eighteen centuries, therefore, in course of time . . . lost their original military character and remained only as a voting body. It was by the transformation thus effected in the character of the eighteen centuries of knights, whilst the cavalry service passed over to the richer citizens not included in the senatorial families, that a new class of Roman citizens began gradually to be formed, distinct from the nobility proper and from the mass of the people, and designated as the equestrian order."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 7, ch. 1.—The equestrian order became a legally constituted class under the judicial law of Caius Gracchus, B. C. 123, which fixed its membership by a census, and transferred to it the judicial functions previously exercised by the senators only. It formed a kind of monetary aristocracy.—The same, bk. 7, ch. 6.

EQUITY. See **LAW**, **EQUITY**.

ERA, Christian.—"Unfortunately for ancient Chronology, there was no one fixed or universally established Era. Different countries reckoned by different eras, whose number is embarrassing, and their commencements not always easily to be adjusted or reconciled to each other; and it was not until A. D. 532 that the Christian Era was invented by Dionysius Exiguus, a Seythian by birth, and a Roman Abbot, who flourished in the reign of Justinian. . . . Dionysius began his era with the year of our Lord's incarnation and nativity, in U. C. 753, of the Varronian Computation, or the 45th of the Julian Era. And at an earlier period, Panodorus, an Egyptian monk, who flourished under the Emperor Arcadius, A. D. 395, had dated the incarnation in the same year. But by some mistake, or misconception of his meaning, Bede, who lived in the next century after Dionysius, adopted his year of the Nativity, U. C. 753, yet began the Vulgar Era, which he first introduced, the year after, and made it commence Jan. 1, U. C. 754, which was an alteration for the worse, as making the Christian Era recede a year further from the true year of the Nativity. The Vulgar Era began to prevail in the West about the time of Charles Martel and Pope Gregory II. A. D. 730. . . . But it was not established till the time of Pope Eugenius IV. A. D. 1431, who ordered this era to be used in the public Registers. . . . Dionysius was led to date the year of the Nativity, U. C. 753, from the Evangelist Luke's account that John the Baptist began his ministry 'in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar'; and that Jesus, at his baptism, 'was beginning to be about 30 years of age.' Luke iii. 1-23. . . . But this date of the Nativity is at variance with Matthew's account, that Christ was born before Herod's death; which followed shortly after his massacre of the infants at Bethlehem. . . . Christ's birth, therefore, could not have been earlier than U. C. 748, nor later than U. C. 749. And if we assume the latter year, as most conformable to the whole tenor of Sacred History, with Chrysostom, Petavius, Prideaux, Playfair, &c., this would give Christ's age at his baptism, about 34 years; contrary to Luke's account."—W. Hales' *New Analysis of Chronology*, v. 1, bk. 1.—In a subsequent table, Mr. Hales gives the results of the computations made by different chronologists, ancient and modern, to fix the true year of the Nativity, as accommodated to what is called "the vulgar," or popularly accepted, Christian Era. The range is through no less than ten years, from B. C. 7 to A. D. 8. His own conclusion, supported by Prideaux and Playfair, is in favor of the year B. C. 5. Somewhat more commonly at the present time, it is put at B. C. 4.—See, also, **Jews**: B. C. 8—A. D. 1.

ERA, French Revolutionary. See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1792 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER), and 1793 (OCTOBER).

ERA, Gregorian. See **CALENDAR, GREGORIAN**.

ERA, Jalalæan. See **TURKS (THE SELJUK)**: A. D. 1073-1092.

ERA, Julian. See **CALENDAR, JULIAN**.

ERA, Mahometan, or Era of the Hegira.—"The epoch of the Era of the Hegira is, according to the civil calculation, Friday, the 16th of July, A. D. 622, the day of the flight of Mahomet from Mecca to Medina, which is the date of the Mahometans; but astronomers and some

historians assign it to the preceding day, viz., Thursday, the 15th of July; an important fact to be borne in mind when perusing Arabian writers. The years of the Hegira are lunar years, and contain twelve months, each commencing with the new moon; a practice which necessarily leads to great confusion and uncertainty, inasmuch as every year must begin considerably earlier in the season than the preceding. In chronology and history, however, and in dating their public instruments, the Turks use months which contain alternately thirty and twenty-nine days, excepting the last month, which, in intercalary years, contains thirty days. . . . The years of the Hegira are divided into cycles of thirty years, nineteen of which are termed common years, of 354 days each; and the eleven others intercalary, or abundant, from their consisting of one day more: these are the 2d, 5th, 7th, 10th, 13th, 16th, 18th, 21st, 24th, 26th and 29th. To ascertain whether any given year be intercalary or not divide it by 30; and if either of the above numbers remain, the year is one of 355 days."—Sir H. Nicolas, *Chronology of History*.—See, also, **MAHOMETAN CONQUEST**: A. D. 609-632.

ERA, Spanish.—"The Spanish era dates from 38 B. C. (A. U. 716) and is supposed to mark some important epoch in the organization of the province by the Romans. It may coincide with the campaign of Calvinus, which is only known to us from a notice in the *Fasti Triumphales*. . . . The Spanish era was preserved in Aragon till 1358, in Castile till 1383, and in Portugal till 1415."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 34, note.

ERA OF DIOCLETIAN, or Era of Martyrs. See **ROME**: A. D. 192-284.

ERA OF GOOD FEELING. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1821-1824.

ERA OF THE FOUNDATION OF ROME. See **ROME**: B. C. 753.

ERA OF THE OLYMPIADS. See **OLYMPIADS, ERA OF THE**.

ERANI.—Associations existing in ancient Athens which resembled the mutual benefit or friendly-aid societies of modern times.—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

ERASTIANISM.—A doctrine which "received its name from Thomas Erastus, a German physician of the 16th century, contemporary with Luther. The work in which he delivered his theory and reasonings on the subject is entitled 'De Excommunicatione Ecclesiastica.' . . . The Erastians . . . held that religion is an affair between man and his creator, in which no other man or society of men was entitled to interpose. . . . Proceeding on this ground, they maintained that every man calling himself a Christian has a right to make resort to any Christian place of worship, and partake in all its ordinances. Simple as this idea is, it strikes at the root of all priestcraft."—W. Godwin, *Hist. of the Commonwealth*, v. 1, ch. 13.

ERCTÉ, Mount, Hamilcar on. See **PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST**.—See, also, **ERYX**.

ERDINI, The. See **IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS**.

EREMITES OF ST. FRANCIS. See **MINIMS**.

ERETRIA. See **CHALCIS AND ERETRIA**.

ERFURT, Imperial Conference and Treaty of. See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1808 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

ERECTHEION AT ATHENS, The.—"At a very early period there was, opposite the long northern side of the Parthenon, a temple which, according to Herodotus, was dedicated jointly to Athene Polias and the Attic hero, Erechtheus. . . . This temple was destroyed by fire while the Persians held the city. Not unlikely the rebuilding of the Erechtheion was begun by Perikles together with that of the other destroyed temples of the Akropolis; but as it was not finished by him, it is generally not mentioned amongst his works. . . . This temple was renowned amongst the ancients as one of the most beautiful and perfect in existence, and seems to have remained almost intact down to the time of the Turks. The siege of Athens by the Venetians in 1687 seems to have been fatal to the Erechtheion, as it was to the Parthenon."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks*, sect. 14.—See, also, ACROPOLIS OF ATHENS.

ERIC, King of Denmark, Sweden and Norway, A. D. 1412-1439. . . . **Eric Blodaexe, King of Norway, A. D. 934-940.** . . . **Eric I., King of Denmark, A. D. 850-854.** . . . **Eric I. (called Saint), King of Sweden, A. D. 1155-1161.** . . . **Eric II., King of Denmark, A. D. 854-883.** . . . **Eric II., King of Norway, A. D. 1280-1299.** . . . **Eric II. (Knutsson), King of Sweden, A. D. 1210-1216.** . . . **Eric III., King of Denmark, A. D. 1095-1103.** . . . **Eric III. (called The Stammerer), King of Sweden, A. D. 1222-1250.** . . . **Eric IV., King of Denmark, A. D. 1134-1137.** . . . **Eric V., King of Denmark, A. D. 1137-1147.** . . . **Eric VI., King of Denmark, A. D. 1241-1250.** . . . **Eric VII., King of Denmark, A. D. 1259-1286.** . . . **Eric VIII., King of Denmark, A. D. 1286-1319.** . . . **Eric XIV., King of Sweden, A. D. 1560-1568.**

ERICSSON, John.—Invention and construction of the Monitor. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MARCH).

ERIE, The City of: A. D. 1735.—Site occupied by the French. See CANADA: A. D. 1700-1735.

ERIE, Fort: A. D. 1764-1791.—Origin.—Four years after the British conquest of Canada, in 1764, Colonel John Bradstreet built a block-house and stockade near the site of the later Fort Erie, which was not constructed until 1791. When war with the United States broke out, in 1812, the British considered the new fort untenable, or unnecessary, and evacuated and partly destroyed it, in May, 1813.—C. K. Remington, *Old Fort Erie*.

A. D. 1814.—The siege and the destruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1866.—The Fenian invasion. See CANADA: A. D. 1866-1871.

ERIE, Lake: The Indian name. See NIAGARA: THE NAME, &c.

A. D. 1679.—Navigated by La Salle. See CANADA: A. D. 1669-1687.

A. D. 1813.—Perry's naval victory. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812-1813.

ERIE CANAL, Construction of the. See NEW YORK: A. D. 1817-1825.

ERIES, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: HURONS, &c., and IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY: THEIR CONQUESTS.

ERIN. See IRELAND.

ERITREA. The name given in 1890 to a strip of territory acquired by Italy on the African coast of the Red Sea, bordering on Nubia and Abyssinia.

ERMANRIC, The empire of. See GOTHs (OSTROGOTHs): A. D. 350-375; and 376.

ERMYN STREET.—A corruption of Eor-men street, the Saxon name of one of the great Roman roads in Britain, which ran from London to Lincoln. See ROMAN ROADS IN BRITAIN.

ERNESTINE LINE OF SAXONY. See SAXONY: A. D. 1180-1553.

ERPEDITANI, The. See IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

ERTANG, The.—The sacred book of the Manicheans. See MANICHEANS.

ERYTHRÆ.—ERYTHRÆAN SIBYL.—Erythræ was an ancient Ionian city on the Lydian coast of Asia Minor, opposite the island of Chios or Scio. It was chiefly famous as the home or seat of one of the most venerated of the sibyls—prophetic women—of antiquity. The collection of Sibylline oracles which was sacredly preserved at Rome appears to have been largely derived from Erythræ. The Cumæan Sibyl is sometimes identified with her Erythræan sister, who is said to have passed into Europe.—See, also, SIBYLS.

ERYTHRÆAN SEA, The.—The Erythræan Sea, in the widest sense of the term, as used by the ancients, comprised "the Arabian Gulf (or what we now call the Red Sea), the coasts of Africa outside the straits of Bab el Mandeb as far as they had then been explored, as well as those of Arabia and India down to the extremity of the Malabar coast." The Periplus of the Erythræan Sea is a geographical treatise of great importance which we owe to some unknown Greek writer supposed to be nearly contemporary with Pliny. It is "a kind of manual for the instruction of navigators and traders in the Erythræan Sea."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 25.—"The Erythræan Sea is an appellation . . . in all appearance deduced [by the ancients] from their entrance into it by the straits of the Red Sea, styled Erythra by the Greeks, and not excluding the gulph of Persia, to which the fabulous history of a king Erythras is more peculiarly appropriate."—W. Vincent, *Periplus of the Erythræan Sea*, bk. 1, *prelim. disquis.*

ERYX.—ERCTE.—A town originally Phœnician or Carthaginian on the northwestern coast of Sicily. It stood on the slope of a mountain which was crowned with an ancient temple of Aphrodite, and which gave the name Erycina to the goddess when her worship was introduced at Rome. See PUNIC WAR, THE FIRST.

ERZEROUM: A. D. 1878.—Taken by the Russians. See TURKS: A. D. 1877-1878.

ESCOCÉS, The party of the. See MEXICO: A. D. 1822-1828.

ESCOMBOLI. See STAMBOUL.

ESCORIAL, The. See SPAIN: A. D. 1559-1563.

ESCUYER.—ESQUIRE. See CHIVALRY.

ESDRAELON, Valley of. See MEOIDDO.

ESKIMO, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ESKIMAUX FAMILY.

ESNE. See THEOW.

ESPARTERO, Regency of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1833-1846.

ESPINOSA, Battle of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808 (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER).

ESQUILINE, The. See **SEVEN HILLS OF ROME.**

ESQUIRE.—ESCUYER.—SQUIRE. See **CHIVALRY.**

ESQUIROS, Battle of (1521). See **NAVARE: A. D. 1442-1521.**

ESSELENIAN FAMILY, The. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ESSELENIAN FAMILY.**

ESSENES, The.—"Apart from the great highroad of Jewish life, there lived in Palestine in the time of Christ a religious community which, though it grew up on Jewish soil, differed essentially in many points from traditional Judaism, and which, though it exercised no powerful influence upon the development of the people, deserves our attention as a peculiar problem in the history of religion. This community, the Essenes or Essens, is generally, after the precedent of Josephus, placed beside the Pharisees and Sadducees as the third Jewish sect. But it scarcely needs the remark, that we have here to deal with a phenomenon of an entirely different kind. While the Pharisees and Sadducees were large political and religious parties, the Essenes might far rather be compared to a monastic order. There is indeed much that is enigmatical in them as to particulars. Even their name is obscure. . . . The origin of the Essenes is as obscure as their name. Josephus first mentions them in the time of Jonathan the Maccabee, about 150 B. C., and speaks expressly of one Judas, an Essene, in the time of Aristobulus I. (105-104 B. C.). According to this, the origin of the order would have to be placed in the second century before Christ. But it is questionable whether they proceeded simply from Judaism, or whether foreign and especially Hellenistic elements had not also an influence in their organization. . . . Philo and Josephus agree in estimating the number of the Essenes in their time at above 4,000. As far as is known, they lived only in Palestine, at least there are no certain traces of their occurrence out of Palestine. . . . For the sake of living as a community, they had special houses of the order in which they dwelt together. Their whole community was most strictly organized as a single body. . . . The strongest tie by which the members were united was absolute community of goods. 'The community among them is wonderful [says Josephus], one does not find that one possesses more than another. For it is the law, that those who enter deliver up their property to the order, so that there is nowhere to be seen, either the humiliation of poverty or the superfluity of wealth, but on the contrary one property for all as brethren, formed by the collection of the possessions of individuals.' 'They neither buy nor sell among each other; but while one gives to another what he wants, he receives in return what is useful to himself, and without anything in return they receive freely whatever they want.' . . . 'There is but one purse for all, and common expenses, common clothes, and common food in common meals. For community of dwelling, of life, and of meals is nowhere so firmly established and so developed as with them. And this is intelligible. For what they receive daily as wages for their labour, they do not keep for themselves, but put it together, and thus make the profits of their work common for those who desire to make use of it. And the sick are without anxiety on account of their inability to

earn, because the common purse is in readiness for the care of them, and they may with all certainty meet their expenses from abundant stores.' . . . The daily labour of the Essenes was under strict regulation. It began with prayer, after which the members were dismissed to their work by the presidents. They reassembled for purifying ablutions, which were followed by the common meal. After this they again went to work, to assemble again for their evening meal. The chief employment of members of the order was agriculture. They likewise carried on, however, crafts of every kind. On the other hand, trading was forbidden as leading to covetousness, and also the making of weapons or of any kind of utensils that might injure men. . . . The Essenes are described by both Philo and Josephus as very connoisseurs in morality. . . . Their life was abstemious, simple and unpretending. 'They condemn sensual desires as sinful, and esteem moderation and freedom from passion as of the nature of virtue.' They only take food and drink till they have had enough; abstaining from passionate excitement, they are 'just dispensers of wrath.' At their meals they are 'contented with the same dish day by day, loving sufficiency and rejecting great expense as harmful to mind and body.' . . . There is not a slave among them, but all are free, mutually working for each other. All that they say is more certain than an oath. They forbid swearing, because it is worse than perjury. . . . Before every meal they bathe in cold water. They do the same after performing the functions of nature. . . . They esteem it seemly to wear white raiment at all times. . . . They entirely condemned marriage. Josephus indeed knew of a branch of the Essenes who permitted marriage. But these must at all events have formed a small minority. . . . A chief peculiarity of the Essenes was their common meals, which bore the character of sacrificial feasts. The food was prepared by priests, with the observance probably of certain rites of purification; for an Essene was not permitted to partake of any other food than this. The meals are described as follows by Josephus: 'After the bath of purification they betake themselves to a dwelling of their own, entrance into which is forbidden to all of another faith. And being clean they go into the refectory as into a sanctuary. . . . The priest prays before the meal, and none may eat before the prayer. After the meal he prays again. At the beginning and end they honour God as the giver of food. Then they put off their garments as sacred and go back to their work till evening. Returning, they feed again in the same manner.' In their worship, as well as in that of other Jews, the Holy Scriptures were read and explained; and Philo remarks, that they specially delighted in allegorical interpretation. They were extraordinarily strict in the celebration of the Sabbath. They did not venture on that day to move a vessel from its place, nor even to perform the functions of nature. In other respects too they showed themselves to be Jews. Though they were excluded from the temple they sent gifts of incense there. . . . Concerning their doctrine of the soul and of its immortality, Josephus expresses himself most fully. If we may trust his account, they taught that bodies are perishable, but souls immortal, and that the latter dwelt originally in the subtlest æther, but

being debased by sensual pleasures united themselves with bodies as with prisons; but when they are freed from the fetters of sense they will joyfully soar on high, as if delivered from long bondage. To the good (souls) is appointed a life beyond the ocean. . . . But to the bad (souls) is appointed a dark, cold region full of unceasing torment."—E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, v. 2.

ESSEX.—Originally the kingdom formed by that body of the Saxon conquerors of Britain, in the fifth and sixth centuries, who acquired, from their geographical position in the island, the name of the East Saxons. It covered the present county of Essex, and London and Middlesex. See ENGLAND: A. D. 477–527.

ESSEX JUNTO, The.—In the Massachusetts election of 1781, "the representatives of the State in Congress, and some of the more moderate leaders at home, opposed Governor Hancock, the popular candidate, and supported James Bowdoin, who was thought to represent the more conservative elements. . . . It was at this time that Hancock is said to have bestowed on his opponents the title of the 'Essex Junto,' and this is the first appearance of the name in American politics. . . . The 'Junto' was generally supposed to be composed of such men as Theophilus Parsons, George Cabot, Fisher Ames, Stephen Higginson, the Lowells, Timothy Pickering, &c., and took its name from the county to which most of its reputed members originally belonged. . . . The reputed members of the 'Junto' held political power in Massachusetts [as leaders of the Federalist party] for more than a quarter of a century." According to Chief Justice Parsons, as quoted by Colonel Pickering in his *Diary*, the term 'Essex Junto' was applied by one of the Massachusetts royal governors, before the Revolution, to certain gentlemen of Essex county who opposed his measures. Hancock, therefore, only revived the title and gave it currency, with a new application.—H. C. Lodge, *Life and Letters of George Cabot*, pp. 17–22.

ESSLINGEN, OR ASPERN, Battle of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JANUARY—JUNE).

ESSUVII, The.—A Gallic tribe established anciently in the modern French department of the Orne.—Napoleon III., *Hist. of Cæsar*, bk. 3, ch. 2, note.

ESTATES, Assembly of.—"An assembly of estates is an organised collection, made by representation or otherwise, of the several orders, states or conditions of men, who are recognised as possessing political power. A national council of clergy and barons is not an assembly of estates, because it does not include the body of the people, the plebs, the simple freemen or commons."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 15, sect. 185.—See, also, **ESTATES, THE THREE.**

ESTATES, The Three.—"The arrangement of the political factors in three estates is common, with some minor variations, to all the European constitutions, and depends on a principle of almost universal acceptance. This classification differs from the system of caste and from all divisions based on differences of blood or religion, historical or prehistorical. . . . In Christendom it has always taken the form of a distinction between clergy and laity, the latter being subdivided according to national custom into noble and non-noble, patrician and plebeian, warriors and traders, landowners and craftsmen.

. . . The Aragonese cortes contained four brazos or arms, the clergy, the great barons or ricos hombres, the minor barons, knights or infanzones, and the towns. The Germanic diet comprised three colleges, the electors, the princes and the cities, the two former being arranged in distinct benches, lay and clerical. . . . The Castilian cortes arranged the clergy, the ricos hombres and the comunidades, in three estates. The Swedish diet was composed of clergy, barons, burghers and peasants. . . . In France, both in the States General and in the provincial estates, the division is into gentz de l'eglise, nobles, and gentz des bonnes villes. In England, after a transitional stage, in which the clergy, the greater and smaller barons, and the cities and boroughs, seemed likely to adopt the system used in Aragon and Scotland, and another in which the county and borough communities continued to assert an essential difference, the three estates of clergy, lords and commons, finally emerge as the political constituents of the nation, or, in their parliamentary form, as the lords spiritual and temporal and the commons. This familiar formula in either shape bears the impress of history. The term commons is not in itself an appropriate expression for the third estate; it does not signify primarily the simple freemen, the plebs, but the plebs organised and combined in corporate communities, in a particular way for particular purposes. The commons are the comunidades or universitates, the organised bodies of freemen of the shires and towns. . . . The third estate in England differs from the same estate in the continental constitutions, by including the landowners under baronial rank. In most of those systems it contains the representatives of the towns or chartered communities only."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 15, sect. 185, 193.—"The words 'gens de tiers et commun état' are found in many acts [France] of the 15th century. The expressions 'tiers état,' 'commun état,' and 'le commun' are used indifferently. . . . This name of Tiers État, when used in its ordinary sense, properly comprises only the population of the privileged cities; but in effect it extends much beyond this; it includes not only the cities, but the villages and hamlets—not only the free commonalty, but all those for whom civil liberty is a privilege still to come."—A. Thierry, *Formation and Progress of the Tiers État in France*, v. 1, pp. 61 and 60.

ESTATES, or "States," of the Netherland Provinces. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1584–1585.

ESTATES GENERAL. See STATES GENERAL.

ESTE, The House of.—"Descended from one of the northern families which settled in Italy during the darkest period of the middle ages, the Este traced their lineal descent up to the times of Charlemagne. They had taken advantage of the frequent dissensions between the popes and the German emperors of the houses of Saxony and Swabia, and acquired wide dominions in Lunigiana, and the March of Treviso, where the castle of Este, their family residence, was situated. Towards the middle of the 11th century, that family had been connected by marriages with the Guelphs of Bavaria, and one of the name of Este was eventually to become the common source from which sprung the illustrious houses of Brunswick and Hanover. The Este had warmly espoused the Guelph party [see GUELPHS], during the wars of the Lombard League.

... Towards the year 1200, Azzo V., Marquis of Este, married Marchesella degli Adelardi, daughter of one of the most conspicuous Guelphs at Ferrara, where the influence of the House of Este was thus first established."—L. Mariotti (A. Gallenga), *Italy*, v. 2, pp. 62–63.—The Marquesses of Este became, "after some of the usual fluctuations, permanent lords of the cities of Ferrara [1264] and Modena [1288]. About the same time they lost their original holding of Este, which passed to Padua, and with Padua to Venice. Thus the nominal marquess of Este and real lord of Ferrara was not uncommonly spoken of as Marquess of Ferrara. In the 15th century these princes rose to ducal rank; but by that time the new doctrine of the temporal dominion of the Popes had made great advances. Modena, no man doubted, was a city of the Empire; but Ferrara was now held to be under the supremacy of the Pope. The Marquess Borso had thus to seek his elevation to ducal rank from two separate lords. He was created Duke of Modena [1453] and Reggio by the Emperor, and afterwards Duke of Ferrara [1471] by the Pope. This difference of holding . . . led to the destruction of the power of the house of Este. In the times in which we are now concerned, their dominions lay in two masses. To the west lay the duchy of Modena and Reggio; apart from it to the east lay the duchy of Ferrara. Not long after its creation, this last duchy was cut short by the surrender of the border-district of Rovigo to Venice. . . . Modena and Ferrara remained united, till Ferrara was annexed [1598] as an escheated fief to the dominions of its spiritual overlord. But the house of Este still reigned over Modena with Reggio and Mirandola, while its dominions were extended to the sea by the addition of Massa and other small possessions between Lucca and Genoa. The duchy in the end passed by female succession to the House of Austria [1771–1803]."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, ch. 8, sect. 3–4.—"The government of the family of Este at Ferrara, Modena, and Reggio displays curious contrasts of violence and popularity. Within the palace frightful deeds were perpetrated; a princess was beheaded [1425] for alleged adultery with a stepson; legitimate and illegitimate children fled from the court, and even abroad their lives were threatened by assassins sent in pursuit of them (1471). Plots from without were incessant; the bastard of a bastard tried to wrest the crown from the lawful heir, Hercules I.: this latter is said afterwards (1493) to have poisoned his wife on discovering that she, at the instigation of her brother, Ferrante of Naples, was going to poison him. This list of tragedies is closed by the plot of two bastards against their brothers, the ruling Duke Alfonso I. and the Cardinal Ippolito (1506), which was discovered in time, and punished with imprisonment for life. . . . It is undeniable that the dangers to which these princes were constantly exposed developed in their capacities of a remarkable kind."—J. Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Period of the Renaissance in Italy*, pt. 1, ch. 5.—For the facts of the ending of the legitimate Italian line of Este, see PAPACY: A. D. 1597.

ESTHONIA, OR ESTONIA: Origin of the name. See **ÆSTII**.

Christian conquest. See **LIVONIA: 12TH–13TH CENTURIES**.

ESTIENNES, The Press of the. See **PRINTING: A. D. 1496–1598**.

ESTREMOS, OR AMEIXAL, Battle of (1663). See **PORTUGAL: A. D. 1637–1668**.

ETCHEMINS, The. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY**.

ETHANDUN, OR EDINGTON, Battle of (A. D. 878). See **ENGLAND: A. D. 855–880**.

ETHEL, ETHELINGS, OR ÆTHELINGS.—"The sons and brothers of the king [of the English] were distinguished by the title of Æthelings. The word Ætheling, like eorl, originally denoted noble birth simply; but as the royal house of Wessex rose to pre-eminence and the other royal houses and the nobles generally were thereby reduced to a relatively lower grade, it became restricted to the near kindred of the national king."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist.*, p. 29.—"It has been sometimes held that the only nobility of blood recognized in England before the Norman Conquest was that of the king's kin. The statement may be regarded as deficient in authority, and as the result of a too hasty generalization from the fact that only the sons and brothers of the kings bear the name of ætheling. On the other hand must be alleged the existence of a noble (edhiling) class among the continental Saxons who had no kings at all. . . . The laws of Ethelbert prove the existence of a class bearing the name of eorl of which no other interpretation can be given. That these, eorlas and æthel, were the descendants of the primitive nobles of the first settlement, who, on the institution of royalty, sank one step in dignity from the ancient state of rude independence, in which they had elected their own chiefs and ruled their own dependents, may be very reasonably conjectured.

. . . The ancient name of eorl, like that of ætheling, changed its application, and, under the influence, perhaps, of Danish association, was given like that of jarl to the official ealdorman. Henceforth the thegn takes the place of the æthel, and the class of thegns probably embraces all the remaining families of noble blood. The change may have been very gradual; the 'north people's law' of the tenth or early eleventh century still distinguishes the eorl and ætheling with a wergild nearly double that of the ealdorman and seven times that of the thegn; but the north people's law was penetrated with Danish influence, and the eorl probably represents the jarl rather than the ealdorman, the great eorl of the fourth part of England as it was divided by Canute. . . . The word eorl is said to be the same as the Norse jarl and another form of ealdor (?); whilst the eorl answers to the Norse Karl; the original meaning of the two being old man and young man."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 6, sect. 64, and note.

ETHEL.—Family-land. See **ALOD**; and **FOLCLAND**.

ETHELBALD, King of Mercia, A. D. 716–755. . . . Ethelbald, King of Wessex, A. D. 858–860.

ETHELBERT, King of Kent, A. D. 565–616. . . . Ethelbert, King of Wessex, A. D. 860–866.

ETHELFRITH, King of Northumberland, A. D. 593–617.

ETHELRED, King of Wessex, A. D. 866–871. . . . Ethelred, called the Unready, King of Wessex, A. D. 979–1016.

ETHELSTAN, King of Wessex, A. D. 925-940.

ETHELWULF, King of Wessex, A. D. 836-858.

ETHIOPIA.—The Ethiopia of the ancients, "in the ordinary and vague sense of the term, was a vast tract extending in length above a thousand miles, from the 9th to the 24th degree of north latitude, and in breadth almost 900 miles, from the shores of the Red Sea and Indian Ocean to the desert of the Sahara. This tract was inhabited for the most part by wild and barbarous tribes—herdsmen, hunters, or fishermen—who grew no corn, were unacquainted with bread, and subsisted on the milk and flesh of their cattle, or on game, turtle, and fish, salted or raw. The tribes had their own separate chiefs, and acknowledged no single head, but on the contrary were frequently at war one with the other, and sold their prisoners for slaves. Such was Ethiopia in the common vague sense; but from this must be distinguished another narrower Ethiopia, known sometimes as 'Ethiopia Proper' or 'Ethiopia above Egypt,' the limits of which were, towards the south, the junction of the White and Blue Niles, and towards the north the Third Cataract. Into this tract, called sometimes 'the kingdom of Meroë,' Egyptian civilisation had, long before the eighth century [B. C.], deeply penetrated. Temples of the Egyptian type, stone pyramids, avenues of sphinxes, had been erected; a priesthood had been set up, which was regarded as derived from the Egyptian priesthood; monarchical institutions had been adopted; the whole tract formed ordinarily one kingdom, and the natives were not very much behind the Egyptians in arts or arms, or very different from them in manners, customs, and mode of life. Even in race the difference was not great. The Ethiopians were darker in complexion than the Egyptians, and possessed probably a greater infusion of Nigritic blood; but there was a common stock at the root of the two races—Cush and Mizraim were brethren. In the region of Ethiopia Proper a very important position was occupied in the eighth century [B. C.] by Napata. Napata was situated midway in the great bend of the Nile, between lat. 18° and 19°. . . . It occupied the left bank of the river in the near vicinity of the modern Gebel Berkal. . . . Here, when the decline of Egypt enabled the Ethiopians to reclaim their ancient limits, the capital was fixed of that kingdom, which shortly became a rival of the old empire of the Pharaohs, and aspired to take its place. . . . The kingdom of Meroë, whereof it was the capital, reached southward as far as the modern Khartoum, and eastward stretched up to the Abyssinian highlands, including the valleys of the Atbara and its tributaries, together with most of the tract between the Atbara and the Blue Nile. . . . Napata continued down to Roman times a place of importance, and only sank to ruin in consequence of the campaigns of Petronius against Candacé in the first century after our era."—G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Ancient Egypt*, ch. 25.

ALSO IN: A. H. L. Heeren, *Historical Researches, Carthaginians, Ethiopians, &c.*, pp. 143-249.—See, also, **EGYPT**: ABOUT B. C. 1200-670; and **LIBYANS**, THE.

ETON SCHOOL. See **EDUCATION**, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—**ENGLAND**.

ETRURIA, Ancient. See **ETRUSCANS**.

ETRURIA, The kingdom of. See **GERMANY**: A. D. 1801-1803; also **PORTUGAL**: A. D. 1807; and **FRANCE**: A. D. 1807-1808 (**NOVEMBER**—**FEBRUARY**).

ETRUSCANS, The.—"At the time when Roman history begins, we find that a powerful and warlike race, far superior to the Latins in civilisation and in the arts of life, hemmed in the rising Roman dominion in the north. The Greeks called them Turrhenoi, the Romans called them Etrusci, they called themselves the Rasenna. Who they were and whence they came has ever been regarded as one of the most doubtful and difficult problems in ethnology. One conclusion only can be said to have been universally accepted both in ancient and in modern times. It is agreed on every hand that in all essential points, in language, in religion, in customs, and in appearance, the Etruscans were a race wholly different from the Latins. There is also an absolute agreement of all ancient tradition to the effect that the Etruscans were not the original inhabitants of Etruria, but that they were an intrusive race of conquerors. . . . It has been usually supposed that the Rasenna made their appearance in Italy some ten or twelve centuries before the Christian era. . . . For some six or seven centuries, the Etruscan power and territory continued steadily to increase, and ultimately stretched far south of the Tiber, Rome itself being included in the Etruscan dominion, and being ruled by an Etruscan dynasty. The early history of Rome is to a great extent the history of the uprising of the Latin race, and its long struggle for Italian supremacy with its Etruscan foe. It took Rome some six centuries of conflict to break through the obstinate barrier of the Etruscan power. The final conquest of Etruria by Rome was effected in the year 281 B. C. . . . The Rasennic people were collected mainly in the twelve great cities of Etruria proper, between the Arno and the Tiber. [Modern Tuscany takes its name from the ancient Etruscan inhabitants of the region.] This region was the real seat of the Etruscan power. . . . From the 'Shah-nameh,' the great Persian epic, we learn that the Aryan Persians called their nearest non-Aryan neighbours—the Turkic or Turcoman tribes to the north of them—by the name Turan, a word from which we derive the familiar ethnologic term Turanian. The Aryan Greeks, on the other hand, called the Turkic tribe of the Rasenna, the nearest non-Aryan race, by the name of Turrhenoi. The argument of this book is to prove that the Tyrrhenians of Italy were of kindred race with the Turanians of Turkestan. Is it too much to conjecture that the Greek form Turrhene may be identically the same word as the Persian form Turan?"—I. Taylor, *Etruscan Researches*, ch. 2.—"The utmost we can say is that several traces, apparently reliable, point to the conclusion that the Etruscans may be on the whole included among the Indo-Germans. . . . But even granting those points of connection, the Etruscan people appears withal scarcely less isolated. 'The Etruscans,' Dionysius said long ago, 'are like no other nation in language and manners'; and we have nothing to add to his statement. . . . Reliable traces of any advance of the Etruscans beyond the Tiber, by land, are altogether wanting. . . . South of the Tiber no Etruscan settlement can be pointed out as having owed its origin

to founders who came by land; and that no indication whatever is discernible of any serious pressure by the Etruscans upon the Latin nation."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk 1, ch. 9.

EUBŒA.—"The island of Eubœa, long and narrow like Krête, and exhibiting a continuous backbone of lofty mountains from northwest to southeast, is separated from Boœtia at one point by a strait so narrow (celebrated in antiquity under the name of the Eurîpus) that the two were connected by a bridge for a large portion of the historical period of Greece, erected during the later times of the Peloponnesian war by the inhabitants of Chalkis [Chalcis]. Its general want of breadth leaves little room for plains. The area of the island consists principally of mountain, rock, dell, and ravine, suited in many parts for pasture, but rarely convenient for grain-culture or town habitations. Some plains there were, however, of great fertility, especially that of Lelantum, bordering on the sea near Chalkis, and continuing from that city in a southerly direction towards Eretria. Chalkis and Eretria, both situated on the western coast, and both occupying parts of this fertile plain, were the two principal places in the island: the domain of each seems to have extended across the island from sea to sea. . . . Both were in early times governed by an oligarchy, which among the Chalkidians was called the Hippobotæ, or Horse feeders,—proprietors probably of most part of the plain called Lelantum."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 12.—See, also, NEGROPONT.

EUBOIC TALENT. See **TALENT.**

EUCHITES, The. See **MYSTICISM.**

EUDES, King of France (in partition with Charles the Simple), A. D. 887–898.

EUDOSSES, The. See **AVIONES.**

EUGENE (Prince) of Savoy, Campaigns of. See **HUNGARY:** A. D. 1699–1718; **GERMANY:** A. D. 1704; **ITALY (SAVOY AND PIEDMONT):** A. D. 1701–1713; **NETHERLANDS:** A. D. 1708–1709, and 1710–1712.

EUGENE I., Pope, A. D. 655–657. . . . Eugene II., Pope, A. D. 824–827. . . . Eugene III., Pope, A. D. 1145–1153. . . . Eugene IV., Pope, A. D. 1431–1447.

EUGENIANS, The. See **HY-NIALS.**

EUMENES, and the wars of the Diadochi. See **MACEDONIA:** B. C. 323–316.

EUMOLPHIDÆ, The. See **PHYLÆ.**

EUPATRIDÆ, The.—"The Eupatridæ [in ancient Athens] are the wealthy and powerful men, belonging to the most distinguished families in all the various gentes, and principally living in the city of Athens, after the consolidation of Attica: from them are distinguished the middling and lower people, roughly classified into husbandmen and artisans. To the Eupatridæ is ascribed a religious as well as a political and social ascendancy. They are represented as the source of all authority on matters both sacred and profane."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 10.

EUROKS, OR YUROKS. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES: MODOCS.**

EUROPE.

A HISTORICAL SKETCH.*

The first inhabitants of the continent of Europe have left no trace of their existence on the surface of the land. The little that we know of them has been learned by the discovery of deeply buried remains, including a few bones and skulls, many weapons and tools which they had fashioned out of stone and bone, and some other rude marks of their hands which time has not destroyed. The places in which these remains are found—under deposits that formed slowly in ancient river beds and in caves—have convinced geologists that the people whose existence they reveal lived many thousands of years ago, and that the continent of Europe in their time was very different from the Europe of the present day, in its climate, in its aspect, and in its form. They find reason to suppose that the peninsula of Italy, as well as that of Spain, was then an isthmus which joined Europe to Africa; and this helps to explain the fact that remains of such animals as the elephant, the lion, the rhinoceros, the hippopotamus, and the hyena, as well as the mammoth, are found with the remains of these early men. They all seem to have belonged, together, to a state of things, on the surface of the earth, which was greatly changed before the men and the animals that we have historical knowledge of appeared.

The Stone Age.

These primitive Europeans were evidently quite at the bottom of the savage state. They had learned no use of metals, since every relic of their workmanship that can be found is of stone,

or bone, or wood. It is thought possible that they shaped rough vessels out of unbaked clay; but that is uncertain. There is nothing to show that they had domesticated any animals. It is plain that they dwelt in caves, wherever nature provided such dwellings; but what shelters they may have built elsewhere for themselves is unknown.

In one direction, only, did these ancient people exhibit a faculty finer than we see in the lowest savages of the present day: they were artists, in a way. They have left carvings and drawings of animals—the latter etched with a sharp point on horns, bones, and stones—which are remarkable for uncultured men.

The period in man's life on the earth at which these people lived—the period before metals were known—has been named by archaeologists the Stone Age. But the Stone Age covers two stages of human culture—one in which stone implements were fashioned unskilfully, and a second in which they were finished with expert and careful hands. The first is called the Palæolithic or Old Stone Age, the second the Neolithic or New Stone Age. Between the two periods in Europe there seems to have been a long interval of time, and a considerable change in the condition of the country, as well as in that of its people. In fact, the Europe of the Neolithic Age

* A general sketch of the history of Europe at large cannot, for obvious reasons, be constructed of quotations from the historians, on the plan followed in other parts of this work. The editor has found it necessary, therefore, to introduce here an essay of his own.

was probably not very different in form and climate from the Europe of our own day. Relics of the human life of that time are abundantly scattered over the face of the continent. There are notable deposits of them in the so-called "kitchen-middens" of Denmark, which are great mounds of shells,—shells of oysters and other molluscs,—which these ancient fishermen had opened and emptied, and then cast upon a refuse heap. Buried in those mounds, many bits of their workmanship have been preserved, and many hints of their manner of life are gleaned from the signs and tokens which these afford. They had evidently risen some degrees above the state of the men of the Palæolithic or Old Stone Age; but they were inferior in art.

The Bronze Age.

The discovery and use of copper—the metal most easily worked, and most frequently found in the metallic state—is the event by which archaeologists mark the beginning of a second stage in early civilizations. The period during which copper, and copper hardened by an alloy of tin, are the only metals found in use, they call the Bronze Age. There is no line of positive division between this and the Neolithic period which it followed. The same races appear to have advanced from the one stage to the other, and probably some were in possession of tools and weapons of bronze, while others were still contenting themselves with implements of stone.

Lake Dwellings.

In many parts of Europe, especially in Switzerland and northern Italy, plain traces of some curious habitations of people who lived through the later Stone Age into the Bronze Age, and even after it, have been brought to light. These are the "lake dwellings," or "lacustrine habitations," as they have been called, which have excited interest in late years. They were generally built on piles, driven into a lake-bottom, at such distance from shore as would make them easy of defence against enemies. The foundations of whole villages of these dwellings have been found in the Swiss and North Italian lakes, and less numerously elsewhere. From the lake-mud under and around them, a great quantity of relics of the lake-dwellers have been taken, and many facts about their arts and mode of life have been learned. It is known that, even before a single metal had come into their hands, they had begun to cultivate the earth; had raised wheat and barley and flax; had domesticated the horse, the ox, the sheep, the goat, the pig and the dog; had become fairly skilful in weaving, in rope-making, and in the art of the potter, but without the potter's wheel.

Gradually copper and bronze made their appearance among the implements of these people, as modern search discovers them imbedded, layer upon layer, in the old ooze of the lake-beds where they were dropped. In time, iron, too, reveals itself among their possessions, showing that they lived in their lake-villages from the later Stone Age into that third period of the early process of civilization which is named the Iron Age—when men first acquired the use of the most useful of all the metals. It appears, in fact, that the lake-dwellings were occupied even down to Roman times, since articles of Roman make have been found in the ruins of them.

Barrows.

In nearly all parts of Europe there are found burial mounds, called barrows, which contain buried relics of people who lived at one or the other of the three periods named. For the most part, they represent inhabitants of the Neolithic and of the Bronze Ages. In Great Britain some of these barrows are long, some are round; and the skulls found in the long barrows are different in shape from those in the round ones, showing a difference of race. The people to whom the first belonged are called "long-headed," or "dolichocephalic"; the others are called "broad-headed," or "brachycephalic." In the opinion of some ethnologists, who study this subject of the distinctions of race in the human family, the broad-headed people were ancestors of the Celtic or Keltic tribes, whom the Romans subdued in Gaul and Britain; while the long-headed men were of a preceding race, which the Celts, when they came, either drove out of all parts of Europe, except two or three mountainous corners, or else absorbed by intermarriage. The Basques of northwestern Spain, and some of their neighbors on the French side of the Pyrenees, are supposed to be survivals of this very ancient people; and there are suspected to be traces of their existence seen in the dark-haired and dark-skinned people of parts of Wales, Ireland, Corsica, North Africa, and elsewhere.

The Aryan Nations.

At least one part of this conjecture has much to rest upon. The inhabitants of western Europe when our historical knowledge of them—that is, our recorded and reported knowledge of them—begins, were, certainly, for the most part, Celtic peoples, and it is extremely probable that they had been occupying the country as long as the period represented by the round barrows. It is no less probable that they were the lake-dwellers of Switzerland, North Italy, and other regions; and that they did, in fact, displace some earlier people in most parts of Western Europe.

The Celts—whose nearly pure descendants are found now in the Bretons of France, the Welsh, the Highland Scotch and the Celtic Irish, and who formed the main stock of the larger part of the French nation—were one branch of the great family of nations called Aryan or Indo-European. The Aryan peoples are assumed to be akin to one another—shoots from one stem—because their languages are alike in grammatical structure and contain great numbers of words that are manifestly formed from the same original "root"; and because they differ in these respects from all other languages. The nations thus identified as Aryan are the nations that have acted the most important parts in all human history except the history of extremely ancient times. Besides the Celtic peoples already mentioned, they include the English, the Dutch, the Germans, and the Scandinavians, forming the Teutonic race; the Russians, Poles, and others of the Slavonic group; the ancient Greeks and Romans, with their modern representatives, and the Persians and Hindus in Asia. According to the evidence of their languages, there must have been a time and a place, in the remote past, when and where a primitive Aryan race, which was ancestral to all these nations, lived and multiplied until it outgrew its original country and began to send forth successive "swarms," or migrating hordes, as many

unsettled races have been seen to do within the historic age. It is hopeless, perhaps, to think of determining the time when such a dispersion of the Aryan peoples began; but many scholars believe it possible to trace, by various marks and indications, in language and elsewhere, the lines of movement in the migration, so far as to guess with some assurance the region of the primitive Aryan home; but thus far there are great disagreements in the guessing. Until recent years, the prevailing judgment pointed to that highland district in Central Asia which lies north of the Hindoo-Koosh range of mountains, and between the upper waters of the Oxus and Jaxartes. But later studies have discredited this first theory and started many opposing ones. The strong tendency now is to believe that the cradle of all the peoples of Aryan speech was somewhere in Europe, rather than in Asia, and in the north of Europe rather than in the center or the south. At the same time, there seems to be a growing opinion that the language of the Aryans was communicated to conquered peoples so extensively that its spread is not a true measure of the existing diffusion of the race.

The Celtic Branch.

Whatever may have been the starting-point of the Aryan migrations, it is supposed that the branch now distinguished as Celtic was the first to separate from the parent stem and to acquire for itself a new domain. It occupied southwestern Europe, from northern Spain to the Rhine, and across the Channel to the British islands, extending eastward into Switzerland, North Italy and the Tyrol. But little of what the tribes and nations forming this Celtic race did is known, until the time when another Aryan people, better civilized, came into collision with them, and drew them into the written history of the world by conquering them and making them its subjects.

The people who did this were the Romans, and the Romans and the Greeks are believed to have been carried into the two peninsulas which they inhabited, respectively, by one and the same movement in the Aryan dispersion. Their languages show more affinity to one another than to the other Aryan tongues, and there are other evidences of a near relationship between them; though they separated, it is quite certain, long before the appearance of either in history.

The Hellenes, or Greeks.

The Greeks, or Hellenes, as they called themselves, were the first among the Aryan peoples in Europe to make themselves historically known, and the first to write the record which transmits history from generation to generation. The peninsula in which they settled themselves is a very peculiar one in its formation. It is crossed in different directions by mountain ranges, which divide the land into parts naturally separated from one another, and which form barriers easily defended against invading foes. Between the mountains lie numerous fertile valleys. The coast is ragged with gulfs and bays, which notch it deeply on all sides, making the whole main peninsula a cluster of minor peninsulas, and supplying the people with harbors which invite them to a life of seafaring and trade. It is surrounded, moreover, with islands, which repeat the invitation.

Almost necessarily, in a country marked with such features so strongly, the Greeks became divided politically into small independent states — city-states they have been named — and those on the sea-coast became engaged very early in trade with other countries of the Mediterranean Sea. Every city of importance in Greece was entirely sovereign in the government of itself and of the surrounding territory which formed its domain. The stronger among them extended their dominion over some of the weaker or less valiant ones; but even then the subject cities kept a considerable measure of independence. There was no organization of national government to embrace the whole, nor any large part, of Greece. Certain among the states were sometimes united in temporary leagues, or confederacies, for common action in war; but these were unstable alliances, rather than political unions.

In their earliest form, the Greek city-states were governed by kings, whose power appears to have been quite limited, and who were leaders rather than sovereigns. But kingship disappeared from most of the states in Greece proper before they reached the period of distinct and accepted history. The kings were first displaced by aristocracies — ruling families, which took all political rights and privileges to themselves, and allowed their fellows (whom they usually oppressed) no part or voice in public affairs. In most instances these aristocracies, or oligarchies, were overthrown, after a time, by bold agitators who stirred up a revolution, and then contrived, while confusion prevailed, to gather power into their own hands. Almost every Greek city had its time of being ruled by one or more of these Tyrants, as they were called. Some of them, like Pisistratus of Athens, ruled wisely and justly for the most part, and were not "tyrants" in the modern sense of the term; but all who gained and held a princely power unlawfully were so named by the Greeks. The reign of the Tyrants was nowhere lasting. They were driven out of one city after another until they disappeared. Then the old aristocracies came uppermost again in some cities, and ruled as before. But some, like Athens, had trained the whole body of their citizens to such intelligence and spirit that neither kingship nor oligarchy would be endured any longer, and the people undertook to govern themselves. These were the first democracies — the first experiments in popular government — that history gives any account of. "The little commonwealths of Greece," says a great historian, "were the first states at once free and civilized which the world ever saw. They were the first states which gave birth to great statesmen, orators, and generals who did great deeds, and to great historians who set down those great deeds in writing. It was in the Greek commonwealths, in short, that the political and intellectual life of the world began."

In the belief of the Greeks, or of most men among them, their early history was embodied with truth in the numerous legends and ancient poems which they religiously preserved; but people in modern times look differently upon those wonderful myths and epics, studying them with deep interest, but under more critical views. They throw much light on the primitive life of the Hellenes, and more light upon the development of the remarkable genius and spirit of those thoughtful and imaginative people; but of actual

history there are only glimpses and guesses to be got from them.

The Homeric poems, the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey," describe a condition of things in which the ruling state of Peloponnesus (the southern peninsula of Greece) was a kingdom of the Achæians, having its capital at Mycenæ, in Argolis,—the realm of King Agamemnon,—and in which Athens is unknown to the poet. Within recent years, Dr. Schliemann has excavated the ruins of Mycenæ, and has found evidence that it really must have been, in very early times, the seat of a strong and rich monarchy. But the Achæian kingdom had entirely disappeared, and the Achæian people had shrunk to an insignificant community, on the Gulf of Corinth, when the first assured views of Greek history open to us.

The Dorians.

It seems to be a fact that the Achæians had been overwhelmed by a great invasion of more barbarous Greek tribes from the North, very much as the Roman Empire, in later times, was buried under an avalanche of barbarism from Germany. The invaders were a tribe or league of tribes called Dorians, who had been driven from their own previous home on the slopes of the Pindus mountain range. Their movement southward was part, as appears, of an extensive shifting of place, or migration, that occurred at that time (not long, it is probable, before the beginning of the historic period) among the tribes of Hellas. The Dorians claimed that in conquering Peloponnesus they were recovering a heritage from which their chiefs had been anciently expelled, and their legends were shaped accordingly. The Dorian chiefs appeared in these legends as descendants of Hercules, and the tradition of the conquest became a story of "The Return of the Heræclids."

The principal states founded or possessed and controlled by the Dorians in Peloponnesus, after their conquest, were Sparta, or Lacedæmon, Argos, and Corinth. The Spartans were the most warlike of the Greeks,—the most resolute and energetic,—and their leadership in practical affairs common to the whole came to be generally acknowledged. At the same time they had little of the intellectual superiority which distinguished some of their Hellenic kindred in so remarkable a degree. Their state was organized on military principles; its constitution (the body of famous ordinances ascribed to Lycurgus) was a code of rigid discipline, which dealt with the citizen as a soldier always under training for war, and demanded from him the utmost simplicity of life. Their form of government combined a peculiar monarchy (having two royal families and two kings) with an aristocratic senate (the Gerousia), and a democratic assembly (which voted on matters only as submitted to it by the senate), with an irresponsible executive over the whole, consisting of five men called the Ephors. This singular government, essentially aristocratic or oligarchical, was maintained, with little disturbance or change, through the whole independent history of Sparta. In all respects, the Spartans were the most conservative and the least progressive among the politically important Greeks.

At the beginning of the domination of the Dorians in Peloponnesus, their city of Argos took the lead, and was the head of a league which included Corinth and other city-states.

But Sparta soon rose to rivalry with Argos; then reduced it to a secondary place, and finally subjugated it completely.

The Ionians.

The extensive shifting of population which had produced its most important result in the invasion of Peloponnesus by the Dorians, must have caused great commotions and changes throughout the whole Greek peninsula; and quite as much north of the Corinthian isthmus as south of it. But in the part which lies nearest to the isthmus—the branch peninsula of Attica—the old inhabitants appear to have held their ground, repelling invaders, and their country was affected only by an influx of fugitives, flying from the conquered Peloponnesus. The Attic people were more nearly akin to the expelled Achæians and Ionians than to the conquering Dorians, although a common brotherhood in the Hellenic race was recognized by all of them. Whatever distinction there may have been before between Achæians and Ionians now practically disappeared, and the Ionic name became common to the whole branch of the Greek people which derived itself from them. The important division of the race through all its subsequent history was between Dorians and Ionians. The Æolians constituted a third division, of minor importance and of far less significance.

The distinction between Ionians and Dorians was a very real one, in character no less than in traditions and name. The Ionians were the superior Greeks on the intellectual side. It was among them that the wonderful genius resided which produced the greater marvels of art, literature and philosophy in Greek civilization. It was among them, too, that the institutions of political freedom were carried to their highest attainment. Their chief city was Athens, and the splendor of its history bears testimony to their unexampled genius. On the other hand, the Dorians were less thoughtful, less imaginative, less broad in judgment or feeling—less susceptible, it would seem, of a high refinement of culture; but no less capable in practical pursuits, no less vigorous in effective action, and sounder, perhaps, in their moral constitution. Sparta, which stood at the head of the Doric states, contributed almost nothing to Greek literature, Greek thought, Greek art, or Greek commerce, but exercised a great influence on Greek political history. Other Doric states, especially Corinth, were foremost in commercial and colonizing enterprise, and attained some brilliancy of artistic civilization, but with moderate originality.

Greeks and Phœnicians.

It was natural, as noted above, that the Greeks should be induced at an early day to navigate the surrounding seas, and to engage in trade with neighboring nations. They were not original, it is supposed, in these ventures, but learned more or less of ship-building and the art of navigation from an older people, the Phœnicians, who dwelt on the coast of Syria and Palestine, and whose chief cities were Sidon and Tyre. The Phœnicians had extended their commerce widely through the Mediterranean before the Greeks came into rivalry with them. Their ships, and their merchants, and the wares they bartered, were familiar in the Ægean when the Homeric

poems were composed. They seem to have been the teachers of the early Greeks in many things. They gave them, with little doubt, the invention of the alphabet, which they themselves had borrowed from Egypt. They conveyed hints of art, which bore astonishing fruits when planted in the fertile Hellenic imagination. They carried from the East strange stories of gods and demigods, which were woven into the mythology of the Greeks. They gave, in fact, to Greek civilization, at its beginning, the greatest impulse it received. But all that Hellas took from the outer world it wrought into a new character, and put upon it the stamp of its own unmistakable genius. In navigation and commerce the Greeks of the coast-cities and the islands were able, ere long, to compete on even terms with the Phœnicians, and it happened, in no great space of time, that they had driven the latter entirely from the *Ægean* and the *Euxine* seas.

Greek Colonies.

They had now occupied with colonies the coast of Asia Minor and the islands on both their own coasts. The Ionian Greeks were the principal colonizers of the Asiatic shore and of the Cyclades. On the former and near it they founded twelve towns of note, including Samos, Miletus, Ephesus, Chios, and Phocæa, which are among the more famous cities of ancient times. Their important island settlements in the Cyclades were Naxos, Delos, Melos, and Paros. They possessed, likewise, the great island of Eubœa, with its two wealthy cities of Chalcis and Eretria. These, with Attica, constituted, in the main, the Ionic portion of Hellas.

The Dorians occupied the islands of Rhodes and Cos, and founded on the coast of Asia Minor the cities of Halicarnassus and Cnidus.

The important *Æolian* colonies in Asia were Smyrna (acquired later by the Ionians), Temnos, Larissa, and Cyme. Of the islands they occupied Lesbos and Tenedos.

From these settlements on neighboring coasts and islands the vigorous Greeks pushed on to more distant fields. It is probable that their colonies were in Cyprus and Crete before the eighth century, B. C. In the seventh century B. C., during a time of confusion and weakness in Egypt, they had entered that country as allies or as mercenaries of the kings, and had founded a city, Naucratis, which became an important agent in the exchange of arts and ideas, as well as of merchandise, between the Nile and the *Ægean*. Within a few years past the site of Naucratis has been uncovered by explorers, and much has been brought to light that was obscure in Greek and Egyptian history before. Within the same seventh century, Cyrene and Barca had been built on the African coast, farther west. Even a century before that time, the Corinthians had taken possession of Corcyra (modern Corfu), and they, with the men of Chalcis and Megara, had been actively founding cities that grew great and rich, in Sicily and in southern Italy, which latter acquired the name of "*Magna Græcia*" (Great Greece). At a not much later time they had pressed northwards to the *Euxine* or Black Sea, and had scattered settlements along the Thracian and Macedonian coast, including one (Byzantium) on the Bosphorus, which became, after a thousand years had passed, the imperial city of Constantinople. About 597 B. C., the

Phocæans had planted a colony at Massalia, in southern Gaul, from which sprang the great city known in modern times as Marseilles. And much of all this had been done, by Ionians and Dorians together, before Athens (in which Attica now centered itself, and which loomed finally greater in glory than the whole Hellenic world besides) had made a known mark in history.

Rise of Athens.

At first there had been kings in Athens, and legends had gathered about their names which give modern historians a ground-work for critical guessing, and scarcely more. Then the king disappeared and a magistrate called Archon took his place, who held office for only ten years. The archons are believed to have been chosen first from the old royal family alone; but after a time the office was thrown open to all noble families. This was the aristocratic stage of political evolution in the city-state. The next step was taken in 683 B. C. (which is said to be the beginning of authentic Athenian chronology) when nine archons were created, in place of the one, and their term of office was reduced to a single year.

Fifty years later, about 621 B. C., the people of Athens obtained their first code of written law, ascribed to one Draco, and described as a code of much severity. But it gave certainty to law, for the first time, and was the first great protective measure secured by the people. In 612 B. C. a noble named Kylon attempted to overthrow the aristocratic government and establish a tyranny under himself, but he failed.

Legislation of Solon.

Then there came forward in public life another noble, who was one of the wisest men and purest patriots of any country or age, and who made an attempt of quite another kind. This was Solon, the famous lawgiver, who became archon in 594 B. C. The political state of Athens at that time has been described for us in an ancient Greek treatise lately discovered, and which is believed to be one of the hitherto lost writings of Aristotle. "Not only," says the author of this treatise, "was the constitution at this time oligarchical in every respect, but the poorer classes, men, women, and children, were in absolute slavery to the rich. . . . The whole country was in the hands of a few persons, and if the tenants failed to pay their rent, they were liable to be haled into slavery, and their children with them. Their persons were mortgaged to their creditors." Solon saw that this was a state of things not to be endured by such a people as the Athenians, and he exerted himself to change it. He obtained authority to frame a new constitution and a new code of laws for the state. In the latter, he provided measures for relieving the oppressed class of debtors. In the former, he did not create a democratic government, but he greatly increased the political powers of the people. He classified them according to their wealth, defining four classes, the citizens in each of which had certain political duties and privileges measured to them by the extent of their property and income. But the whole body of citizens, in their general assembly (the *Ecclesia*), were given the important right of choosing the annual archons, whom they must select, however, from the ranks of the wealthiest class. At the same time, Solon enlarged the

powers of the old aristocratic senate — the Areopagus — giving it a supervision of the execution of the laws and a censorship of the morals of the people.

"These changes did not constitute Democracy, — a form of government then unknown, and for which there was as yet no word in the Greek language. But they initiated the democratic spirit. . . . Athens, thus fairly started on her way, — emancipated from the discipline of aristocratic school-masters, and growing into an age of manly liberty and self-restraint, — came eventually nearer to the ideal of 'the good life' [Aristotle's phrase] than any other State in Hellas." (W. W. Fowler.)

Tyranny of Pisistratus.

But before the Athenians reached their nearness to this "good life," they had to pass under the yoke of a "tyrant," Pisistratus, who won the favor of the poorer people, and, with their help, established himself in the Acropolis (560 B. C.) with a foreign guard to maintain his power. Twice driven out, he was twice restored, and reigned quite justly and prudently, on the whole, until his death in 527 B. C. He was succeeded by his two sons, Hippias and Hipparchus; but the latter was killed in 514, and Hippias was expelled by the Spartans in 510 B. C.; after which there was no tyranny in Athens.

The Democratic Republic.

On the fall of the Pisistratidæ, a majority of the noble or privileged class struggled hard to regain their old ascendancy; but one of their number, Cleisthenes, took the side of the people and helped them to establish a democratic constitution. He caused the ancient tribal division of the citizens to be abolished, and substituted a division which mixed the members of clans and broke up or weakened the clannish influence in politics. He enlarged Solon's senate or council and divided it into committees, and he brought the "ecclesia," or popular assembly, into a more active exercise of its powers. He also introduced the custom of ostracism, which permitted the citizens of Athens to banish by their vote any man whom they thought dangerous to the state. The constitution of Cleisthenes was the final foundation of the Athenian democratic republic. Monarchical and aristocratic Sparta resented the popular change, and undertook to restore the oligarchy by force of arms; but the roused democracy of Athens defended its newly won liberties with vigor and success.

The Persian Wars.

Not Athens only, but all Greece, was now about to be put to a test which proved the remarkable quality of both, and formed the beginning of their great career. The Ionian cities of Asia Minor had recently been twice conquered, first by Cræsus, King of Lydia, and then by Cyrus the Great, founder of the Persian empire, who had overthrown Cræsus (B. C. 547), and taken his dominions. The Persians oppressed them, and in 500 B. C. they rose in revolt. Athens and Eretria sent help to them, while Sparta refused. The revolt was suppressed, and Darius, the king of Persia, planned vengeance upon the Athenians and Eretrians for the aid they had given to it. He sent an expedition against them in 493 B. C., which was mostly destroyed by a

storm. In 490 B. C. he sent a second powerful army and fleet, which took Eretria and razed it to the ground. The great Persian army then marched upon Athens, and was met at Marathon by a small Athenian force of 9,000 men. The little city of Platea sent 1,000 more to stand with them in the desperate encounter. They had no other aid in the fight, and the Persians were a great unnumbered host. But Miltiades, the Greek general that day, planned his battle-charge so well that he routed the Asiatic host and lost but 192 men.

The Persians abandoned their attempt and returned to their wrathful king. One citizen of Athens, Themistocles, had sagacity enough to foresee that the "Great King," as he was known, would not rest submissive under his defeat; and with difficulty he persuaded his fellow citizens to prepare themselves for future conflicts by building a fleet and by fortifying their harbors, thus making themselves powerful at sea. The wisdom of his counsels was proved in 480 B. C., when Xerxes, the successor of Darius, led an army of prodigious size into Greece, crossing the Hellespont by a bridge of boats. This time, Sparta, Corinth, and several of the lesser states, rallied with Athens to the defence of the common country; but Thebes and Argos showed friendship to the Persians, and none of the important island-colonies contributed any help. Athens was the brain and right arm of the war, notwithstanding the accustomed leadership of Sparta in military affairs.

The first encounter was at Thermopylæ, where Leonidas and his 300 Spartans defended the narrow pass, and died in their place when the Persians found a way across the mountain to surround them. But on that same day the Persian fleet was beaten at Artemisium. Xerxes marched on Athens, however, found the city deserted, and destroyed it. His fleet had followed him, and was still stronger than the naval force of the Greeks. Themistocles forced a battle, against the will of the Peloponnesian captains, and practically destroyed the Persian fleet. This most memorable battle of Salamis was decisive of the war, and decisive of the independence of Greece. Xerxes, in a panic, hastened back into Asia, leaving one of his generals, Mardonius, with 300,000 men, to pursue the war. But Mardonius was routed and his host annihilated, at Platea, the next year, while the Persian fleet was again defeated on the same day at Mycale.

The Golden Age of Athens.

The war had been glorious for the Athenians, and all could see that Greece had been saved by their spirit and their intelligence much more than by the valor of Sparta and the other states. But they were in a woful condition, with their city destroyed and their families without homes. Wasting no time in lamentations, they rebuilt the town, stretched its walls to a wider circuit, and fortified it more strongly than before, under the lead of the sagacious Themistocles. Their neighbors were meanly jealous, and Sparta made attempts to interfere with the building of the walls; but Themistocles baffled them cunningly, and the new Athens rose proudly out of the ashes of the old.

The Ionian islands and towns of Asia Minor (which had broken the Persian yoke) now recognized the superiority and leadership of Athens, and a league was formed among them, which held

the meetings of its deputies and kept its treasury in the temple of Apollo on the sacred island of Delos; for which reason it was called the Confederacy of Delos, or the Delian League. The Peloponnesian states formed a looser rival league under the headship of Sparta. The Confederacy of Delos was in sympathy with popular governments and popular parties everywhere, while the Spartans and their following favored oligarchies and aristocratic parties. There were many occasions for hostility between the two.

The Athenians, at the head of their Confederacy, were strong, until they impaired their power by using it in tyrannical ways. Many lesser states in the league were foolish enough to commute in money payments the contribution of ships and men which they had pledged themselves to make to the common naval force. This gave Athens the power to use that force despotically, as her own, and she did not scruple to exercise the power. The Confederacy was soon a name; the states forming it were no longer allies of Athens, but her subjects; she ruled them as the sovereign of an Empire, and her rule was neither generous nor just. Thereby the double tie of kinship and of interest which might have bound the whole circle of Ionian states to her fortunes and herself was destroyed by her own acts. Provoking the hatred of her allies and challenging the jealous fear of her rivals, Athens had many enemies.

At the same time, a dangerous change in the character of her democratic institutions was begun, produced especially by the institution of popular jury-courts, before which prosecutions of every kind were tried, the citizens who constituted the courts acting as jury and judge at once. This gave them a valuable training, without doubt, and helped greatly to raise the common standard of intelligence among the Athenians so high; but it did unquestionably tend also to demoralizations that were ruinous in the end. The jury service, which was slightly paid, fell more and more to an unworthy class, made up of idlers or intriguers. Party feeling and popular passions gained an increasing influence over the juries, and demagogues acquired an increasing skill in making use of them.

But these evils were scarcely more than in their seed during the great period of "Athenian Empire," as it is sometimes called, and everything within its bounds was suffused with the shining splendor of that matchless half-century. The genius of this little Ionic state was stimulated to amazing achievements in every intellectual field. *Æschylus*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, *Aristophanes*, within a single generation, crowded Athenian literature with the masterpieces of classic drama. *Pheidias* and his companions crowned the *Acropolis* and filled the city with works that have been the models in art for all ages since. *Socrates* began the quizzing which turned philosophy into honest truth-seeking paths, and *Plato* listened to him and was instructed for his mission. *Thucydides* watched events with sagacious young eyes, and prepared his pen for the chronicling of them; while *Herodotus*, pausing at Athens from his wide travels, matured the knowledge he had gathered up and perfected it for his final work. Over all of them came *Pericles* to preside and rule, not as a master, or "tyrant," but as leader, guide, patron, princely republican,—statesman and politician in one.

The Peloponnesian War.

The period of the ascendancy of *Pericles* was the "golden age" of Athenian prosperity and power, both material and intellectual. The beginning of the end of it was reached a little before he died, when the long-threatened war between Athens and the Peloponnesian league, led by Sparta, broke out (B. C. 431). If Athens had then possessed the good will of the cities of her own league, and if her citizens had retained their old sobriety and intelligence, she might have triumphed in the war; for she was all powerful at sea and fortified almost invincibly against attacks by land. But the subject states, called allies, were hostile, for the most part, and helped the enemy by their revolts, while the death of *Pericles* (B. C. 429) let loose on the people a swarm of demagogues who flattered and deluded them, and baffled the wiser and more honest, whose counsels and leadership might have given her success.

The fatal folly of the long war was an expedition against the distant city of *Syracuse* (B. C. 415–413), into which the Athenians were enticed by the restless and unscrupulous ambition of *Alcibiades*. The entire force sent to Sicily perished there, and the strength and spirit of Athens were ruinously sapped by the fearful calamity. She maintained the war, however, until 404 B. C., when, having lost her fleet in the decisive battle of *Ægospotami*, and being helplessly blockaded by sea and land, the city was surrendered to the Spartan general *Lyander*. Her walls and fortifications were then destroyed and her democratic government was overthrown, giving place to an oligarchy known as the "thirty tyrants." The democracy soon suppressed the thirty tyrants and regained control, and Athens, in time, rose somewhat from her deep humiliation, but never again to much political power in Greece. In intellect and cultivation, the superiority of the Attic state was still maintained, and its greatest productions in philosophy and eloquence were yet to be given to the world.

Spartan and Theban Ascendancy.

After the fall of Athens, Sparta was dominant in the whole of Greece for thirty years and more, exercising her power more oppressively than Athens had done. Then *Thebes*, which had been treacherously seized and garrisoned by the Spartans, threw off their yoke (B. C. 379) and led a rising, under her great and high-souled citizen, *Epaminondas*, which resulted in bringing *Thebes* to the head of Greek affairs. But the Theban ascendancy was short-lived, and ended with the death of *Epaminondas* in 362 B. C.

Macedonian Supremacy.

Meantime, while the city-states of *Hellas* proper had been wounding and weakening one another by their jealousies and wars, the semi-Greek kingdom of *Macedonia*, to the north of them, in their own peninsula, had been acquiring their civilization and growing strong. And now there appeared upon its throne a very able king, *Philip*, who took advantage of their divisions, interfered in their affairs, and finally made a practical conquest of the whole peninsula, by his victory at the battle of *Chæronea* (B. C. 338). At Athens, the great orator *Demosthenes* had exerted himself for years to rouse resistance to *Philip*. If his eloquence failed then, it has served

the world immortally since, by delighting and instructing mankind.

King Philip was succeeded by his famous son, Alexander the Great, who led an army of Macedonians and Greeks into Asia (B. C. 334), overthrew the already crumbling Persian power, pursued his conquests through Afghanistan to India, and won a great empire which he did not live to rule. When he died (B. C. 323), his generals divided the empire among them and fought with one another for many years. But the general result was the spreading of the civilization and language of the Greeks, and the establishing of their intellectual influence, in Egypt, in Syria, in Asia Minor, and beyond.

In Greece itself, a state of disturbance and of political confusion and weakness prevailed for another century. There was promise of something better, in the formation, by several of the Peloponnesian states, of a confederacy called the Achaian League, which might possibly have federated and nationalized the whole of Hellas in the end; but the Romans, at this juncture, turned their conquering arms eastward, and in three successive wars, between 211 and 146 B. C., they extinguished the Macedonian kingdom, and annexed it, with the whole peninsula, to the dominions of their wonderful republic.

The Romans.

The Romans, as stated already, are believed to have been originally near kindred to the Greeks. The same movement, it is supposed, in the successive outwarmings of Aryan peoples, deposited in one peninsula the Italian tribes, and in the next peninsula, eastward, the tribes of the Hellenes. Among the Italian tribes were Latins, Umbrians, Sabines, Samnites, etc., occupying the middle and much of the southern parts of the peninsula, while a mysterious alien people, the Etruscans, whose origin is not known, possessed the country north of them between the Arno and the Tiber. In the extreme south were remnants of a primitive race, the Iapygian, and Greek colonies were scattered there around the coasts.

From the Latins sprang the Romans, at the beginning of their separate existence; but there seems to have been a very early union of these Romans of the primitive tradition with a Sabine community, whereby was formed the Roman city-state of historical times. That union came about through the settlement of the two communities, Latin and Sabine, on two neighboring hills, near the mouth of the river Tiber, on its southern bank. In the view of some historians, it is the geographical position of those hills, hardly less than the masterful temper and capacity of the race seated on them, which determined the marvellous career of the city founded on that site. Says Professor Freeman: "The whole history of the world has been determined by the geological fact that at a point a little below the junction of the Tiber and the Anio the isolated hills stand nearer to one another than most of the other hills of Latium. On a site marked out above all other sites for dominion, the centre of Italy, the centre of Europe, as Europe then was, a site at the junction of three of the great nations of Italy, and which had the great river as its highway to lands beyond the bounds of Italy, stood two low hills, the hill which bore the name of Latin Saturn, and the hill at the meaning of whose name of Palatine scholars will perhaps

guess for ever. These two hills, occupied by men of two of the nations of Italy, stood so near to one another that a strait choice indeed was laid on those who dwelled on them. They must either join together on terms closer than those which commonly united Italian leagues, or they must live a life of border warfare more ceaseless, more bitter, than the ordinary warfare of Italian enemies. Legend, with all likelihood, tells us that warfare was tried; history, with all certainty, tells us that the final choice was union. The two hills were fenced with a single wall; the men who dwelled on them changed from wholly separate communities into tribes of a single city."

The followers of Romulus occupied the Palatine Mount, and the Sabines were settled on the Quirinal. At subsequent times, the Cœlian, the Capitoline, the Aventine, the Esquiline and the Viminal hills were embraced in the circumvallation, and the city on the seven hills thus acquired that name.

If modern students and thinkers, throwing light on the puzzling legends and traditions of early Rome from many sources, in language and archæology, have construed their meaning rightly, then great importance attaches to those first unions or incorporations of distinct settlements in the forming of the original city-state. For it was the beginning of a process which went on until the whole of Latium, and then the whole of Italy, and, finally, the whole Mediterranean world, were joined to the seven hills of Rome. "The whole history of Rome is a history of incorporation"; and it is reasonable to believe that the primal spring of Roman greatness is found in that early adoption and persistent practice of the policy of political absorption, which gave conquest a character it had never borne before.

At the same time, this view of the creation of the Roman state contributes to an understanding of its early constitutional history. It supposes that the union of the first three tribes which coalesced — those of the Palatine, the Quirinal and Capitoline (both occupied by the Sabines) and the Cœlian hills — ended the process of incorporation on equal terms. These formed the original Roman people — the "fathers," the "patres," whose descendants appear in later times as a distinct class or order, the "patricians" — holding and struggling to maintain exclusive political rights, and exclusive ownership of the public domain, the "ager publicus," which became a subject of bitter contention for four centuries. Around these heirs of the "fathers" of Rome arose another class of Romans, brought into the community by later incorporations, and not on equal terms. If the first class were "fathers," these were children, in a political sense, adopted into the Roman family, but without a voice in general affairs, or a share in the public lands, or eligibility to the higher offices of the state. These were the "plebeians" or "plebs" of Rome, whose long struggle with the patricians for political and agrarian rights is the more interesting side of Roman history throughout nearly the whole of the prosperous age of the republic.

At Rome, as at Athens, there was a period of early kingship, the legends of which are as familiar to us all as the stories of the Bible, but the real facts of which are almost totally unknown. It is surmised that the later kings — the well known Tarquinius of the classical tale — were

Etruscan princes (it is certain that they were Etruscans), who had broken for a time the independence of the Romans and extended their sovereignty over them. It is suspected, too, that this period of Etruscan domination was one in which Roman civilization made a great advance, under the tuition of a more cultivated people. But if Rome in its infancy did know a time of subjugation, the endurance was not long. It ended, according to Roman chronology, in the 245th year of the city, or 509 B.C., by the expulsion of Tarquin the Proud, the last of the kings.

The Roman Republic.

The Republic was then founded; but it was an aristocratic and not a democratic republic. The consuls, who replaced the kings, were required to be patricians, and they were chosen by the landholders of the state. The senate was patrician; all the important powers of government were in patrician hands, and the plebs suffered grievous oppression in consequence. They were not of a tamely submissive race. They demanded powers for their own protection, and by slow degrees they won them—strong as the patricians were in their wealth and their trained political skill.

Precisely as in Athens, the first great effort among the common people was to obtain relief from crushing burdens of debt, which had been laid upon them in precisely the same way—by loss of harvests while in military service, and by the hardness of the laws which creditors alone had framed. An army of plebs, just home from war, marched out of the city and refused to return until magistrates of their own choosing had been conceded to them. The patricians could not afford to lose the bone and sinew of their state, and they yielded the point in demand (B. C. 494). This first "secession of the plebs" brought about the first great democratic change in the Roman constitution, by calling into existence a powerful magistracy—the Tribunes of the Plebs—who henceforth stood between the consuls and the common people, for the protection of the latter.

From this first success the plebeian order went forward, step by step, to the attainment of equal political rights in the commonwealth, and equal participation in the lands which Roman conquest was continually adding to the public domain. In 450 B. C., after ten years of struggle, they secured the appointment of a commission which framed the famous Twelve Tables of the Law, and so established a written and certain code. Five years later, the caste exclusiveness of the patricians was broken down by a law which permitted marriages between the orders. In 367 B. C. the patrician monopoly of the consular office was extinguished, by the notable Licinian Laws, which also limited the extent of land that any citizen might occupy, and forbade the exclusive employment of slave labor on any estate. One by one, after that, other magistracies were opened to the plebs; and in 287 B. C. by the Lex Hortensia, the plebeian concilium, or assembly, was made independent of the senate and its acts declared to be valid and binding. The democratic commonwealth was now completely formed.

Roman Conquest of Italy.

While these changes in the constitution of their Republic were in progress, the Romans had been

making great advances toward supremacy in the peninsula. First they had been in league with their Latin neighbors, for war with the Æquians, the Volscians, and the Etruscans. The Volscian war extended over forty years, and ended about 450 B. C. in the practical disappearance of the Volscians from history. Of war with the Æquians, nothing is heard after 458 B. C., when, as the tale is told, Cincinnatus left his plow to lead the Romans against them. The war with the Etruscans of the near city of Veii had been more stubborn. Suspended by a truce between 474 and 438 B. C., it was then renewed, and ended in 396 B. C., when the Etruscan city was taken and destroyed. At the same time the power of the Etruscans was being shattered at sea by the Greeks of Tarentum and Syracuse, while at home they were attacked from the north by the barbarous Gauls or Celts.

These last named people, having crossed the Alps from Gaul and Switzerland and occupied northern Italy, were now pressing upon the more civilized nations to the south of the Po. The Etruscans were first to suffer, and their despair became so great that they appealed to Rome for help. The Romans gave little aid to them in their extremity; but enough to provoke the wrath of Brennus, the savage leader of the Gauls. He quitted Etruria and marched to Rome, defeating an army which opposed him on the Allia, pillaging and burning the city (B. C. 390) and slaying the senators, who had refused to take refuge, with other inhabitants, in the capitol. The defenders of the capitol held it for seven months; Rome was rebuilt, when the Gauls withdrew, and soon took up her war again with the Etruscan cities. By the middle of the same century she was mistress of southern Etruria, though her territories had been ravaged twice again by renewed incursions of the Gauls. In a few years more, when her allies of Latium complained of their meager share of the fruits of these common wars, and demanded Roman citizenship and equal rights, she fought them fiercely and humbled them to submissiveness (B. C. 339-338), reducing their cities to the status of provincial towns.

And now, having awed or subdued her rivals, her friends, and her enemies, near at hand, the young Republic swung into the career of rapid conquest which subdued to her will, within three-fourths of a century, the whole of Italy below the mouth of the Arno.

In 343 B. C. the Roman arms had been turned against the Samnites at the south, and they had been driven from the Campania. In 327 B. C. the same dangerous rivals were again assailed, with less impunity. At the Caudine Forks, in 321 B. C., the Samnites inflicted both disaster and shame upon their indomitable foes; but the end of the war (B. C. 304) found Rome advanced and Samnium fallen back. A third contest ended the question of supremacy; but the Samnites (B. C. 290) submitted to become allies and not subjects of the Roman state.

In this last struggle the Samnites had summoned Gauls and Etruscans to join them against the common enemy, and Rome had overcome their united forces in a great fight at Sentinum. This was in 295 B. C. Ten years later she annihilated the Senonian Gauls, annexed their territory and planted a colony at Sena on the coast. In two years more she had paralyzed the Boian

Gauls by a terrible chastisement, and had nothing more to fear from the northward side of her realm. Then she turned back to finish her work in the south.

War with Pyrrhus.

The Greek cities of the southern coast were harassed by various marauding neighbors, and most of them solicited the protection of Rome, which involved, of course, some surrender of their independence. But one great city, Tarentum, the most powerful of their number, refused these terms, and hazarded a war with the terrible republic, expecting support from the ambitious Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, on the Greek coast opposite their own. Pyrrhus came readily at their call, with dreams of an Italian kingdom more agreeable than his own. Assisted in the undertaking by his royal kinsmen of Macedonia and Syria, he brought an army of 25,000 men, with 20 elephants — which Roman eyes had never seen before. In two bloody fights (B. C. 280-279), Pyrrhus was victorious; but the cost of victory was so great that he dared not follow it up. He went over to Sicily, instead, and waged war for three years (B. C. 278-276) with the Carthaginians, who had subjugated most of the island. The Epirot king brought timely aid to the Sicilian Greeks, and drove their Punic enemies into the western border of the island; but he claimed sovereignty over all that his arms delivered, and was not successful in enforcing the claim. He returned to Italy and found the Romans better prepared than before to face his phalanx and his elephants. They routed him at Beneventum, in the spring of 275 B. C. and he went back to Epirus, with his dreams dispelled. Tarentum fell, and Southern Italy was added to the dominion of Rome.

Punic Wars.

During her war with Pyrrhus, the Republic had formed an alliance with Carthage, the powerful maritime Phœnician city on the African coast. But friendship between these two cities was impossible. The ambition of both was too boundless and too fierce. They were necessarily competitors for supremacy in the Mediterranean world, from the moment that a narrow strait between Italy and Sicily was all that held them apart. Rome challenged her rival to the duel in 264 B. C., when she sent help to the Mamertines, a band of brigands who had seized the Sicilian city of Messina, and who were being attacked by both Carthaginians and Syracusan Greeks. The "First Punic War," then begun, lasted twenty-four years, and resulted in the withdrawal of the Carthaginians from Sicily, and in their payment of an enormous war indemnity to Rome. The latter assumed a protectorate over the island, and the kingdom of Hiero of Syracuse preserved its nominal independence for the time; but Sicily, as a matter of fact, might already be looked upon as the first of those provinces, beyond Italy, which Rome bound to herself, one by one, until she had compassed the Mediterranean with her dominion and gathered to it all the islands of that sea.

The "Second Punic war," called sometimes the "Hannibalic war," was fought with a great Carthaginian, rather than with Carthage herself. Hamilcar Barca had been the last and ablest of the Punic generals in the contest for Sicily. Afterwards he undertook the conquest of Spain, where his arms had such success that he estab-

lished a very considerable power, more than half independent of the parent state. He nursed an unquenchable hatred of Rome, and transmitted it to his son Hannibal, who solemnly dedicated his life to warfare with the Latin city. Hamilcar died, and in due time Hannibal found himself prepared to make good his oath. He provoked a declaration of war (B. C. 218) by attacking Saguntum, on the eastern Spanish coast — a town which the Romans "protected." The latter expected to encounter him in Spain; but before the fleet bearing their legions to that country had reached Massilia, he had already passed the Pyrenees and the Rhone, with nearly 100,000 men, and was crossing the Alps, to assail his astounded foes on their own soil. The terrific barrier was surmounted with such suffering and loss that only 20,000 foot and 6,000 horse, of the great army which left Spain, could be mustered for the clearing of the last Alpine pass. With this small following, by sheer energy, rapidity and precision of movement — by force, in other words, of a military genius never surpassed in the world — he defeated the armies of Rome again and again, and so crushingly in the awful battle of Cannæ (B. C. 216) that the proud republic was staggered, but never despaired. For fifteen years the great Carthaginian held his ground in southern Italy; but his expectation of being joined by discontented subjects of Rome in the peninsula was very slightly realized, and his own country gave him little encouragement or help. His brother Hasdrubal, marching to his relief in 207 B. C., was defeated on the river Metaurus and slain. The arms of Rome had prospered meantime in Sicily and in Spain, even while beaten at home, and her Punic rival had been driven from both. In 204 B. C. the final field of battle was shifted to Carthaginian territory by Scipio, of famous memory, thereafter styled Africanus, because he "carried the war into Africa." Hannibal abandoned Italy to confront him, and at Zama, in the autumn of 202 B. C., the long contention ended, and the career of Carthage as a Power in the ancient world was forever closed. Existing by Roman sufferance for another half century, she then gave her implacable conquerors another pretext for war, and they ruthlessly destroyed her (B. C. 146).

Roman Conquest of Greece.

In that same year of the destruction of Carthage, the conquest of Greece was finished. The first war of the Romans on that side of the Adriatic had taken place during the Second Punic war, and had been caused by an alliance formed between Hannibal and King Philip of Macedonia (B. C. 214). They pursued it then no further than to frustrate Philip's designs against themselves; but they formed alliances with the Greek states oppressed or menaced by the Macedonian, and these drew them into a second war, just as the century closed. On Cynoscephalæ, Philip was overthrown (B. C. 197), his kingdom reduced to vassalage, and the freedom of all Greece was solemnly proclaimed by the Roman Consul Flaminius.

And now, for the first time, Rome came into conflict with an Asiatic power. The throne of the Syrian monarchy, founded by one of the generals of Alexander the Great, was occupied by a king more ambitious than capable, who had acquired a large and loosely jointed dominion in the East, and who bore the sounding name of

Antiochus the Great. This vainglorious King, having a huge army and many elephants at his disposal, was eager to try a passage at arms with the redoubtable men of Rome. He was encouraged in his desire by the Ætolians in Greece, who bore ill-will to Rome. Under this encouragement, and having Hannibal — then a fugitive at his court — to give him counsel, which he lacked intelligence to use, Antiochus crossed the Ægean and invaded Greece (B. C. 192). The Romans met him at the pass of Thermopylæ; drove him back to the shores from which he came; pursued him thither; crushed and humbled him on the field of Magnesia, and took the kingdoms and cities of Asia Minor under their protection, as the allies (soon to be subjects) of Rome.

Twenty years passed with little change in the outward situation of affairs among the Greeks. But discontent with the harshness and haughtiness of Roman "protection" changed from sullenness to heat, and Perseus, son of Philip of Macedonia, fanned it steadily, with the hope of bringing it to a flame. Rome watched him with keen vigilance, and before his plans were ripe her legions were upon him. He battled with them obstinately for three years (B. C. 171-168); but his fate was sealed at Pydna. He went as a prisoner to Rome; his kingdom was broken into four small republics; the Achæan League was stricken by the captivity of a thousand of its chief men; the whole of Greece was humbled to submissiveness, though not yet formally reduced to the state of a Roman province. That followed some years later, when risings in Macedonia and Achaia were punished by the extinction of the last semblance of political independence in both (B. C. 148-146).

The zenith of the Republic.

Rome now gripped the Mediterranean (the ocean of the then civilized world) as with four fingers of a powerful hand: one laid on Italy and all its islands, one on Macedonia and Greece, one on Carthage, one on Spain, and the little finger of her "protection" reaching over to the Lesser Asia. Little more than half a century, since the day that Hannibal threatened her own city gates, had sufficed to win this vast dominion. But the losses of the Republic had been greater, after all, than the gains; for the best energies of its political constitution had been expended in the acquisition, and the nobler qualities in its character had been touched with the incurable taints of a licentious prosperity.

Beginning of Decline.

A century and a half had passed since the practical ending of the struggle of plebeians with patricians for political and agrarian rights. In theory and in form, the constitution remained as democratic as it was made by the Licinian Laws of 367 B. C., and by the finishing touch of the Hortensian Law of 287 B. C. But in practical working it had reverted to the aristocratic mode. A new aristocracy had risen out of the plebeian ranks to reinforce the old patrician order. It was composed of the families of men who had been raised to distinction and ennobled by the holding of eminent offices, and its spirit was no less jealous and exclusive than that of the older high caste.

The Senate and the Mob.

Thus strengthened, the aristocracy had recovered its ascendancy in Rome, and the Senate, which it controlled, had become the supreme power in government. The amazing success of the Republic during the last century just reviewed — its successes in war, in diplomacy, and in all the sagacious measures of policy by which its great dominion had been won — are reasonably ascribed to this fact. For the Senate had wielded the power of the state, in most emergencies, with passionless deliberation and with unity and fixity of aim.

But it maintained its ascendancy by an increasing employment of means which debased and corrupted all orders alike. The people held powers which might paralyze the Senate at any moment, if they chose to exercise them, through their assemblies and their tribunes. They had seldom brought those powers into play thus far, to interfere with the senatorial government of the Republic, simply because they had been bribed to abstain. The art of the politician in Rome, as distinguished from the statesman, had already become demagoguery. This could not well have been otherwise under the peculiar constitution of the Roman citizenship. Of the thirty-five tribes who made up the Roman people, legally qualified to vote, only four were within the city. The remaining thirty-one were *tribus rusticae*. There was no delegated representation of this country populace — citizens beyond the walls. To exercise their right of suffrage they must be personally present at the meetings of the "comitia tributa" — the tribal assemblies; and those of any tribe who chanced to be in attendance at such a meeting might give a vote which carried with it the weight of their whole tribe. For questions were decided by the majority of tribal, not individual, votes; and a very few members of a tribe might act for and be the tribe, for all purposes of voting, on occasions of the greatest possible importance.

It is quite evident that a democratic system of this nature gave wide opportunity for corrupt "politics." There must have been, always, an attraction for the baser sort among the rural plebs, drawing them into the city, to enjoy the excitement of political contests, and to partake of the flatteries and largesses which began early to go with these. And circumstances had tended strongly to increase this sinister sifting into Rome of the most vagrant and least responsible of her citizens, to make them practically the deputies and representatives of that mighty sovereign which had risen in the world — the "Populus Romanus." For there was no longer either thrift or dignity possible in the pursuits of husbandry. The long Hannibalic War had ruined the farming class in Italy by its ravages; but the extensive conquests that followed it had been still more ruinous to that class by several effects combined. Corn supplies from the conquered provinces were poured into Rome at cheapened prices; enormous fortunes, gathered in the same provinces by officials, by farmers of taxes, by money-lenders, and by traders, were largely invested in great estates, absorbing the small farms of olden time; and, finally, free-labor in agriculture was supplanted, more and more, by the labor of slaves, which war and increasing wealth combined to multiply in numbers. Thus the rural "plebs" of Rome

were a depressed and, therefore, a degenerating class, and the same circumstances that made them so impelled them towards the city, to swell the mob which held its mighty sovereignty in their hands.

So far, a lavish amusement of this mob with free games, and liberal bribes, had kept it generally submissive to the senatorial government. But the more it was debased by such methods, and its vagrancy encouraged, the more extravagant gratuities of like kind it claimed. Hence a time could never be far away when the aristocracy and the senate would lose their control of the popular vote on which they had built their governing power.

Agrarian Agitations.

But they invited the quicker coming of that time by their own greediness in the employment of their power for selfish and dishonest ends. They had practically recovered their monopoly of the use of the public lands. The Licinian law, which forbade any one person to occupy more than five hundred jugera (about three hundred acres) of the public lands, had been made a dead letter. The great tracts acquired in the Samnite wars, and since, had remained undistributed, while the use and profit of them were enjoyed, under one form of authority or another, by rich capitalists and powerful nobles.

This evil, among many that waxed greater each year, caused the deepest discontent, and provoked movements of reform which soon passed by rapid stages into a revolution, and ended in the fall of the Republic. The leader of the movement at its beginning was Tiberius Gracchus, grandson of Scipio Africanus on the side of his mother, Cornelia. Elected tribune in 133 B. C., he set himself to the dangerous task of rousing the people against senatorial usurpations, especially in the matter of the public domain. He only drew upon himself the hatred of the senate and its selfish supporters; he failed to rally a popular party that was strong enough for his protection, and his enemies slew him in the very midst of a meeting of the tribes. His brother Caius took up the perilous cause and won the office of tribune (B. C. 123) in avowed hostility to the senatorial government. He was driven to bid high for popular help, even when the measures which he strove to carry were most plainly for the welfare of the common people, and he may seem to modern eyes to have played the demagogue with some extravagance. But statesmanship and patriotism without demagoguery for their instrument or their weapon were hardly practicable, perhaps, in the Rome of those days, and it is not easy to find them clean-handed in any political leader of the last century of the Republic.

The fall of Caius Gracchus was hastened by his attempt to extend the Roman franchise beyond the "populus Romanus," to all the freemen of Italy. The mob in Rome was not pleased with such political generosity, and cooled in its admiration for the large-minded tribune. He lost his office and the personal protection it threw over him, and then he, like his brother, was slain (B. C. 121) in a *melee*.

Jugurthine War.

For ten years the senate, the nobility, and the capitalists (now beginning to take the name of the equestrian order), had mostly their own way

again, and effaced the work of the Gracchi as completely as they could. Then came disgraceful troubles in Numidia which enraged the people and moved them to a new assertion of themselves. The Numidian king who helped Scipio to pull Carthage down had been a ward of Rome since that time. When he died, he left his kingdom to be governed jointly by two young sons and an older nephew. The latter, Jugurtha, put his cousins out of the way, took the kingdom to himself, and baffled attempts at Rome to call him to account, by heavy bribes. The corruption in the case became so flagrant that even the corrupted Roman populace revolted against it, and took the Numidian business into its own hands. War was declared against Jugurtha by popular vote, and, despite opposing action in the Senate, one Marius, an experienced soldier of humble birth, was elected consul and sent out to take command. Marius distinguished himself in the war much less than did one of his officers, Cornelius Sulla; but he bore the lion's share of glory when Jugurtha was taken captive and conveyed to Rome (B. C. 104). Marius was now the great hero of the hour, and events were preparing to lift him to the giddiest heights of popularity.

Teutones and Cimbri.

Hitherto, the barbarians of wild Europe whom the Romans had met were either the Aryan Celts, or the non-Aryan tribes found in northern Italy, Spain and Gaul. Now, for the first time, the armies of Rome were challenged by tribes of another grand division of the Aryan stock, coming out of the farther North. These were the Cimbri and the Teutones, wandering hordes of the great Teutonic or Germanic race which has occupied Western Europe north of the Rhine since the beginning of historic time. So far as we can know, these two were the first of the Germanic nations to migrate to the South. They came into collision with Rome in 113 B. C., when they were in Noricum, threatening the frontiers of her Italian dominion. Four years later they were in southern Gaul, where the Romans were now settling colonies and subduing the native Celts. Twice they had beaten the armies opposed to them; two years later they added a third to their victories; and in 105 B. C. they threw Rome into consternation by destroying two great armies on the Rhone. Italy seemed helpless against the invasion for which these terrible barbarians were now preparing, when Marius went against them. In the summer of 102 B. C. he annihilated the Teutones, near Aquæ Sextiæ (modern Aix), and in the following year he destroyed the invading Cimbri, on a bloody field in northern Italy, near modern Vercellæ.

Marius.

From these great victories, Marius went back to Rome, doubly and terribly clothed with power, by the devotion of a reckless army and the hero-worship of an unthinking mob. The state was at his mercy. A strong man in his place might have crushed the class-factions and accomplished the settlement which Cæsar made after half a century more of turbulence and shame. But Marius was ignorant, he was weak, and he became a mere blood-stained figure in the ruinous anarchy of his time.

Optimates and Populares.

The social and political state of the capital had grown rapidly worse. A middle-class in Roman society had practically disappeared. The two contending parties or factions, which had taken new names—"optimates" and "populares"—were now divided almost solely by the line which separates rich from poor. "If we said that 'optimates' signified the men who bribed and abused office under the banner of the Senate and its connections, and that 'populares' meant men who bribed and abused office with the interests of the people outside the Senatorial pale upon their lips, we might do injustice to many good men on both sides, but should hardly be slandering the parties" (Beesly). There was a desperate conflict between the two in the year 100 B. C. and the Senate once more recovered its power for a brief term of years.

The Social War.

The enfranchisement of the so-called "allies"—the Latin and other subjects of Rome who were not citizens—was the burning question of the time. The attempt of Caius Gracchus to extend rights of citizenship to them had been renewed again and again, without success, and each failure had increased the bitter discontent of the Italian people. In 90 B. C. they drew together in a formidable confederation and rose in revolt. In the face of this great danger Rome sobered herself to action with old time wisdom and vigor. She yielded her full citizenship to all Italian freemen who had not taken arms, and then offered it to those who would lay their arms down. At the same time, she fought the insurrection with every army she could put into the field, and in two years it was at an end. Marius and his old lieutenant, Sulla, had been the principal commanders in this "Social War," as it was named, and Sulla had distinguished himself most. The latter had now an army at his back and was a power in the state, and between the two military champions there arose a rivalry which produced the first of the Roman Civil Wars.

Marius and Sulla.

A troublesome war in the East had been forced upon the Romans by aggressions of Mithridates, King of Pontus. Both Marius and Sulla aspired to the command. Sulla obtained election to the consulship in 88 B. C. and was named for the coveted place. But Marius succeeded in getting the appointment annulled by a popular assembly and himself chosen instead for the Eastern command. Sulla, personally imperilled by popular tumults, fled to his legions, put himself at their head, and marched back to Rome—the first among her generals to turn her arms against herself. There was no effective resistance; Marius fled; both Senate and people were submissive to the dictates of the consul who had become master of the city. He "made the tribes decree their own political extinction, resuscitating the *comitia centuriata*; he reorganized the Senate by adding three hundred to its members and vindicating the right to sanction legislation; conducted the consular elections, exacting from L. Cornelius Cinna, the newly elected consul, a solemn oath that he would observe the new regulations, and securing the election of Cn. Octavius in his own interest, and then, like 'a countryman who had just shaken the lice off his coat,' to use his own figure,

he turned to do his great work in the East" (Horton).

Sulla went to Greece, which was in revolt and in alliance with Mithridates, and conducted there a brilliant, ruthless campaign for three years (B. C. 87-84), until he had restored Roman authority in the peninsula, and forced the King of Pontus to surrender all his conquests in Asia Minor. Until this task was finished, he gave no heed to what his enemies did at Rome; though the struggle there between "Sullans" and "Marians" had gone fiercely and bloodily on, and his own partisans had been beaten in the fight. The consul Octavius, who was in Sulla's interest, had first driven the consul Cinna out of the city, after slaying 10,000 of his faction. Cinna's cause was taken up by the new Italian citizens; he was joined by the exiled Marius, and these two returned together, with an army which the Senate and the party of Sulla were unable to resist. Marius came back with a burning heart and with savage intentions of revenge. A horrible massacre of his opponents ensued, which went on unchecked for five days, and was continued more deliberately for several months, until Marius died, at the beginning of the year 86 B. C. Then Cinna ruled absolutely at Rome for three years, supported in the main by the newly-made citizens; while the provinces generally remained under the control of the party of the optimates.

In 83 B. C. Sulla, having finished with carefulness his work in the East, came back into Italy, with 40,000 veterans to attend his steps. He had been outlawed and deprived of his command, by the faction governing at the capital; but its decrees had no effect and troubled him little. Cinna had been killed by his own troops, even before Sulla's landing at Brundisium. Several important leaders and soldiers on the Marian side, such as Pompeius, then a young general, and Crassus, the millionaire, went over to Sulla's camp. One of the consuls of the year saw his troops follow their example, in a body; the other consul was beaten and driven into Capua. Sulla wintered in Campania, and the next spring he pressed forward to Rome, fighting a decisive battle with Marius the younger on the way, and took possession of the city; but not in time to prevent a massacre of senators by the resentful mob.

Sulla's Dictatorship.

Before that year closed, the whole of Italy had been subdued, the final battle being fought with the Marians and Italians at the Colline Gate, and Sulla again possessed power supreme. He placed it beyond dispute by a deliberate extermination of his opponents, more merciless than the Marian massacre had been. They were proscribed by name, in placarded lists, and rewards paid to those who killed them; while their property was confiscated, and became the source of vast fortunes to Sulla's supporters, and of lands for distribution to his veterans.

When this terror had paralyzed all resistance to his rule, the Dictator (for he had taken that title) undertook a complete reconstruction of the constitution, aiming at a permanent restoration of senatorial ascendancy and a curbing of the powers which the people, in their assemblies, and the magistrates who especially represented them, had gained during the preceding century. He remodelled, moreover, the judicial system, and some of his reforms were undoubtedly good,

though they did not prove enduring. When he had fashioned the state to his liking, this extraordinary usurper quietly abdicated his dictatorial office (B. C. 80) and retired to private life, undisturbed until his death (B. C. 78).

After Sulla.

The system he had established did not save Rome from renewed distractions and disorder after Sulla died. There was no longer a practical question between Senate and people—between the few and the many in government. The question now, since the legionaries held their swords prepared to be flung into the scale, was what *one* should again gather the powers of government into his hands, as Sulla had done.

The great Game and the Players.

The history of the next thirty years—the last generation of republican Rome—is a sad and sinister but thrilling chronicle of the strifes and intrigues, the machinations and corruptions, of a stupendous and wicked game in politics that was played, against one another and against the Republic, by a few daring, unscrupulous players, with the empire of the civilized world for the stake between them. There were more than a few who aspired; there were only three players who entered really as principals into the game. These were Pompeius, called “the Great,” since he extinguished the Marian faction in Sicily and in Spain; Crassus, whose wealth gave him power, and who acquired some military pretensions besides, by taking the field against a formidable insurrection of slaves (B. C. 73–71); and Julius Cæsar, a young patrician, but nephew of Marius by marriage, who assiduously strengthened that connection with the party of the people, and who began, very soon after Sulla’s death, to draw attention to himself as a rising power in the politics of the day. There were two other men, Cicero and the younger Cato, who bore a nobler and greater because less selfish part in the contest of that fateful time. Both were blind to the impossibility of restoring the old order of things, with a dominant Senate, a free but well guided populace, and a simply ordered social state; but their blindness was heroic and high-souled.

Pompeius in the East.

Of the three strong rivals for the vacant dictatorial chair which waited to be filled, Pompeius held by far the greater advantages. His fame as a soldier was already won; he had been a favorite of Fortune from the beginning of his career; everything had succeeded with him; everything was expected for him and expected from him. Even while the issues of the great struggle were pending, a wonderful opportunity for increasing his renown was opened to him. The disorders of the civil war had licensed a swarm of pirates, who fairly possessed the eastern Mediterranean and had nearly extirpated the maritime trade. Pompeius was sent against them (B. C. 67), with a commission that gave him almost unlimited powers, and within ninety days he had driven them from the sea. Then, before he had returned from this exploit, he was invested with supreme command in the entire East, where another troublesome war with Mithridates was going on. He harvested there all the laurels which belonged by better right to his predecessor, Lucullus, finding the power of Mithridates already broken down. From Pontus

he passed into Armenia, and thence into Syria, easily subjugating both, and extinguishing the monarchy of the Seleucids. The Jews resisted him and he humbled them by the siege and conquest of their sacred city. Egypt was now the only Mediterranean state left outside the all-absorbing dominion of Rome; and even Egypt, by bequest of its late king, belonged to the Republic, though not yet claimed.

The First Triumvirate.

Pompeius came back to Rome in the spring of 61 B. C. so glorified by his successes that he might have seemed to be irresistible, whatever he should undertake. But, either through an honest patriotism or an overweening confidence, he had disbanded his army when he reached Italy, and he had committed himself to no party. He stood alone and aloof, with a great prestige, great ambitions, and no ability to use the one or realize the other. Before another year passed, he was glad to accept offers of a helping hand in politics from Cæsar, who had climbed the ladder of office rapidly within four or five years, spending vast sums of borrowed money to amuse the people with games, and distinguishing himself as a democratic champion. Cæsar, the far seeing calculator, discerned the enormous advantages that he might gain for himself by massing together the prestige of Pompeius, the wealth of Crassus and his own invincible genius, which was sure to be the master element in the combination. He brought the coalition about through a bargain which created what is known in history as the First Triumvirate, or supremacy of three.

Cæsar in Gaul.

Under the terms of the bargain, Cæsar was chosen consul for 59 B. C., and at the end of his term was given the governorship of Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul, with command of three legions there, for five years. His grand aim was a military command—the leadership of an army—the prestige of a successful soldier. No sooner had he secured the command than fortune gave him opportunities for its use in the most striking way and with the most impressive results. The Celtic tribes of Gaul, north of the two small provinces which the Romans had already acquired on the Mediterranean coast, gave him pretexts or provocations (it mattered little to Cæsar which) for war with them, and in a series of remarkable campaigns, which all soldiers since have admired, he pushed the frontiers of the dominion of Rome to the ocean and the Rhine, and threatened the nations of Germany on the farther banks of that stream. “The conquest of Gaul by Cæsar,” says Mr. Freeman, “is one of the most important events in the history of the world. It is in some sort the beginning of modern history, as it brought the old world of southern Europe, of which Rome was the head, into contact with the lands and nations which were to play the greatest part in later times—with Gaul, Germany, and Britain.” From Gaul Cæsar crossed the channel to Britain in 55 B. C. and again in the following year, exacting tribute from the Celtic natives, but attempting no lodgment in the island.

Meantime, while pursuing a career of conquest which excited the Roman world, Cæsar never lost touch with the capital and its seething politics. Each winter he repaired to Lucca, the point in

his province which was nearest to Rome, and conferred there with his friends, who flocked to the rendezvous. He secured an extension of his term, to enable him to complete his plans, and year by year he grew more independent of the support of his colleagues in the triumvirate, while they weakened one another by their jealousies, and the Roman state was more hopelessly distracted by factious strife.

End of the Triumvirate.

The year after Cæsar's second invasion of Britain, Crassus, who had obtained the government of Syria, perished in a disastrous war with the Parthians, and the triumvirate was at an end. Disorder in Rome increased and Pompeius lacked energy or boldness to deal with it, though he seemed to be the one man present who might do so. He was made sole consul in 52 B. C.; he might have seized the dictatorship, with approval of many, but he waited for it to be offered to him, and the offer never came. He drew at last into close alliance with the party of the Optimates, and left the Populares to be won entirely to Cæsar's side.

Civil War.

Matters came to a crisis in 50 B. C., when the Senate passed an order removing Cæsar from his command and discharging his soldiers who had served their term. He came to Ravenna with a single legion and concerted measures with his friends. The issue involved is supposed to have been one of life or death to him, as well as of triumph or failure in his ambitions; for his enemies were malignant. His friends demanded that he be made consul, for his protection, before laying down his arms. The Senate answered by proclaiming him a public enemy if he failed to disband his troops with no delay. It was a declaration of war, and Cæsar accepted it. He marched his single legion across the Rubicon, which was the boundary of his province, and advanced towards Rome.

Pompeius, with the forces he had gathered, retreated southward, and consuls, senators and nobles generally streamed after him. Cæsar followed them—turning aside from the city—and his force gathered numbers as he advanced. The Pompeians continued their flight and abandoned Italy, withdrawing to Epirus, planning to gather there the forces of the East and return with them. Cæsar now took possession of Rome and secured the islands of Sicily and Sardinia, from which it drew its supply of food. This done, he proceeded without delay to Spain, where seven legions strongly devoted to Pompeius were stationed. He overcame them in a single campaign, enlisted most of the veterans in his own service, and acquired a store of treasure. Before the year ended he was again in Rome, where the citizens had proclaimed him dictator. He held the dictatorship for eleven days, only, to legalize an election which made him consul, with a pliant associate. He reorganized the government, complete in all its branches, including a senate, partly composed of former members of the body who had remained or returned. Then (B. C. 48.—January) he took up the pursuit of Pompeius and the Optimates. Crossing to Epirus, after some months of changeable fortune, he fought and won the decisive battle of Pharsalia. Pompeius, flying to Egypt,

was murdered there. Cæsar, following, with a small force, was placed in great peril by a rising at Alexandria, but held his ground until assistance came. He then garrisoned Egypt with Roman troops and made the princess Cleopatra, who had captivated him by her charms, joint occupant of the throne with her younger brother.

During his absence, affairs at Rome were again disturbed, and he was once more appointed dictator, as well as tribune for life. His presence restored order at once, and he was soon in readiness to attack the party of his enemies who had taken refuge in Africa. The battle of Thapsus, followed by the suicide of Cato and the surrender of Utica, practically finished the contest, though one more campaign was fought in Spain the following year.

Cæsar Supreme.

Cæsar was now master of the dominions of Rome, and as entirely a monarch as any one of his imperial successors, who took his name, with the power which he caused it to symbolize, and called themselves "Cæsars," and "Imperators," as though the two titles were equivalent. "Imperator" was the title under which he chose to exercise his sovereignty. Other Roman generals had been Imperators before, but he was the first to be named Imperator for life, and the word (changed in our tongue to Emperor) took a meaning from that day more regal than Rex or King. That Cæsar, the Imperator, first of all Emperors, ever coveted the crown and title of an older-fashioned royalty, is not an easy thing to believe.

Having settled his authority firmly, he gave his attention to the organization of the Empire (still Republic in name) and to the reforming of the evils which afflicted it. That he did this work with consummate judgment and success is the opinion of all who study his time. He gratified no resentments, executed no revenges, proscribed no enemies. All who submitted to his rule were safe; and it seems to be clear that the people in general were glad to be rescued by his rule from the old oligarchical and anarchical state. But some of Cæsar's own partisans were dissatisfied with the autocracy which they helped to create, or with the slenderness of their own parts in it. They conspired with surviving leaders of the Optimates, and Cæsar was assassinated by them, in the Senate chamber, on the 15th of March, B. C. 44.

Professor Mommsen has expressed the estimate of Cæsar which many thoughtful historians have formed, in the following strong words: "In the character of Cæsar the great contrasts of existence meet and balance each other. He was of the mightiest creative power, and yet of the most penetrating judgment; of the highest energy of will and the highest capacity of execution; filled with republican ideals, and at the same time born to be king. He was 'the entire perfect man'; and he was this because he was the entire and perfect Roman." This may be nearly true if we ignore the moral side of Cæsar's character. He was of too large a nature to do evil things unnecessarily, and so he shines even morally in comparison with many of his kind; but he had no scruples.

After the Murder of Cæsar.

The murderers of Cæsar were not accepted by the people as the patriots and "liberators" which

they claimed to be, and they were soon in flight from the city. Marcus Antonius, who had been Cæsar's associate in the consulship, now naturally and skillfully assumed the direction of affairs, and aspired to gather the reins of imperial power into his own hands. But rivals were ready to dispute with him the great prize of ambition. Among them, it is probable that Antony gave little heed at first to the young man, Caius Octavius, or Octavianus, who was Cæsar's nephew, adopted son and heir; for Octavius was less than nineteen years old, he was absent in Apollonia, and he was little known. But the young Cæsar, coming boldly though quietly to Rome, began to push his hereditary claims with a patient craftiness and dexterity that were marvellous in one so young.

The Second Triumvirate.

The contestants soon resorted to arms. The result of their first indecisive encounter was a compromise and the formation of a triumvirate, like that of Cæsar, Pompeius and Crassus. This second triumvirate was made up of Antonius, Octavius, and Lepidus, lately master of the horse in Cæsar's army. Unlike the earlier coalition, it was vengeful and bloody-minded. Its first act was a proscription, in the terrible manner of Sulla, which filled Rome and Italy with murders, and with terror and mourning. Cicero, the patriot and great orator, was among the victims cut down.

After this general slaughter of their enemies at home, Antonius and Octavius proceeded against Brutus and Cassius, two of the assassins of Cæsar, who had gathered a large force in Greece. They defeated them at Philippi, and both "liberators" perished by their own hands. The triumvirs now divided the empire between them, Antonius ruling the East, Octavius the West, and Lepidus taking Africa—that is, the Carthaginian province, which included neither Egypt nor Numidia. Unhappily for Antonius, the queen of Egypt was among his vassals, and she ensnared him. He gave himself up to voluptuous dalliance with Cleopatra at Alexandria, while the cool intriguer, Octavius, at Rome, worked unceasingly to solidify and increase his power. After six years had passed, the young Cæsar was ready to put Lepidus out of his way, which he did mercifully, by sending him into exile. After five years more, he launched his legions and his war galleys against Antonius, with the full sanction of the Roman senate and people. The sea-fight at Actium (B. C. 31) gave Octavius the whole empire, and both Antonius and Cleopatra committed suicide after flying to Egypt. The kingdom of the Ptolemies was now extinguished and became a Roman province in due form.

Octavius (Augustus) Supreme.

Octavius was now more securely absolute as the ruler of Rome and its great empire than Sulla or Julius Cæsar had been, and he maintained that sovereignty without challenge for forty-five years, until his death. He received from the Senate the honorary title of "Augustus," by which he is most commonly known. For official titles, he took none but those which had belonged to the institutions of the Republic, and were familiarly known. He was Imperator, as his uncle had been. He was Princeps, or

head of the Senate; he was Censor; he was Tribune; he was Supreme Pontiff. All the great offices of the Republic he kept alive, and ingeniously constructed his sovereignty by uniting their powers in himself.

Organization of the Empire.

The historical position of Augustus, as the real founder of the Roman Empire, is unique in its grandeur; and yet History has dealt contemptuously, for the most part, with his name. His character has been looked upon, to use the language of De Quincey, as "positively repulsive, in the very highest degree." "A cool head," wrote Gibbon of him, "an unfeeling heart, and a cowardly disposition, prompted him, at the age of nineteen, to assume the mask of hypocrisy, which he never afterwards laid aside." And again: "His virtues, and even his vices, were artificial; and according to the various dictates of his interest, he was at first the enemy, and at last the father, of the Roman world." Yet, how can we deny surpassing high qualities of some description to a man who set the shattered Roman Republic, with all its democratic bases broken up, on a new — an imperial — foundation, so gently that it suffered no further shock, and so solidly that it endured, in whole or in part, for a millenium and a half?

In the reign of Augustus the Empire was consolidated and organized; it was not much extended. The frontiers were carried to the Danube, throughout, and the subjugation of Spain was made complete. Augustus generally discouraged wars of conquest. His ambitious stepsons, Drusus and Tiberius, persuaded him into several expeditions beyond the Rhine, against the restless German nations, which perpetually menaced the borders of Gaul; but these gained no permanent footing in the Teutonic territory. They led, on the contrary, to a fearful disaster (A. D. 9), near the close of the reign of Augustus, when three legions, under Varus, were destroyed in the Teutoburg Forest by a great combination of the tribes, planned and conducted by a young chieftain named Hermann, or Arminius, who is the national hero of Germany to this day.

The policy of Drusus in strongly fortifying the northern frontier against the Germans left marks which are conspicuously visible at the present day. From the fifty fortresses which he is said to have built along the line sprang many important modern cities,—Basel, Strasburg, Worms, Mainz, Bingen, Coblenz, Bonn, Cologne, and Leyden, among the number. From similar forts on the Danubian frontier rose Vienna, Regensburg and Passau.

Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero.

Augustus died A. D. 11, and was succeeded in his honors, his offices, and his powers, by his step-son, Tiberius Claudius Nero, whom he had adopted. Tiberius, during most of his reign, was a vigorous ruler, but a detestable man, unless his subjects belied him, which some historians suspect. Another attempt at the conquest of Germany was made by his nephew Germanicus, son of Drusus; but the jealousy of the emperor checked it, and Germanicus died soon after, believing that he had been poisoned. A son of Germanicus, Caius, better known by his nickname of Caligula, succeeded to the throne on the death of Tiberius (A. D. 37), and was the first of

many emperors to be crazed and made beast-like, in lust, cruelty and senselessness, by the awful, unbounded power which passed into their hands. The Empire bore his madness for three years, and then he was murdered by his own guards. The Senate had thoughts now of restoring the commonwealth, and debated the question for a day; but the soldiers of the prætorian guard took it out of their hands, and decided it, by proclaiming Tiberius Claudius (A. D. 41), a brother of Germanicus, and uncle of the emperor just slain. Claudius was weak of body and mind, but not vicious, and his reign was distinctly one of improvement and advance in the Empire. He began the conquest of Britain, which the Romans had neglected since Cæsar's time, and he opened the Senate to the provincials of Gaul. He had two wives of infamous character, and the later one of these, Agrippina, brought him a son, not his own, whom he adopted, and who succeeded him (A. D. 54). This was Nero, of foul memory, who was madman and monster in as sinister a combination as history can show. During the reign of Nero, the spread of Christianity, which had been silently making its way from Judæa into all parts of the Empire, began to attract the attention of men in public place, and the first persecution of its disciples took place (A. D. 64). A great fire occurred in Rome, which the hated emperor was believed to have caused; but he found it convenient to accuse the Christians of the deed, and large numbers of them were put to death in horrible ways.

Vespasian and his Sons.

Nero was tolerated for fourteen years, until the soldiers in the provinces rose against him, and he committed suicide (A. D. 68) to escape a worse death. Then followed a year of civil war between rival emperors — Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian — proclaimed by different bodies of soldiers in various parts of the Empire. The struggle ended in favor of Vespasian, a rude, strong soldier, who purged the government, disciplined the army, and brought society back toward simpler and decenter ways. The great revolt of the Jews (A. D. 66-70) had broken out before he received the purple, and he was commanding in Judæa when Nero fell. The siege, capture and destruction of Jerusalem was accomplished by his son Titus. A more formidable revolt in the West (A. D. 69) was begun by the Batavians, a German tribe which occupied part of the Netherland territory, near the mouth of the Rhine. They were joined by neighboring Gauls and by disaffected Roman legionaries, and they received help from their German kindred on the northern side of the Rhine. The revolt, led by a chieftain named Civilis, who had served in the Roman army, was overcome with extreme difficulty.

Vespasian was more than worthily succeeded (A. D. 79) by his elder son, Titus, whose subjects so admired his many virtues that he was called "the delight of the human race." His short reign, however, was one of calamities: fire at Rome, a great pestilence, and the frightful eruption of Vesuvius which destroyed Herculaneum and Pompeii. After Titus came his younger brother Domitian (A. D. 81), who proved to be another creature of the monstrous species that appeared so often in the series of Roman emperors. The conquest of southern Britain (modern

England) was completed in his reign by an able soldier, Agricola, who fought the Caledonians of the North, but was recalled before subduing them. Domitian was murdered by his own servants (A. D. 96), after a reign of fifteen years.

Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian.

Rome and the Empire were happy at last in the choice that was made of a sovereign to succeed the hateful son of Vespasian. Not the soldiery, but the Senate, made the choice, and it fell on one of their number, Cocceius Nerva, who was already an aged man. He wore the purple but sixteen months, and his single great distinction in Roman history is, that he introduced to the imperial succession a line of the noblest men who ever sat in the seat of the Cæsars. The first of these was the soldier Trajan, whom Nerva adopted and associated with himself in authority. When Nerva died (A. D. 97), his son by adoption ascended the throne with no opposition. The new Emperor was simple and plain in his habits and manners of life; he was honest and open in all his dealings with men; he was void of suspicion, and of malice and jealousy no less. He gave careful attention to the business of state and was wise in his administration of affairs, improving roads, encouraging trade, helping agriculture, and developing the resources of the Empire in very prudent and practical ways. But he was a soldier, fond of war, and he unwisely reopened the career of conquest which had been almost closed for the Empire since Pompeius came back from the East. A threatening kingdom having risen among the Dacians, in the country north of the lower Danube — the Transylvania and Roumania of the present day — he attacked and crushed it, in a series of vigorous campaigns (A. D. 101-106), and annexed the whole territory to the dominion of Rome. He then garrisoned and colonized the country, and Romanized it so completely that it keeps the Roman name, and its language to this day is of the Latin stock, though Goths, Huns, Bulgarians and Slavs have swept it in successive invasions, and held it among their conquests for centuries at a time. In the East, he ravaged the territory of the Parthian king, entered his capital and added Mesopotamia, Armenia, and Arabia Petræa to the list of Roman provinces. But he died (A. D. 117) little satisfied with the results of his eastern campaigns.

His successor abandoned them, and none have doubted that he did well; because the Empire was weakened by the new frontier in Asia which Trajan gave it to defend. His Dacian conquests were kept, but all beyond the Euphrates in the East were given up. The successor who did this was Hadrian, a kinsman, whom the Emperor adopted in his last hours. Until near the close of his life, Hadrian ranked among the best of the emperors. Rome saw little of him, and resented his incessant travels through every part of his great realm. His manifest preference for Athens, where he lingered longest, and which flourished anew under his patronage, was still more displeasing to the ancient capital. For the Emperor was a man of cultivation, fond of literature, philosophy and art, though busy with the cares of State. In his later years he was afflicted with a disease which poisoned his nature by its torments, filled his mind with dark suspicions, and made him fitfully tyrannical and cruel. The event most

notable in his generally peaceful and prosperous reign was the renewed and final revolt of the Jews, under Barchochebas, which resulted in their total expulsion from Jerusalem, and its conversion into a heathen city, with a Roman name.

The Antonines.

Hadrian had adopted before his death (A. D. 138) a man of blameless character, Titus Aurelius Antoninus, who received from his subjects, when he became Emperor, the appellation "Pius," to signify the dutiful reverence and kindness of his disposition. He justified the name of Antoninus Pius, by which he is historically known, and his reign, though disturbed by some troubles on the distant borders of the Empire, was happy for his subjects in nearly all respects. "No great deeds are told of him, save this, perhaps the greatest, that he secured the love and happiness of those he ruled" (Capes).

Like so many of the emperors, Antoninus had no son of his own; but even before he came to the throne, and at the request of Hadrian, he had adopted a young lad who won the heart of the late Emperor while still a child. The family name of this son by adoption was Verus, and he was of Spanish descent; the name which he took, in his new relationship, was Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. It is unquestionably the most illustrious name in the whole imperial line, from Augustus to the last Constantine, and made so, not so much by deeds as by character. He gave the world the solitary example of a philosopher upon the throne. There have been a few—a very few—surpassingly good men in kingly places; but there has never been another whose soul was lifted to so serene a height above the sovereignty of his station. Unlimited power tempted no form of selfishness in him; he saw nothing in his imperial exaltation but the duties which it imposed. His mind was meditative, and inclined him to the studious life; but he compelled himself to be a man of vigor and activity in affairs. He disliked war; but he spent years of his life in camp on the frontiers; because it fell to his lot to encounter the first great onset of the barbarian nations of the north, which never ceased from that time to beat against the barriers of the Empire until they had broken them down. His struggle was on the line of the Danube, with the tribes of the Marcomanni, the Quadi, the Vandals, and others of less formidable power. He held them back, but the resources of the Empire were overstrained and weakened lastingly by the effort. For the first time, too, there were colonies of barbarians brought into the Empire, from beyond its lines, to be settled for the supply of soldiers to the armies of Rome. It was a dangerous sign of Roman decay and a fatal policy to begin. The decline of the great world-power was, in truth, already well advanced, and the century of good emperors which ended when Marcus Aurelius died (A. D. 180), only retarded, and did not arrest, the progress of mortal maladies in the state.

From Commodus to Caracalla.

The best of emperors was followed on the throne by a son, Commodus, who went mad, like Nero and Caligula, with the drunkenness of power, and who was killed (A. D. 192) by his own servants, after a reign of twelve years. The soldiers of the prætorian guard now took upon

themselves the making of emperors, and placed two upon the throne—first, Pertinax, an aged senator, whom they murdered the next year, and then Didius Julianus, likewise a senator, to whom, as the highest bidder, they sold the purple. Again, as after Nero's death, the armies on the frontiers put forward, each, a rival claimant, and there was war between the competitors. The victor who became sovereign was Septimius Severus (A. D. 194–211), who had been in command on the Danube. He was an able soldier, and waged war with success against the Parthians in the East, and with the Caledonians in Britain, which latter he could not subdue. Of his two sons, the elder, nicknamed Caracalla (A. D. 211–217), killed his brother with his own hands, and tortured the Roman world with his brutalities for six years, when he fell under the stroke of an assassin. The reign of this foul beast brought one striking change to the Empire. An imperial edict wiped away the last distinction between Romans and Provincials, giving citizenship to every free inhabitant of the Empire. "Rome from this date became constitutionally an empire, and ceased to be merely a municipality. The city had become the world, or, viewed from the other side, the world had become 'the City'" (Merivale).

Anarchy and Decay.

The period of sixty-seven years from the murder of Caracalla to the accession of Diocletian—when a great constitutional change occurred—demands little space in a sketch like this. The weakening of the Empire by causes inherent in its social and political structure,—the chief among which were the deadly influence of its system of slavery and the paralyzing effects of its autocracy,—went on at an increasing rate, while disorder grew nearly to the pitch of anarchy, complete. There were twenty-two emperors in the term, which scarcely exceeded that of two generations of men. Nineteen of these were taken from the throne by violent deaths, through mutiny or murder, while one fell in battle, and another was held captive in Persia till he died. Only five among these twenty-two ephemeral lords of the world,—namely Alexander Severus, Decius (who was a vigorous soldier and ruler, but who persecuted the Christians with exceptional cruelty), Claudius, Aurelian, and Probus,—can be credited with any personal weight or worth in the history of the time; and they held power too briefly to make any notable mark.

The distractions of the time were made worse by a great number of local "tyrants," as they were called—military adventurers who rose in different parts of the Empire and established themselves for a time in authority over some district, large or small. In the reign of Gallienus (A. D. 260–268) there were nineteen of these petty "emperors," and they were spoken of as the "thirty tyrants." The more important of the "provincial empires" thus created were those of Postumus, in Gaul, and of Odenatus of Palmyra. The latter, under Zenobia, queen and successor of Odenatus, became a really imposing monarchy, until it was overthrown by Aurelian, A. D. 273.

The Teutonic Nations.

The Germanic nations beyond the Rhine and the Danube had, by this time, improved their organization, and many of the tribes formerly

separated and independent were now gathered into powerful confederations. The most formidable of these leagues in the West was that which acquired the common name of the Franks, or Free-men, and which was made up of the peoples occupying territory along the course of the Lower Rhine. Another of nearly equal power, dominating the German side of the Upper Rhine and the headwaters of the Danube, is believed to have absorbed the tribes which had been known in the previous century as Boii, Marcomanni, Quadi, and others. The general name it received was that of the Alemanni. The Alemanni were in intimate association with the Suevi, and little is known of the distinction that existed between the two. They had now begun to make incursions across the Rhine, but were driven back in 238.

Farther to the East, on the Lower Danube, a still more dangerous horde was now threatening the flanks of the Empire in its European domain. These were Goths, a people akin, without doubt, to the Swedes, Norsemen and Danes; but whence and when they made their way to the neighborhood of the Black Sea is a question in dispute. It was in the reign of Caracalla that the Romans became first aware of their presence in the country since known as the Ukraine. A few years later, when Alexander Severus was on the throne, they began to make incursions into Dacia. During the reign of Philip the Arabian (A. D. 244-249) they passed through Dacia, crossed the Danube, and invaded Mœsia (modern Bulgaria). In their next invasion (A. D. 251) they passed the Balkans, defeated the Romans in two terrible battles, the last of which cost the reigning Emperor, Decius, his life, and destroyed the city of Philippopolis, with 100,000 of its people. But when, a few years later, they attempted to take possession of even Thrace and Macedonia, they were crushingly defeated by the Emperor Claudius, whose successor Aurelian made peace by surrendering to them the whole province of Dacia (A. D. 270), where they settled, giving the Empire no disturbance for nearly a hundred years. Before this occurred, the Goths, having acquired the little kingdom of Bosphorus (the modern Crimea) had begun to launch a piratical navy, which plundered the coast cities of Asia Minor and Greece, including Athens itself.

On the Asiatic side of the Empire a new power, a revived and regenerated Persian monarchy, had risen out of the ruins of the Parthian kingdom, which it overthrew, and had begun without delay to contest the rule of Rome in the East.

Diocletian.

Briefly described, this was the state and situation of the Roman Empire when Diocletian, an able Illyrian soldier, came to the throne (A. D. 284). His accession marks a new epoch. "From this time," says Dean Merivale, "the old names of the Republic, the consuls, the tribunes, and the Senate itself, cease, even if still existing, to have any political significance." "The empire of Rome is henceforth an Oriental sovereignty." But the changes which Diocletian made in the organization and administration of the Empire, if they did weigh it down with a yet more crushing autocracy and contribute to its exhaustion in the end, did also, for the time, stop the wasting of its last energies, and gather them in hand for potent use. It can hardly be doubted that he lengthened the term of its career.

Finding that one man in the exercise of supreme sovereignty, as absolute as he wished to make it, could not give sufficient care to every part of the vast realm, he first associated one Maximian with himself, on equal terms, as Emperor, or Augustus, and six years later (A. D. 292) he selected two others from among his generals and invested them with a subordinate sovereignty, giving them the title of "Cæsars." The arrangement appears to have worked satisfactorily while Diocletian remained at the head of his imperial college. But in 305 he wearied of the splendid burden that he bore, and abdicated the throne, unwillingly followed by his associate, Maximian. The two Cæsars, Constantius and Galerius, were then advanced to the imperial rank, and two new Cæsars were named.

Jealousies, quarrels, and civil war were soon rending the Empire again. The details are unimportant.

Constantine and Christianity.

After nine years of struggle, two competitors emerged (A. D. 314) alone, and divided the Empire between them. They were Constantine, son of Constantius, the Cæsar, and one Licinius. After nine years more, Licinius had disappeared, defeated and put to death, and Constantine (A. D. 323) shared the sovereignty of Rome with none.

In its final stages, the contest had become, practically, a trial of strength between expiring Paganism in the Roman world and militant Christianity, now grown to great strength. The shrewd adventurer Constantine saw the political importance to which the Christian Church had risen, and identified himself with it by a "conversion" which has glorified his name most undeservedly. If to be a Christian with sincerity is to be a good man, then Constantine was none; for his life was full of evil deeds, after he professed the religion of Christ, even more than before. "He poured out the best and noblest blood in torrents, more especially of those nearly connected with himself. . . . In a palace which he had made a desert, the murderer of his father-in-law, his brothers-in-law, his sister, his wife, his son, and his nephew, must have felt the stings of remorse, if hypocritical priests and courtier bishops had not lulled his conscience to rest" (Sismondi).

But the so-called "conversion" of Constantine was an event of vast import in history. It changed immensely, and with suddenness, the position, the state, the influence, and very considerably the character and spirit of the Christian Church. The hierarchy of the Church became, almost at once, the greatest power in the Empire, next to the Emperor himself, and its political associations, which were dangerous from the beginning, soon proved nearly fatal to its spiritual integrity. "Both the purity and the freedom of the Church were in danger of being lost. State and Church were beginning an amalgamation fraught with peril. The State was becoming a kind of Church, and the Church a kind of State. The Emperor preached and summoned councils, called himself, though half in jest, a 'bishop,' and the bishops had become State officials, who, like the high dignitaries of the Empire, travelled by the imperial courier-service, and frequented the ante-chambers of the palaces in Constantinople." "The Emperor determined what doctrines were to prevail in the Church, and banished

Arius to-day and Athanasius to-morrow." "The Church was surfeited with property and privileges. The Emperor, a poor financier, impoverished the Empire to enrich" it (Uhlhorn). That Christianity had shared the gain of the Christian Church from these great changes, is very questionable.

By another event of his reign, Constantine marked it in history with lasting effect. He rebuilt with magnificence the Greek city of Byzantium on the Bosphorus, transferred to it his imperial residence, and raised it to a nominal equality with Rome, but to official and practical superiority, as the capital of the Empire. The old Rome dwindled in rank and prestige from that day; the new Rome—the city of Constantine, or Constantinople—rose to the supreme place in the eyes and the imaginations of men.

Julian and the Pagan Revival.

That Constantine added the abilities of a statesman to the unscrupulous cleverness of an adventurer is not to be disputed; but he failed to give proof of this when he divided the Empire between his three sons at his death (A. D. 337). The inevitable civil wars ensued, until, after sixteen years, one survivor gathered the whole realm under his scepter again. He (Constantius), who debased and disgraced the Church more than his father had done, was succeeded (A. D. 361) by his cousin, Julian, an honest, thoughtful, strong man, who, not unnaturally, preferred the old pagan Greek philosophy to the kind of Christianity which he had seen flourishing at the Byzantine court. He publicly restored the worship of the ancient gods of Greece and Rome; he excluded Christians from the schools, and bestowed his favor on those who scorned the Church; but he entered on no violent persecution. His reign was brief, lasting only two years. He perished in a hapless expedition against the Persians, by whom the Empire was now almost incessantly harassed.

Valentinian and Valens.

His successor, Jovian, whom the army elected, died in seven months; but Valentinian, another soldier, raised by his comrades to the throne, reigned vigorously for eleven years. He associated his brother, Valens, with him in the sovereignty, assigning the latter to the East, while he took the administration of the West.

Until the death of Valentinian, in 375, the northern frontiers of the Empire, along the Rhine and the Danube, were well defended. Julian had commanded in Gaul, with Paris for his capital, six years before he became Emperor, and had organized its defence most effectively. Valentinian maintained the line with success against the Alemanni; while his lieutenant, Theodosius, delivered Roman Britain from the ruinous attacks of the Scots and Picts of its northern region. On the Danube, there continued to be peace with the Goths, who held back all other barbarians from that northeastern border.

The Goths in the Empire.

But the death of Valentinian was the beginning of fatal calamities. His brother, Valens, had none of his capability or his vigor, and was unequal to such a crisis as now occurred. The terrible nation of the Huns had entered Europe from the Asiatic steppes, and the Western Goths, or

Visigoths, fled before them. These fugitives begged to be permitted to cross the Danube and settle on vacant lands in Mœsia and Thrace. Valens consented, and the whole Visigothic nation, 200,000 warriors, with their women and children, passed the river (A. D. 376). It is possible that they might, by fair treatment, have been converted into loyal citizens, and useful defenders of the land. But the corrupt officials of the court took advantage of their dependent state, and wrung extortionate prices from them for disgusting food, until they rose in desperation and wasted Thrace with fire and sword. Fresh bodies of Ostrogoths (Eastern Goths) and other barbarians came over to join them (A. D. 378); the Roman armies were beaten in two great battles, and Valens, the Emperor, was slain. The victorious Goths swept on to the very walls of Constantinople, which they could not surmount, and the whole open country, from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, was ravaged by them at will.

Theodosius.

In the meantime, the western division of the Empire had passed, on the death of Valentinian, under the nominal rule of his two young sons, Gratian, aged sixteen, and Valentinian II., aged four. Gratian had made an attempt to bring help to his uncle Valens; but the latter fought his fatal battle while the boy emperor was on the way, and the latter, upon hearing of it, turned back. Then Gratian performed his one great act. He sought a colleague, and called to the throne the most promising young soldier of the day. This was Theodosius, whose father, Count Theodosius, the deliverer of Britain, had been put to death by Valens, on some jealous accusation, only three years before. The new Emperor took the East for his realm, having Gratian and Valentinian II. for colleagues in the West. He speedily checked the ravages of the Goths and restored the confidence of the Roman soldiers. Then he brought diplomacy to bear upon the dangerous situation, and succeeded in arranging a peace with the Gothic chieftains, which enlisted them in the imperial service with forty thousand of their men. But they retained their distinctive organization, under their own chiefs, and were called "fœderati," or allies. This concession of a semi-independence to so great a body of armed barbarians in the heart of the Empire was a fatal mistake, as was proved before many years.

For the time being it secured peace, and gave Theodosius opportunity to attend to other things. The controversies of the Church were among the subjects of his consideration, and by taking the side of the Athanasians, whom his predecessor had persecuted, he gave a final victory to Trinitarianism, in the Roman world. His reign was signalized, moreover, by the formal, official abolition of paganism at Rome.

The weak but amiable Gratian, reigning at Paris, lost his throne and his life, in 383, as the consequence of a revolt which began in Britain and spread to Gaul. The successful rebel and usurper, Maximus, seemed so strong that Theodosius made terms with him, and acknowledged his sovereignty for a number of years. But, not content with a dominion which embraced Britain, Gaul and Spain, Maximus sought, after a time, to add Italy, where the youth, Valentinian II., was still enthroned (at Milan, not Rome), under the tutelage of his mother. Valentinian

fled to Theodosius; the Eastern Emperor adopted his cause, and restored him to his throne, defeating the usurper and putting him to death (A. D. 388). Four years later Valentinian II. died; another usurper arose, and again Theodosius (A. D. 394) recovered the throne.

Final Division of the Empire.

Theodosius was now alone in the sovereignty. The Empire was once more, and for the last time, in its full extent, united under a single lord. It remained so for but a few months. At the beginning of the year 395, Theodosius died, and his two weak sons, Arcadius and Honorius, divided the perishing Empire between them, only to augment, in its more venerable seat, the distress of the impending fall.

Arcadius, at the age of eighteen, took the government of the East; Honorius, a child of eleven, gave his name to the administration of the West. Each emperor was under the guardianship of a minister chosen by Theodosius before he died. Rufinus, who held authority at Constantinople, was worthless in all ways; Stilicho, who held the reins at Milan, was a Vandal by birth, a soldier and a statesman of vigorous powers.

Decay of the Western Empire.

The West seemed more fortunate than the East, in this division; yet the evil days now fast coming near fell crushingly on the older Rome, while the New Rome lived through them, and endured for a thousand years. No doubt the Empire had weakened more on its elder side; had suffered more exhaustion of vital powers. It had little organic vitality now left in it. If no swarms of barbaric invaders had been waiting and watching at its doors, and pressing upon it from every point with increasing fierceness, it seems probable that it would have gone to pieces ere long through mere decay. And if, on the other hand, it could have kept the vigorous life of its best republican days, it might have defied Teuton and Slav forever. But all the diseases, political and social, which the Republic engendered in itself, had been steadily consuming the state, with their virulence even increased, since it took on the imperial constitution. All that imperialism did was to gather waning energies in hand, and make the most of them for external use. It stopped no decay. The industrial palsy, induced by an ever-widening system of slave-labor, continued to spread. Production decreased; the sum of wealth shrunk in the hands of each succeeding generation; and yet the great fortunes and great estates grew bigger from age to age. The gulf between rich and poor opened deeper and wider, and the bridges once built across it by middle-class thrift were fallen down. The burden of imperial government had become an unendurable weight; the provincial municipalities, which had once been healthy centers of a local political life, were strangled by the nets of taxation flung over them. Men sought refuge even in death from the magistracies which made them responsible to the imperial treasury for revenues which they could not collect. Population dwindled, year by year. Recruiting from the body of citizens for the common needs of the army became more impossible. The state was fully dependent, at last, on barbaric mercenaries of one tribe for its defence against barbaric invaders of another; and it was no longer able, as

of old, to impress its savage servitors with awe of its majesty and its name.

Stilicho and Alaric.

Stilicho, for a time, stoutly breasted the rising flood of disaster. He checked the Picts and Scots of Northern Britain, and the Alemanni and their allies on the frontiers of Gaul. But now there arose again the more dreadful barbarian host which had footing in the Empire itself, and which Theodosius had taken into pay. The Visigoths elected a king (A. D. 395), and were persuaded with ease to carve a kingdom for him out of the domain which seemed waiting to be snatched from one or both of the feeble monarchs, who sat in mockery of state at Constantinople and Milan. Alaric, the new Gothic king, moved first against the capital on the Bosphorus; but Rufinus persuaded him to pass on into Greece, where he went pillaging and destroying for a year. Stilicho, the one manly defender of the Empire, came over from Italy with an army to oppose him; but he was stopped on the eve of battle by orders from the Eastern Court, which sent him back, as an officious meddler. This act of mischief and malice was the last that Rufinus could do. He was murdered, soon afterwards, and Arcadius, being free from his influence, then called upon Stilicho for help. The latter came once more to deliver Greece, and did so with success. But Alaric, though expelled from the peninsula, was neither crushed nor disarmed, and the Eastern Court had still to make terms with him. It did so for the moment by conferring on him the government of that part of Illyricum which the Servia and Bosnia of the present day coincide with, very nearly. He rested there in peace for four years, and then (A. D. 400) he called his people to arms again, and led the whole nation, men, women and children, into Italy. The Emperor, Honorius, fled from Milan to Ravenna, which, being a safe shelter behind marshes and streams, became the seat of the court for years thereafter. Stilicho, stripping Britain and Gaul of troops, gathered forces with which, at Eastertide in the year 402, and again in the following year, he defeated the Goths, and forced them to retreat.

He had scarcely rested from these exertions, when the valiant Stilicho was called upon to confront a more savage leader, Radagaisus by name, who came from beyond the lines (A. D. 405), with a vast swarm of mixed warriors from many tribes pouring after him across the Alps. Again Stilicho, by superior skill, worsted the invaders, entrapping them in the mountains near Fiesole (modern Florence), and starving them there till they yielded themselves to slavery and their chieftain to death.

This was the last great service to the dying Roman state which Stilicho was permitted to do. Undermined by the jealousies of the cowardly court at Ravenna, he seems to have lost suddenly the power by which he held himself so high. He was accused of treasonable designs and was seized and instantly executed, by the Emperor's command.

Alaric and his Goths in Rome.

Stilicho dead, there was no one in Italy for Alaric to fear, and he promptly returned across the Alps, with the nation of the Visigoths behind him. There was no resistance to his march, and

he advanced straight upon Rome. He did not assail the walls, but sat down before the gates (A. D. 408), until the starving citizens paid him a great ransom in silver and gold and precious spices and silken robes. With this booty he retired for the winter into Tuscany, where his army was swelled by thousands of fugitive barbarian slaves, and by reinforcements of Goths and Huns. From his camp he opened negotiations with Honorius, demanding the government of Dalmatia, Venetia and Noricum, with certain subsidies of money and corn. The contemptible court, skulking at Ravenna, could neither make war nor make concessions, and it soon exhausted the patience of the barbarian by its puerilities. He marched again to Rome (A. D. 409), seized the port of Ostia, with its supplies of grain, and forced the helpless capital to join him in proclaiming a rival emperor. The prefect of the city, one Attalus, accepted the purple at his hands, and played the puppet for a few months in imperial robes. But the scheme proved unprofitable, Attalus was deposed, and negotiations were reopened with Honorius. Their only result was a fresh provocation which sent Alaric once more against Rome, and this time with wrath and vengeance in his heart. Then the great, august capital of the world was entered, through treachery or by surprise, on the night of the 24th of August, 410, and suffered all that the lust, the ferocity and the greed of a barbarous army let loose could inflict on an unresisting city. It was her first experience of that supreme catastrophe of war, since Brennus and the Gauls came in; but it was not to be the last.

From the sack of Rome, Alaric moved southward, intending to conquer Sicily; but a sudden illness brought his career to an end.

The Barbarians Swarming in.

The Empire was now like a dying quarry, pulled down by fierce hunting packs and torn on every side. The Goths were at its throat; the tribes of Germany — Sueves, Vandals, Burgundians, Alans — had leaped the Rhine (A. D. 406) and swarmed upon its flanks, throughout Gaul and Spain. The inrush began after Stilicho, to defend Italy against Alaric and Radagaisus, had stripped the frontiers of troops. Sueves, Vandals, and Alans passed slowly through the provinces, devouring their wealth and making havoc of their civilization as they went. After three years, they had reached and surmounted the Pyrenees, and were spreading the same destruction through Spain.

The confederated tribes of the Franks had already been admitted as allies into northwestern Gaul, and were settled there in peace. At first, they stood faithful to the Roman alliance, and valiantly resisted the new invasion; but its numbers overpowered them, and their fidelity gave way when they saw the pillage of the doomed provinces going on. They presently joined the barbarous mob, and with an energy which secured the lion's share of plunder and domain.

The Burgundians did not follow the Vandals and Sueves to the southwest, but took possession of the left bank of the middle Rhine, whence they gradually spread into western Switzerland and Savoy, and down the valleys of the Rhone and Saone, establishing in time an important kingdom, to which they gave their name.

No help from Ravenna or Rome came to the perishing provincials of Gaul in the extremity of their distress; but a pretender arose in Britain, who assumed the imperial title and promised deliverance. He crossed over to Gaul in 407 and was welcomed with eagerness, both there and in Spain, to which he advanced. He gained some success, partly by enlisting and partly by resisting the invaders; but his career was brief. Other pretenders appeared in various provinces of the West; but the anarchy of the time was too great for any authority, legitimate or revolutionary, to establish itself.

The Visigoths in Gaul.

And, now, into the tempting country of the afflicted Gauls, already crowded with rapacious freebooters, the Visigoths made their way. Their new king, Ataulph, or Adolphus, who succeeded Alaric, passed into Gaul, but not commissioned, as sometimes stated, to restore the imperial sovereignty there. He moved with his nation, as Alaric had moved, and Italy, by his departure, was relieved; but Narbonne, Toulouse, Bordeaux, and the Aquitanian country at large, was soon subject to his command (A. D. 412-419). He passed the Pyrenees and entered Spain, where an assassin took his life. His successor, Wallia, drove the Sueves into the mountains and the Vandals into the South; but did not take possession of the country until a later time. The Visigoths, returning to Aquitaine, found there, at last, the kingdom which Alaric set out from the Danube to seek, and they were established in it with the Roman Emperor's consent. It was known as the kingdom of Gothia, or Septimania, but is more commonly called, from its capital, the kingdom of Toulouse.

The Eastern Empire.

Affairs in the Eastern Empire had never arrived at so desperate a state as in the West. With the departure of Alaric, it had been relieved from its most dangerous immediate foe. There had been tumults, disorders, assassinations, court conspiracies, fierce religious strifes, and every evidence of a government with no settled authority and no title to respect; but yet the Empire stood and was not yet seriously shaken. In 408 Arcadius died. His death was no loss, though he left an infant son to take his place; for he also left a daughter, Pulcheria, who proved to be a woman of rare virtue and talents, and who reigned in her brother's name.

Aetius and the Huns.

The imbecile Honorius, with whose name the failing sovereignty of Rome had been so disastrously linked for eight and twenty years, died in 423. An infant nephew was his heir, and Placidia, the mother, ruled at Ravenna for a fourth of a century, in the name of her child. Her reign was far stronger than her wretched brother's had been, because she gave loyal support to a valiant and able man, who stood at her side. Aetius, her minister, did all, perhaps, that man could do to hold some parts of Gaul, and to play barbarian against barbarian — Hun against Goth and Frank — in skilful diplomacy and courageous war. But nothing that he won was any lasting gain.

In his youth, Aetius had been a hostage in the camps of both the Goths and the Huns, and had made acquaintances among the chieftains of both

which served his policy many times. He had employed the terrible Huns in the early years of his ministry, and perhaps they had learned too much of the weakness of the Roman State. These most fearful of all the barbarian peoples then surging in Europe had been settled, for some years, in the region since called Hungary, under Attila, their most formidable king. He terrorized all the surrounding lands and exercised a lordship from the Caspian to the Baltic and the Rhine. The imperial court at the East stooped to pay him annual tribute for abstaining from the invasion of its domain. But in 450, when the regent Pulcheria became Empress of the East, by her brother's death, and married a brave old soldier, Marcian, in order to give him the governing power, a new tone was heard in the voice from Constantinople which answered Attila's demands.

Defeat of Attila.

The Hun then appears to have seen that the sinking Empire of the West offered a more certain victim to his terrors and his arms, and he turned them to that side. First forming an alliance with the Vandals (who had crossed from Spain to Africa in 429, had ravaged and subdued the Roman provinces, and had established a kingdom on the Carthaginian ground, with a naval power in the Carthaginian Sea), Attila led his huge army into suffering Gaul. There were Ostrogoths, and warriors from many German tribes, as well as Huns, in the terrific host; for Attila's arm stretched far, and his subjects were forced to follow when he led. His coming into Gaul affrighted Romans and barbarians alike, and united them in a common defense. Aetius formed an alliance with Theodoric, the Visigothic king, and their forces were joined by Burgundians and Franks. They met Attila near Chalons, and there, on a day in June, A. D. 451, upon the Catalaunian fields, was fought a battle that is always counted among the few which gave shape to all subsequent history. The Huns were beaten back, and Europe was saved from the hopeless night that must have followed a Tartar conquest in that age.

Attila threatening Rome.

Attila retreated to Germany, foiled but not daunted. The next year (A. D. 452) he invaded Italy and laid siege to Aquileia, an important city which stood in his path. It resisted for three months and was then utterly destroyed. The few inhabitants who escaped, with fugitives from neighboring ports, found a refuge in some islands of the Adriatic coast, and formed there a sheltered settlement which grew into the great city and republican state of Venice. Aetius made strenuous exertions to gather forces for another battle with the Huns; but the resources of the Empire had sunk very low. While he labored to collect troops, the effect of a pacific embassy was despairingly tried, and it went forth to the camp of Attila, led by the venerable bishop of Rome—the first powerful Pope—Leo I., called the Great. The impression which Leo made on the Hunnish king, by his venerable presence, and by the persuasiveness of his words, appears to have been extraordinary. At all events, Attila consented to postpone his designs on Rome; though he demanded and received promise of an annual tribute. The next winter he died, and Rome was troubled by him no more.

Rome Sacked by the Vandals.

But another enemy came, who rivalled Attila in ruthlessness, and who gave a name to barbarity which it has kept to this day. The Vandal king, Genseric, who now swept the Mediterranean with a piratical fleet, made his appearance in the Tiber (A. D. 455) and found the Roman capital powerless to resist his attack. The venerable Pope Leo again interceded for the city, and obtained a promise that captives should not be tortured nor buildings burned,—which was the utmost stretch of mercy that the Vandal could afford. Once more, then, was Rome given up, for fourteen days and nights, to pillage and the horrors of barbaric debauch. "Whatever had survived the former sack,—whatever the luxury of the Roman Patriciate, during the intervening forty-five years, had accumulated in reparation of their loss,—the treasures of the imperial palace, the gold and silver vessels employed in the churches, the statues of pagan divinities and men of Roman renown, the gilded roof of the temple of Capitoline Jove, the plate and ornaments of private individuals, were leisurely conveyed to the Vandal fleet and shipped off to Africa" (Sheppard).

The Vandal invasion had been preceded, in the same year, by a palace revolution which brought the dynasty of Theodosius to an end. Placidia was dead, and her unworthy son, Valentinian III., provoked assassination by dishonoring the wife of a wealthy senator, Maximus, who mounted to his place. Maximus was slain by a mob at Rome, just before the Vandals entered the city. The Empire was now without a head, and the throne without an heir. In former times, the Senate or the army would have filled the vacant imperial seat; now, it was a barbarian monarch, Theodoric, the Visigothic king, who made choice of a successor to the Cæsars. He named a Gallic noble, Avitus by name, who had won his esteem, and the nomination was confirmed by Marcian, Emperor of the East.

Ricimer and Majorian.

But the influence of Theodoric in Roman affairs was soon rivalled by that of Count Ricimer, another Goth, or Sueve, who held high command in the imperial army, and who resented the elevation of Avitus. The latter was deposed, after reigning a single year, and Majorian, a soldier of really noble and heroic character, was promoted to the throne. He was too great and too sincere a man to be Ricimer's tool, and the same hand which raised him threw him down, after he had reigned four years (A. D. 457-461). He was in the midst of a powerful undertaking against the Vandals when he perished. Majorian was the last Emperor in the Western line who deserves to be named.

The last Emperors in the West.

Ricimer ruled Italy, with the rigor of a despot, under the modest title of Patrician, until 472. His death was soon followed by the rise of another general of the barbarian troops, Orestes, to like autocracy, and he, in turn, gave way to a third, Odoacer, who slew him and took his place. The creatures, half a dozen in number, who put on and put off the purple robe, at the command of these adventurers, who played with the majesty of Rome, need no further mention. The

last of them was Romulus Augustulus, son of Orestes, who escaped his father's fate by formally resigning the throne. He was the last Roman Emperor in the West, until Charlemagne revived the title, three centuries and a quarter later. "The succession of the Western Emperors came to an end, and the way in which it came to an end marks the way in which the names and titles of Rome were kept on, while all power was passing into the hands of the barbarians. The Roman Senate voted that one Emperor was enough, and that the Eastern Emperor, Zeno, should reign over the whole Empire. But at the same time Zeno was made to entrust the government of Italy, with the title of Patrician, to Odoacer. . . . Thus the Roman Empire went on at Constantinople, or New Rome, while Italy and the Old Rome itself passed into the power of the Barbarians. Still the Roman laws and names went on, and we may be sure that any man in Italy would have been much surprised if he had been told that the Roman Empire had come to an end" (Freeman).

Odoacer.

The government of Odoacer, who ruled with the authority of a king, though pretending to kingship only in his own nation, was firm and strong. Italy was better protected from its lawless neighbors than it had been for nearly a century before. But nothing could arrest the decay of its population—the blight that had fallen upon its prosperity. Nor could that turbulent age afford any term of peace that would be long enough for even the beginning of the cure of such maladies and such wounds as had brought Italy low. For fourteen years Odoacer ruled; and then he was overthrown by a new kingdom-seeking barbarian, who came, like Alaric, out of the Gothic swarm.

Theodoric the Ostrogoth.

The Ostrogoths had now escaped, since Attila died, from the yoke of the Huns, and were prepared, under an able and ambitious young king, Theodoric, who had been reared as a hostage at Constantinople, to imitate the career of their cousins, the Visigoths. Having troubled the Eastern Court until it stood in fear of him, Theodoric asked for a commission to overthrow Odoacer, in Italy, and received it from the Emperor's hand. Thus empowered by one still recognized as lawful lord on both sides of the Adriatic, Theodoric crossed the Julian Alps (A. D. 489) with the families of his nation and their household goods. Three battles made him master of the peninsula and decided the fate of his rival. Odoacer held out in Ravenna for two years and a half, and surrendered on a promise of equal sovereignty with the Ostrogothic king. But Theodoric did not scruple to kill him with his own sword, at the first opportunity which came. In that act, the native savagery in him broke loose; but through most of his life he kept his passions decently tamed, and acted the barbarian less frequently than the civilized statesman and king. He gave Italy peace, security, and substantial justice for thirty years. With little war, he extended his sovereignty over Illyrium, Pannonia, Noricum, Rætia and Provence, in south-eastern Gaul. If the extensive kingdom which he formed—with more enlightenment than any other among those who

divided the heritage of Rome—could have endured, the parts of Europe which it covered might have fared better in after times than they did. "Italy might have been spared six hundred years of gloom and degradation." But powerful influences were against it from the first, and they were influences which proceeded mischievously from the Christian Church. Had the Goths been pagans, the Church might have turned a kindly face to them, and wooed them to conversion as she wooed the Franks. But they were Christians, of a heretic stamp, and the orthodox Christianity of Rome held them in deadly loathing. While still beyond the Danube, they had received the faith from an Arian apostle, at the time of the great conflict of Athanasius against Arius, and were stubborn in the rejection of Trinitarian dogma. Hence the Church in the West was never reconciled to the monarchy of Theodoric in Italy, nor to that of the Visigoths at Toulouse; and its hostility was the ultimate cause of the failure of both.

The Empire in the East.

To understand the events which immediately caused the fall of the Ostrogothic power, we must turn back for a moment to the Empire in the East. Marcian, whom Pulcheria, the wise daughter of Arcadius, made Emperor by marrying him, died in 457, and Aspar, the barbarian who commanded the mercenaries, selected his successor. He chose his own steward, one Leo, who proved to have more independence than his patron expected, and who succeeded in destroying the latter. After Leo I. came (474) his infant grandson, Leo II., whose father, an Isaurian chieftain, took his place when he died, within the year. The Isaurian assumed a Greek name, Zeno, and occupied the throne—with one interval of flight and exile for twenty months—during seven years. When he died, his widow gave her hand in marriage to an excellent officer of the palace, Anastasius by name, and he was sovereign of the Empire for twenty-seven years.

The reign of Justinian.

After Anastasius, came Justin I., born a peasant in Dacia (modern Roumania), but advanced as a soldier to the command of the imperial guards, and thence to the throne. He had already adopted and educated his nephew, Justinian, and before dying, in 527, he invested him with sovereignty as a colleague. The reign of Justinian was the most remarkable in the whole history of the Empire in the East. Without breadth of understanding, or notable talents of any kind; without courage; without the least nobility of character; without even the virtue of fidelity to his ministers and friends,—this remarkable monarch contrived to be splendidly served by an extraordinary generation of great soldiers, great jurists, great statesmen, who gave a brilliance to his reign that was never rivalled while the Byzantine seat of Empire stood. It owes, in modern esteem, its greatest fame to the noble collection of Roman laws which was made, in the Pandects and the Code, under the direction of the wise and learned Tribonian. Transiently it was glorified by conquests that bore a likeness to the march of the resistless legions of ancient Rome; and the laurelled names of Belisarius and Narses claimed a place on the columns of victory with the names of Cæsar and Pompeius. But the splendors of

the reign were much more than offset by miseries and calamities of the darkest kind. "The reign of Justinian, from its length, its glory and its disasters, may be compared to the reign of Louis XIV., which exceeded it in length, and equalled it in glory and disaster. . . . He extended the limits of his empire; but he was unable to defend the territory he had received from his predecessors. Every one of the thirty-eight years of his reign was marked by an invasion of the barbarians; and it has been said that, reckoning those who fell by the sword, who perished from want, or were led into captivity, each invasion cost 200,000 subjects to the empire. Calamities which human prudence is unable to resist seemed to combine against the Romans, as if to compel them to expiate their ancient glory. . . . So that the very period which gave birth to so many monuments of greatness, may be looked back upon with horror, as that of the widest desolation and the most terrific mortality" (Sismondi).

The first and longest of the wars of Justinian was the Persian war, which he inherited from his predecessors, and which scarcely ceased while the Persian monarchy endured. It was in these Asiatic campaigns that Belisarius began his career. But his first great achievement was the overthrow and extinction of the Vandal power in Africa, and the restoration of Roman authority (the empire of the new Rome) in the old Carthaginian province (A. D. 533-534). He accomplished this with a force of but 10,000 foot and 5,000 horse, and was hastily recalled by his jealous lord on the instant of his success.

Conquests of Belisarius in Italy.

But the ambition of Justinian was whetted by this marvellous conquest, and he promptly projected an expedition against the kingdom of the Eastern Goths. The death of Theodoric had occurred in 526. His successor was a child of ten years, his grandson, whose mother exercised the regency. Amalsuentha, the queen-regent, was a woman of highly cultivated mind, and she offended her subjects by too marked a Romanization of her ideas. Her son died in his eighteenth year, and she associated with herself on the throne the next heir to it, a worthless nephew of Theodoric, who was able, in a few weeks, to strip all her power from her and consign her to a distant prison, where she was soon put to death (A. D. 535). She had previously opened negotiations with Justinian for the restoration of his supremacy in Italy, and the ambitious Emperor assumed with eagerness a right to avenge her deposition and death. The fate of Amalsuentha was his excuse, the discontent of Roman orthodoxy with the rule of the heretic Goths was his encouragement, to send an army into Italy with Belisarius at its head.

First taking possession of Sicily, Belisarius landed in Italy in 536, took Naples and advanced on Rome. An able soldier, Vitiges, had been raised to the Gothic throne, and he evacuated Rome in December; but he returned the following March and laid siege to the ancient capital, which Belisarius had occupied with a moderate force. It was defended against him for an entire year, and the strength of the Gothic nation was consumed on the outer side of the walls, while the inhabitants within were wasted by famine and disease. The Goths invoked the aid of the Franks in Gaul, and those fierce warriors, crossing the Alps (A. D. 538), assailed both Goths and Greeks, with

indiscriminate hostility, destroyed Milan and Genoa, and mostly perished of hunger themselves before they retreated from the wasted Cisalpine country.

Released from Rome, Belisarius advanced in his turn against Ravenna, and took the Gothic capital, making Vitiges a prisoner (A. D. 539). His reward for these successes was a recall from command. The jealous Emperor could not afford his generals too much glory at a single winning. As a consequence of his folly, the Goths, under a new king, Totila, were allowed to recover so much ground in the next four years that, when, in 544, Belisarius was sent back, almost without an army, the work of conquest had to be done anew. Rome was still being held against Totila, who besieged it, and the great general went by sea to its relief. He forced the passage of the Tiber, but failed through the misconduct of the commander in the city to accomplish an entry, and once more the great capital was entered and yielded to angry Goths (A. D. 546). They spared the lives of the few people they found, and the chastity of the women; but they plundered without restraint.

Rome a Solitude for Forty Days.

Totila commanded the total destruction of the city; but his ruthless hand was stayed by the remonstrances of Belisarius. After demolishing a third of the walls, he withdrew towards the South, dragging the few inhabitants with him, and, during forty days, Rome is said to have been an unpeopled solitude. The scene which this offers to the imagination comes near to being the most impressive in history. At the end of that period it was entered by Belisarius, who hastily repaired the walls, collected his forces, and was prepared to defend himself when Totila came back by rapid marches from Apulia. The Goths made three assaults and were bloodily repulsed.

End of the Ostrogothic Kingdom.

But again Belisarius was recalled by a mean and jealous court, and again the Gothic cause was reanimated and restored. Rome was taken again from its feeble garrison (A. D. 549), and this time it was treated with respect. Most of Italy and Sicily, with Corsica and Sardinia, were subdued by Totila's arms, and that king, now successful, appealed to Justinian for peace. It was refused, and in 552 a vigorous prosecution of the war resumed, under a new commander—the remarkable eunuch Narses, who proved himself to be one of the great masters of war. Totila was defeated and slain in the first battle of the campaign; Rome was again beleaguered and taken; and the last blow needed to extinguish the Gothic kingdom in Italy was given the following year (A. D. 553), when Totila's successor, Teia, ended his life on another disastrous field of battle.

The Exarchate.

Italy was restored for the moment to the Empire, and was placed under the government of an imperial viceroy, called Exarch, which high office the valiant Narses was the first to fill. His successors, known in history as the Exarchs of Ravenna, resided in that capital for a long period, while the arm of their authority was steadily shortened by the conquests of new invaders, whose story is yet to be told.

Events in the West.

Leaving Italy and Rome, once more in the imperial fold, but mere provinces now of a distant and alienated sovereignty, it is necessary to turn back to the West, and glance over the regions in which, when we looked at them last, the institutions of Roman government and society were being dissolved and broken up by flood upon flood of barbaric invasion from the Teutonic North.

Teutonic Conquest of Britain.

If we begin at the farthest West which the Roman dominion reached, we shall find that the island of Britain was abandoned, practically, by the imperial government earlier than the year 410, when Rome was sinking under the blows of Alaric. From that time the inhabitants were left to their own government and their own defense. To the inroads of the savage Caledonian Picts and Irish Scots, there were added, now, the coast ravages of a swarm of ruthless pirates, which the tribes of northwestern Europe had begun to launch upon the German or North Sea. The most cruel and terrible of these ocean freebooters were the Saxons, of the Elbe, and they gave their name for a time to the whole. Their destructive raids upon the coasts of Britain and Gaul had commenced more than a century before the Romans withdrew their legions, and that part of the British coast most exposed to their ravages was known as the Saxon Shore. For about thirty years after the Roman and Romanized inhabitants of Britain had been left to defend themselves, they held their ground with good courage, as appears; but the incessant attacks of the Picts wore out, at last, their confidence in themselves, and they were fatally led to seek help from their other enemies, who scourged them from the sea. Their invitation was given, not to the Saxons, but to a band of Jutes—warriors from that Danish peninsula in which they have left their name. The Jutes landed at Ebbsfleet, in the Isle of Thanet (A. D. 449 or 450), with two chiefs, Hengest and Horsa, at their head. They came as allies, and fought by the side of the Britons against the Picts with excellent success. Then came quarrels, and presently, in 455, the arms of Hengest and Horsa were turned against their employers. Ten years later the Jutes had secure possession of the part of Britain now called Kent, and Hengest was their king, Horsa having fallen in the war. This was the beginning of the transformation of Roman-Celtic Britain into the Teutonic England of later history. The success of the Jutes drew their cousins and piratical comrades, the Saxons and the Angles, to seek kingdoms in the same rich island. The Saxons came first, landing near Selsey, in 477, and taking gradual possession of a district which became known as the kingdom of the South Saxons, or Sussex. The next invasion was by Saxons under Cerdic, and Jutes, who joined to form the kingdom of the West Saxons, or Wessex, covering about the territory of modern Hampshire. So much of their conquest was complete by the year 519. At about the same time, other colonies were established and gave their names, as East Saxons and Middle Saxons, to the Essex and Middlesex of modern English geography. A third tribe from the German shore, the Angles, now came (A. D. 547) to take their part in the conquest of the island, and these

laid their hands upon kingdoms in the East and North of England, so much larger than the modest Jute and Saxon realms in the south that their name fixed itself, at last, upon the whole country, when it lost the name of Britain. Northumberland, which stretched from the Humber to the Firth of Forth, Mercia, which covered at one time the whole middle region of England, and East Anglia, which became divided into the two English counties of Norfolk (North-folk) and Suffolk (South-folk), were the three great kingdoms of the Angles.

The Making of England.

Before the end of the sixth century, almost the whole of modern England, and part of Scotland, on its eastern side, as far to the north as Edinburgh, was in possession of the German invaders. They had not merely subdued the former possessors—Britons and Roman provincials (if Romans remained in the island after their domination ceased),—but, in the judgment of the best investigators of the subject, they had practically swept them from all the parts of the island in which their own settlements were established. That is to say, the prior population was either exterminated by the merciless swords of these Saxon and English pagans, or was driven into the mountains of Wales, into the peninsula of Cornwall and Devon, or into the Strathclyde corner of Scottish territory,—in all which regions the ancient British race has maintained itself to this day. Scarcely a vestige of its existence remains elsewhere in England,—neither in language, nor in local names, nor in institutions, nor in survivals of any other kind; which shows that the inhabitants were effaced by the conquest, as the inhabitants of Gaul, of Spain, and of Italy, for example, were not.

The new society and the new states which now arose on the soil of Britain, and began to shape themselves into the England of the future, were as purely Germanic as if they had grown up in the Jutish peninsula or on the Elbe. The institutions, political and social, of the immigrant nations, had been modified by changed circumstances, but they had incorporated almost nothing from the institutions which they found existing in their new home and which they supplanted. Broadly speaking, nothing Roman and nothing Celtic entered into them. They were constructed on German lines throughout.

The barbarism of the Saxons and their kin when they entered Britain was far more unmitigated than that of most of the Teutonic tribes which overwhelmed the continental provinces of Rome had been. The Goths had been influenced to some extent and for quite a period by Roman civilization, and had nominally accepted Christian precepts and beliefs, before they took arms against the Empire. The Franks had been allies of Rome and in contact with the refinements of Roman Gaul, for a century or two before they became masters in that province. Most of the other nations which transplanted themselves in the fifth century from beyond the Rhine to new homes in the provinces of Rome, had been living for generations on the borders of the Empire, or near; had acquired some acquaintance, at least, with the civilization which they did not share, and conceded to it a certain respect; while some of them had borne arms for the Emperor and taken his pay. But the Saxons, Angles and

Jutes had thus far been remote from every influence or experience of the kind. They knew the Romans only as rich strangers to be plundered and foes to be fought. Christianity represented nothing to them but an insult to their gods. There seems to be little doubt, therefore, that the civilizing work which Rome had done in western Europe was obliterated nowhere else so ruthlessly and so wantonly as in Britain.

Christianity, still sheltered and strong in Ireland, was wholly extinguished in England for a century and more, until the memorable mission of Augustine, sent by Pope Gregory the Great (A. D. 597), began the conversion of the savage islanders.

The Kingdom of the Franks.

In Gaul, meanwhile, and in southwestern Germany, the Franks had become the dominant power. They had moved tardily to the conquest, but when they moved it was with rapid strides. While they dwelt along the Lower Rhine, they were in two divisions: the Salian Franks, who occupied, first, the country near the mouth of the river, and then spread southwards, to the Somme, or beyond; and the Ripuarians, who lived farther up the Rhine, in the neighborhood of Cologne, advancing thence to the Moselle. In the later part of the fifth century a Roman Patrician, Syagrius, still exercised some kind of authority in northern Gaul; but in 486 he was defeated and overthrown by Chlodwig, or Clovis, the chief of the Salian Franks. Ten years later, Clovis, leading both the Salian and the Riparian Franks in an attack upon the German Alemanni, beyond the Upper Rhine, subdued that people completely, and took their country. Their name survived, and adhered to the whole people of Germany, whom the Franks and their successors the French have called Allemands to this day. After his conquest of the Alemanni, Clovis, who had married a Christian wife, accepted her faith and was baptized, with three thousand of his chief men. The professed conversion was as fortunate politically for him as it had been for Constantine. He adopted the Christianity which was that of the Roman Church—the Catholic Christianity of the Athanasian creed—and he stood forth at once as the champion of orthodoxy against the heretic Goths and Burgundians, whose religion had been poisoned by the condemned doctrines of Arius. The blessings, and the more substantial endeavors, of the Roman Church were, therefore, on his side, when he attacked the Burgundians and made them tributary, and when, a few years later, he expelled the Goths from Aquitaine and drove them into Spain (A. D. 500–508). Beginning, apparently, as one of several chiefs among the Salian Franks, he ended his career (510) as sole king of the whole Frank nation, and master of all Gaul except a Gothic corner of Provence, with a considerable dominion beyond the Rhine.

The Merovingian Kings.

But Clovis left his realm to four sons, who divided it into as many kingdoms, with capitals at Metz, Orleans, Paris, and Soissons. There was strife and war between them, until one of the brothers, Lothaire, united again the whole kingdom, which, meantime, had been enlarged by the conquest of Thuringia and Provence, and by the extinction of the tributary Burgundian

kings. When he died, his sons rent the kingdom again, and warred with one another, and once more it was brought together. Says Hallam: "It is a weary and unprofitable task to follow these changes in detail, through scenes of tumult and bloodshed, in which the eye meets with no sunshine, nor can rest upon any interesting spot. It would be difficult, as Gibbon has justly observed, to find anywhere more vice or less virtue." But, as Dean Church has remarked, the Franks were maintained in their ascendancy by the favor of the clergy and the circumstances of their position, despite their divisions and the worthless and detestable character of their kings, after Clovis. "They occupied a land of great natural wealth, and great geographical advantages, which had been prepared for them by Latin culture; they inherited great cities which they had not built, and fields and vineyards which they had not planted; and they had the wisdom, not to destroy, but to use their conquest. They were able with singular ease and confidence to employ and trust the services, civil and military, of the Latin population. . . . The bond between the Franks and the native races was the clergy. . . . The forces of the whole nation were at the disposal of the ruling race; and under Frank chiefs, the Latins and Gauls learned once more to be warriors." This no doubt suggests a quite true explanation of the success of the Franks; but too much may easily be inferred from it. It will not be safe to conclude that the Franks were protectors of civilization in Gaul, and did not lay destroying hands upon it. We shall presently see that it sank to a very darkened state under their rule, though the eclipse may have been less complete than in some other of the barbarized provinces of Rome.

Rise of the Carolingians.

The division in the Frankish dominion which finally marked itself deeply and became permanent was that which separated the East Kingdom, or Austrasia, from the West Kingdom, or Neustria. In Austrasia, the Germanic element prevailed; in Neustria, the Roman and Gallic survivals entered most largely into the new society. Austrasia widened into the Germany of later history; Neustria into France. In both these kingdoms, the Frankish kings sank lower and lower in character, until their name (of Merwings or Merovingians, from an ancestor of Clovis) became a byword for sloth and worthlessness. In each kingdom there arose, beside the nominal monarch, a strong minister, called the Major Domus, or Mayor of the Palace, who exercised the real power and governed in the king's name. During the last half of the seventh century, the Austrasian Mayor, Pippin of Heristal, and the Neustrian Mayor, Ebroin, converted the old antagonism of the two kingdoms into a personal rivalry and struggle for supremacy. Ebroin was murdered, and Pippin was the final victor, in a decisive battle at Testry (687), which made him virtual master of the whole Frank realm, although the idle Merwings still sat on their thrones. Pippin's son, Charles Martel, strengthened and extended the domination which his father had acquired. He drove back the Saxons and subdued the Frisians in the North, and, in the great and famous battle of Tours (732) he repelled, once for all, the attempt of the Arab and Moorish followers of Mahomet, already lodged in Spain, to push their

conquests beyond the Pyrenees. The next of the family, Pippin the Short, son of Charles Martel, put an end to the pretence of governing in the name of a puppet-king. The last of the Merovingians was quietly deposed—lacking even importance enough to be put to death—and Pippin received the crown at the hands of Pope Zachary (A. D. 751). He died in 768, and the reign of his son, who succeeded him—the Great Charles—the Charlemagne of mediæval history—is the introduction to so new an era, and so changed an order of circumstances in the European world, that it will be best to finish with all that lies behind it in our hasty survey before we take it up.

The Conquests of Islam.

Outside of Europe, a new and strange power had now risen, and had spread its forces with extraordinary rapidity around the southern and eastern circuit of the Mediterranean, until it troubled both extremities of the northern shore. This was the power of Islam—the proselyting, war-waging religion of Mahomet, the Arabian prophet. At the death of Mahomet, in 632, he was lord of Arabia, and his armies had just crossed the border, to attack the Syrian possessions of the Eastern Roman Empire. In seven years from that time, the whole of Palestine and Syria had been overrun, Jerusalem, Damascus, Antioch, and all the strong cities taken, and Roman authority expelled. In two years more, they had dealt the last blow to the Sassanian monarchy in Persia and shattered it forever. At the same time they were besieging Alexandria and adding Egypt to their conquests. In 668, only thirty-six years after the death of the Prophet, they were at the gates of Constantinople, making the first of their many attempts to gain possession of the New Rome. In 698 they had taken Carthage, had occupied all North Africa to the Atlantic coast, had converted the Mauretanians, or Moors, and absorbed them into their body politic as well as into their communion. In 711 the commingled Arabs and Moors crossed the Straits and entered Spain, and the overthrow of the Christian kingdom of the Visigoths was practically accomplished in a single battle that same year. Within two years more, the Moors (as they came to be most commonly called) were in possession of the whole southern, central, and eastern parts of the Spanish peninsula, treating the inhabitants who had not fled with a more generous toleration than differing Christians were wont to offer to one another. The Spaniards (a mixed population of Roman, Suevic, Gothic, and aboriginal descent) who did not submit, took refuge in the mountainous region of the Asturias and Galicia, where they maintained their independence, and, in due time, became aggressive, until, after eight centuries, they recovered their whole land.

The Eastern Empire.

At the East, as we have seen, the struggle of the Empire with the Arabs began at the first moment of their career of foreign conquest. They came upon it when it was weak from many wounds, and exhausted by conflict with many foes. Before the death of Justinian (565), the transient glories of his reign had been waning fast. His immediate successor saw the work of Belisarius and Narses undone, for the most part,

and the Italian peninsula overrun by a new horde of barbarians, more rapacious and more savage than the Goths. At the same time, the Persian war broke out again, and drained the imperial resources to pay for victories that had no fruit. Two better and stronger emperors—Tiberius and Maurice—who came after him, only made an honorable struggle, without leaving the Empire in a better state. Then a brutal creature—Phocas—held the throne for eight years (602-610) and sunk it very low by his crimes. The hero, Heraclius, who was now raised to power, came too late. Assailed suddenly, at the very beginning of his reign, by a fierce Persian onset, he was powerless to resist. Syria, Egypt and Asia Minor were successively ravaged and conquered by the Persian arms. They came even to the Bosphorus, and for ten years they held its eastern shore and maintained a camp within sight of Constantinople itself; while the wild Tartar nation of the Avars raged, at the same time, through the northern and western provinces of the Empire, and threatened the capital on its landward sides. The Roman Empire was reduced, for a time, to “the walls of Constantinople, with the remnant of Greece, Italy, and Africa, and some maritime cities, from Tyre to Trebizond, of the Asiatic coast.” But in 622 Heraclius turned the tide of disaster and rolled it back upon his enemies. Despite an alliance of the Persians with the Avars, and their combined assault upon Constantinople in 626, he repelled the latter, and wrested from the former, in a series of remarkable campaigns, all the territory they had seized. He had but just accomplished this great deliverance of his dominions, when the Arabs came upon him, as stated above. There was no strength left in the Empire to resist the terrible prowess of these warriors of the desert. They extinguished its authority in Syria and Egypt, as we have seen, in the first years of their career; but then turned their arms to the East and the West, and were slow in disputing Asia Minor with its Christian lords. “From the time of Heraclius the Byzantine theatre is contracted and darkened: the line of empire which had been defined by the laws of Justinian and the arms of Belisarius recedes on all sides from our view” (Gibbon). There was neither vigor nor virtue in the descendants of Heraclius; and when the last of them was destroyed by a popular rising against his vicious tyranny (711), revolution followed revolution so quickly that three reigns were begun and ended in six years.

The so-called Byzantine Empire.

Then came to the throne a man of strong character, who redeemed it at least from contempt; who introduced a dynasty which endured for a century, and whose reign is the beginning of a new era in the history of the Eastern Empire, so marked that the Empire has taken from that time, in the common usage, a changed name, and is known thenceforth as the Byzantine, rather than the Eastern or the Greek. This was Leo the Isaurian, who saved Constantinople from a second desperate Moslem siege; who checked for a considerable period the Mahometan advance in the East; who reorganized the imperial administration on lasting lines; and whose suppression of image-worship in the Christian churches of his empire led to a rupture with the Roman Church in the

West,—to the breaking of all relations of dependence in Rome and Italy upon the Empire in the East, and to the creating of a new imperial sovereignty in Western Europe which claimed succession to that of Rome.

Lombard Conquest of Italy.

On the conquest of Italy by Belisarius and Narses, for Justinian, the eunuch Narses, as related before, was made governor, residing at Ravenna, and bearing the title of Exarch. In a few years he was displaced, through the influence of a palace intrigue at Constantinople. To be revenged, it is said that he persuaded the Lombards, a German tribe lately become threatening on the Upper Danube, to enter Italy. They came, under their leader Alboin, and almost the whole northern and middle parts of the peninsula submitted to them with no resistance. Pavia stood a siege for three years before it surrendered to become the Lombard capital; Venice received an added population of fugitives, and was safe in her lagoons—like Ravenna, where the new Exarch watched the march of Lombard conquest, and scarcely opposed it. Rome was preserved, with part of southern Italy and with Sicily; but no more than a shadow of the sovereignty of the Empire now stretched westward beyond the Adriatic.

Temporal Power of the Popes.

The city of Rome, and the territory surrounding it, still owned a nominal allegiance to the Emperor at Constantinople; but their immediate and real ruler was the Bishop of Rome, who had already acquired, in a special way, the fatherly name of "Papa" or Pope. Many circumstances had combined to place both spiritual and temporal power in the hands of these Christian pontiffs of Rome. They may have been originally, in the constitution of the Church, on an equal footing of ecclesiastical authority with the four other chiefs of the hierarchy—the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem; but the great name of Rome gave them prestige and weight of superior influence to begin with. Then, they stood, geographically and sympathetically, in nearest relations with that massive Latin side of Christendom, in western Europe, which was never much disturbed by the raging dogmatic controversies that tore and divided the Church on its Eastern, Greek side. It was inevitable that the Western Church should yield homage to one head—to one bishopric above all other bishoprics; and it was more inevitable that the See of Rome should be that one. So the spiritual supremacy to which the Popes arrived is easily enough explained. The temporal authority which they acquired is accounted for as obviously. Even before the interruption of the line of emperors in the West, the removal of the imperial residence for long periods from Rome, to Constantinople, to Milan, to Ravenna, left the Pope the most impressive and influential personage in the ancient capital. Political functions were forced on him, whether he desired to exercise them or not. It was Pope Leo who headed the embassy to Attila, and saved the city from the Huns. It was the same Pope who pleaded for it with the Vandal king, Genseric. And still more and more, after the imperial voice which uttered occasional commands to his Roman subjects was heard from a distant palace in Con-

stantinople, and in accents that had become wholly Greek, the chair of St. Peter grew throne-like,—the respect paid to the Pope in civil matters took on the spirit of obedience, and his aspect before the people became that of a temporal prince.

This process of the political elevation of the Papacy was completed by the Lombard conquest of Italy. The Lombard kings were bent upon the acquisition of Rome; the Popes were resolute and successful in holding it against them. At last the Papacy made its memorable and momentous alliance with the Carolingian chiefs of the Franks. It assumed the tremendous super-imperial right and power to dispose of crowns, by taking that of the kingdom of the Franks from Childeric and giving it to Pippin (751); and this was the first assumption of that right by the chief priest of Western Christendom. In return, Pippin led an army twice to Italy (754-755), humbled the Lombards, took from them the exarchate of Ravenna and the Pentapolis (a district east of the Apennines, between Ancona and Ferrara), and transferred this whole territory as a conqueror's "donation" to the Apostolic See. The temporal sovereignty of the Popes now rested on a base as political and as substantial as that of the most worldly and vulgar potentates around them.

Charlemagne's restored Roman Empire.

Pippin's greater son, Charlemagne, renewed the alliance of his house with the Papacy, and strengthened it by completing the conquest of the Lombards, extinguishing their kingdom (774), and confirming his father's donation of the States of the Church. Charlemagne was now supreme in Italy, and the Pope became the representative of his sovereignty at Rome,—a position which lastingly enhanced the political importance of the Roman See in the peninsula. But while Pope and King stood related, in one view, as agent and principal, or subject and sovereign, another very different relationship slowly shaped itself in the thoughts of one, if not of both. The Western Church had broken entirely with the Eastern, on the question of image-worship; the titular sovereignty of the Eastern Emperor in the ancient Roman capital was a worn-out fiction; the reign of a female usurper, Irene, at Constantinople afforded a good occasion for renouncing and discarding it. But a Roman Emperor there must be, somewhere, for lesser princes and sovereigns to do homage to; the political habit and feeling of the European world, shaped and fixed by the long domination of Rome, still called for it. "Nor could the spiritual head of Christendom dispense with the temporal; without the Roman Empire there could not be," according to the feeling of the ninth century, "a Roman, nor by necessary consequence a Catholic and Apostolic Church." For "men could not separate in fact what was indissoluble in thought: Christianity must stand or fall along with the great Christian state; they were but two names for one and the same thing" (Bryce). Therefore the head of the Church, boldly enlarging the assumption of his predecessor who bestowed the crown of the Merovingians upon Pippin, now took it upon himself to set the diadem of the Cæsars on the head of Charlemagne. On the Christmas Day, in the year 800, in the basilica of St. Peter, at Rome, the solemn act of coronation was performed by Pope Leo III.; the Roman

Empire lived again, in the estimation of that age, and Charles the Great reopened the interrupted line of successors to Augustus.

Before this imperial coronation of Charlemagne occurred, he had already made his dominion imperial in extent, by the magnitude of his conquests. North, south, east, and west, his armies had been everywhere victorious. In eighteen campaigns against the fierce and troublesome Saxons, he subdued those stubborn pagans and forced them to submit to a Christian baptism—with how much of immediate religious effect may be easily surmised. But by opening a way for the more Christ-like missionaries of the cross, who followed him, this missionary of the battle-ax did, no doubt, a very real apostolic work. He checked the ravages of the piratical Danes. He crushed the Avars and took their country, which comprised parts of the Austria and Hungary of the present day. He occupied Bavaria, on the one hand, and Brittany on the other. He crossed the Pyrenees to measure swords with the Saracens, and drove them from the north of Spain, as far as the Ebro. His lordship in Italy has been noticed already. He was unquestionably one of the greatest monarchs of any age, and deserves the title *Magnus*, affixed to his name, if that title ever has been deserved by the kings who were flattered with it. There was much more in his character than the mere aggressive energy which subjugated so wide a realm. He was a man of enlightenment far beyond his time; a man who strove after order, in that disorderly age, and who felt oppressed by the ignorance into which the world had sunk. He was a seeker after learning, and the friend and patron of all in his day who groped in the darkness and felt their way towards the light. He organized his Empire with a sense of political system which was new among the Teutonic masters of Western Europe (except as shown by Theodoric in Italy); but there were not years enough in his own life for the organism to mature, and his sons brought back chaos again.

Appearance of the Northmen.

Before Charlemagne died (814) he saw the western coasts and river valleys of his Empire harried by a fresh outpouring of sea-rovers from the far North, and it is said that he had sad forebodings of the affliction they would become to his people thereafter. These new pirates of the North Sea, who took up, after several centuries, the abandoned trade of their kinsmen, the Saxons (now retired from their wild courses and respectably settled on one side of the water, while subdued and kept in order on the other), were of the bold and rugged Scandinavian race, which inhabited the countries since known as Denmark, Sweden and Norway. They are more or less confused under the general name of Northmen, or Norsemen—men of the North; but that term appears to have been applied more especially to the freebooters from the Norwegian coast, as distinguished from the “Danes” of the lesser peninsula. It is convenient, in so general a sketch as this, to ignore the distinction, and to speak of the Northmen as inclusive, for that age, of the whole Scandinavian race.

Their visitations began to terrify the coasts of England, France and Germany, and the lower valleys of the rivers which they found it possible to ascend, some time in the later half of the

eighth century. It is probable that their appearance on the sea at this time, and not before, was due to a revolution which united Norway under a single king and a stronger government, and which, by suppressing independence and disorder among the petty chiefs, drove many of them to their ships and sent them abroad, to lead a life of lawlessness more agreeable to their tastes. It is also probable that the northern countries had become populated beyond their resources, as seemed to have happened before, when the Goths swarmed out, and that the outlet by sea was necessarily and deliberately opened. Whatever the cause, these Norse adventurers, in fleets of long boats, issued with some suddenness from their “vics,” or fiords (whence the name “viking”), and began an extraordinary career. For more than half a century their raids had no object but plunder, and what they took they carried home to enjoy. First to the Frisian coast, then to the Rhine—the Seine—the Loire,—they came again and again to pillage and destroy; crossing at the same time to the shores of their nearest kinsmen—but heeding no kinship in their savage and relentless forays along the English coasts—and around to Ireland and the Scottish islands, where their earliest lodgments were made.

The Danes in England.

About the middle of the ninth century they began to seize tracts of land in England and to settle themselves there in permanent homes. The Angles in the northern and eastern parts and the Saxons in the southern part of England had weakened themselves and one another by rivalry and war between their divided kingdoms. There had been for three centuries an unceasing struggle among them for supremacy. At the time of the coming of the Danes (who were prominent in the English invasion and gave their name to it), the West Saxon kings had won a decided ascendancy. The Danes, by degrees, stripped them of what they had gained. Northumberland, Mercia and East Angia were occupied in succession, and Wessex itself was attacked. King Alfred, the great and admirable hero of early English history, who came to the throne in 871, spent the first eight years of his reign in a deadly struggle with the invaders. He was obliged in the end to concede to them the whole northeastern part of England, from the Thames to the Tyne, which was known thereafter as “the Danelaw”; but they became his vassals, and submitted to Christian baptism. A century later, the Norse rovers resumed their attacks upon England, and a cowardly English king, distrusting the now settled and peaceful Danes, ordered an extensive massacre of them (1002). The rage which this provoked in Denmark led to a great invasion of the country. England was completely conquered, and remained subject to the Danish kings until 1042, when its throne was recovered for a brief space of time by the English line.

The Normans in Normandy.

Meanwhile the Northmen had gained a much firmer and more important footing in the territory of the Western Franks—which had not yet acquired the name of France. The Seine and its valley attracted them again and again, and after repeated expeditions up the river, even to the city of Paris, which they besieged several

times, one of their chiefs, Rolf or Rollo, got possession of Rouen and began a permanent settlement in the country. The Frank King, Charles the Simple, now made terms with Rollo and granted him a district at the mouth of the Seine, (912), the latter acknowledging the suzerainty or feudal superiority of Charles, and accepting at the same time the doubly new character of a baptised Christian and a Frankish Duke. The Northmen on the Seine were known thenceforth as Normans, their dukedom as Normandy, and they played a great part in European history during the next two centuries.

The Northmen in the West.

The northern sea-rovers who had settled neither in Ireland, England, nor Frankland, went farther afield into the West and North and had wonderful adventures there. They took possession of the Orkneys, the Shetlands, the Hebrides, and other islands in those seas, including Man, and founded a powerful island-kingdom, which they held for a long period. Thence they passed on to Faroë and Iceland, and in Iceland, where they lived peaceful and quiet lives of necessity, they founded an interesting republic, and developed a very remarkable civilization, adorned by a literature which the world is learning more and more to admire. From Iceland, it was a natural step to the discovery of Greenland, and from Greenland, there is now little doubt that they sailed southwards and saw and touched the continent of America, five centuries before Columbus made his voyage.

The Northmen in the East.

While the Northmen of the ninth and tenth centuries were exciting and disturbing all Western Europe by their naval exploits, other adventurers from the Swedish side of the Scandinavian country were sallying eastwards under different names. Both as warriors and as merchants, they made their way from the Baltic to the Black Sea and the Bosphorus, and bands of them entered the service of the Eastern Emperor, at Constantinople, where they received the name of Varangians, from the oath by which they bound themselves. One of the Swedish chiefs, Rurik by name, was chosen by certain tribes of the country now called Russia, to be their prince. Rurik's capital was Novgorod, where he formed the nucleus of a kingdom which grew, through many vicissitudes, into the modern empire of Russia. His successors transferred their capital to Kief, and ultimately it was shifted again to Moscow, where the Muscovite princes acquired the title, the power, and the great dominion of the Czars of all the Russias.

The Slavonic Race.

The Russian sovereigns were thus of Swedish origin; but their subjects were of another race. They belonged to a branch of the great Aryan stock, called the Slavic or Slavonic, which was the last to become historically known. The Slavonians bore no important part in events that we have knowledge of until several centuries of the Christian era had passed. They were the obscure inhabitants in that period of a wide region in Eastern Europe, between the Vistula and the Caspian. In the sixth century, pressed by the Avars, they crossed the Vistula, moving westwards, along the Baltic; and, about the same time

they moved southwards, across the Danube, and established the settlements which formed the existing Slavonic states in South-eastern Europe—Serbia, Croatia and their lesser neighbors. But the principal seat of the Slavonic race within historic times has always been in the region still occupied by its principal representatives, the Russians and the Poles.

Mediæval Society.—The Feudal System.

We have now come to a period in European history—the middle period of the Middle Ages—when it is appropriate to consider the peculiar state of society which had resulted from the transplanting of the Germanic nations of the North to the provinces of the Roman Empire, and from placing the well civilized surviving inhabitants of the latter in subjection to and in association with masters so vigorous, so capable and so barbarous. In Gaul, the conquerors, unused to town-life, not attracted to town pursuits, and eager for the possession of land, had generally spread themselves over the country and left the cities more undisturbed, except as they pillaged them or extorted ransom from them. The Roman-Gallic population of the country had sought refuge, no doubt, to a large extent, in the cities; the agricultural laborers were already, for the most part, slaves or half-slaves—the coloni of the Roman system—and remained in their servitude; while some of the poorer class of freemen may have sunk to the same condition.

How far the new masters of the country had taken possession of its land by actual seizure, ousting the former owners, and under what rules, if any, it was divided among them, are questions involved in great obscurity. In the time of Charlemagne, there seems to have been a large number of small landowners who cultivated their own holdings, which they owned, not conditionally, but absolutely, by the tenure called allodial. But alongside of these peasant proprietors there was another landed class whose estates were held on very different terms, and this latter class, at the time now spoken of, was rapidly absorbing the former. It was a class which had not existed before, neither among the Germans nor among the Romans, and the system of land tenure on which it rested was equally new to both, although both seem to have contributed something to the origin of it. This was the Feudal System, which may be described, in the words of Bishop Stubbs, as being “a complete organization of society through the medium of land tenure, in which, from the king down to the landowner, all are bound together by obligation of service and defence: the lord to protect his vassal, the vassal to do service to his lord; the defence and service being based on, and regulated by, the nature and extent of the land held by the one of the other.” Of course, the service exacted was, in the main, military, and the system grew up as a military system, expanding into a general governing system, during a time of loose and ineffective administration. That it was a thing of gradual growth is now fairly well settled, although little is clearly known of the process of growth. It came to its perfection in the tenth century, by which time most other tenures of land had disappeared. The allodial tenure gave way before it, because, in those disorderly times, men of small or moderate property in land were in need of the protection which a

powerful lord, who had many retainers at his back, or a strong monastery, could give, and were induced to surrender, to one or the other, their free ownership of the land they held, receiving it back as tenants, in order to establish the relation which secured a protector.

In its final organization, the feudal system, as stated before, embraced the whole society of the kingdom. Theoretically, the king was the pinnacle of the system. In the political view of the time — so far as a political view existed — he was the over-lord of the realm rather by reason of being its ultimate land-lord, than by being the center of authority and the guardian of law. The greater subordinate lordships of the kingdom — the dukedoms and counties — were held as huge estates, called fiefs, derived originally by grant from the king, subject to the obligation of military service, and to certain acts of homage, acknowledging the dependent relationship. The greater feudatories, or vassals, holding immediately from the king, were lords in their turn of a second order of feudatories, who held lands under them; and they again might divide their territories among vassals of a third degree; for the process of sub-infeudation went on until it reached the cultivator of the soil, who bore the whole social structure of society on his bent back.

But the feudal system would have wrought few of the effects which it did if it had involved nothing but land tenure and military service. It became, however, as before intimated, a system of government, and one which inevitably produced a disintegration of society and a destruction of national bonds. A grant of territory generally carried with it almost a grant of sovereignty over the inhabitants of the territory, limited only by certain rights and powers reserved to the king, which he found extreme difficulty in exercising. The system was one "in which every lord judged, taxed, and commanded the class next below him, in which abject slavery formed the lowest and irresponsible tyranny the highest grade, in which private war, private coinage, private prisons, took the place of the imperial institutions of government" (Stubbs).

This was the singular system which had its original and special growth among the Franks, in the Middle Ages, and which spread from them, under the generally similar conditions of the age, to other countries, with various degrees of modification and limitation. Its influence was obviously opposed to political unity and social order, and to the development of institutions favorable to the people.

But an opposing influence had kept life in one part of society which feudalism was not able to envelope. That was in cities. The cities, as before stated, had been the refuge of a large and perhaps a better part of the Roman-Gallic free population which survived the barbarian conquest. They, in conjunction with the Church, preserved, without doubt, so much of the plant of Roman civilization as escaped destruction. They certainly suffered heavily, and languished for several centuries; but a slow revival of industries and arts went on in them, — trade crept again into its old channels, or found new ones, — and wealth began to be accumulated anew. With the consciousness of wealth came feelings of independence; and such towns were now beginning to acquire the spirit which made them, a little

later, important instruments in the weakening and breaking of the feudal system.

Rise of the Kingdom of France.


During the period between the death of Charlemagne and the settlement of the Normans in the Carolingian Empire, that Empire had become permanently divided. The final separation had taken place (887) between the kingdom of the East Franks, or Germany, and the kingdom of the West Franks, which presently became France. Between them stretched a region in dispute called Lotharingia, out of which came the duchy of Lorraine. The kingdom of Burgundy (sometimes cut into two) and the kingdom of Italy, had regained a separate existence; and the Empire which Charlemagne had revived was nothing but a name. The last of the Carolingian emperors was Arnulf, who died in 899. The imperial title was borne afterwards by a number of petty Italian potentates, but lost all imperial significance for two-thirds of a century, until it was restored to some grandeur again and to a lasting influence in history, by another German king.

Before this occurred, the Carolingian race of kings had disappeared from both the Frank kingdoms. During the last hundred years of their reign in the West kingdom, the throne had been disputed with them two or three times by members of a rising family, the Counts of Paris and Orleans, who were also called Dukes of the French, and whose duchy gave its name to the kingdom which they finally made their own. The kings of the old race held their capital at Laon, with little power and a small dominion, until 987, when the last one died. The then Count of Paris and Duke of the French, Hugh, called Capet, became king of the French, by election; Paris became the capital of the kingdom, and the France of modern times had its birth, though very far from its full growth.

The royal power had now declined to extreme weakness. The development of feudalism had undermined all central authority, and Hugh Capet as king had scarcely more power than he drew from his own large fief. "At first he was by no means acknowledged in the kingdom; but . . . the chief vassals ultimately gave at least a tacit consent to the usurpation, and permitted the royal name to descend undisputed upon his posterity. But this was almost the sole attribute of sovereignty which the first kings of the third dynasty enjoyed. For a long period before and after the accession of that family France has, properly speaking, no national history" (Hallam).

The Communes.

When the royal power began to gain ascendancy, it seems to have been largely in consequence of a tacitly formed alliance between the kings and the commons or burghers of the towns. The latter, as noted before, were acquiring a spirit of independence, born of increased prosperity, and were converting their guilds or trades unions into crude forms of municipal organization, as "communes" or commons. Sometimes by purchase and sometimes by force, they were ridding themselves of the feudal pretensions which neighboring lords held over them, and were obtaining charters which defined and guaranteed municipal freedom to them. One or two kings of the time happened to be wise enough to give encourage





EUROPE

AT THE CLOSE OF THE TENTH CENTURY.

- HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE
- BYZANTINE EMPIRE
- LITHUANIAN PEOPLES
- FINNIC PEOPLES
- SARACEN POSSESSIONS
- VENETIAN POSSESSIONS

THE HEAVY RED LINE SHOWS THE BOUNDARY OF THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE ABOUT 1000 A.D.
THE DOTTED RED LINE SHOWS THE FORMER EASTERN BOUNDARY OF THE EMPIRE UNDER OTTO I.



ment to this movement towards the enfranchisement of the communes, and it proved to have an important influence in weakening feudalism and strengthening royalty.

Germany.

In the German kingdom, much the same processes of disintegration had produced much the same results as in France. The great fiefs into which it was divided — the duchies of Saxony, Franconia, Swabia and Bavaria — were even more powerful than the great fiefs of France. When the Carolingian dynasty came to an end, in 911, the nobles made choice of a king, electing Conrad of Franconia, and, after him (919), Henry the Fowler, Duke of Saxony. The monarchy continued thereafter to be elective, actually as well as in theory, for a long period. Three times the crown was kept in the same family during several successive generations: in the House of Saxony from 919 to 1024; in the House of Franconia from 1024 to 1137; in the House of the Hohenstaufens, of Swabia, from 1137 to 1254: but it never became an acknowledged heritage until long after the Hapsburgs won possession of it; and even to the end the forms of election were preserved.

The Holy Roman Empire.

The second king of the Saxon dynasty, Otho I., called the Great, recovered the imperial title, which had become extinct again in the West, added the crown of Lombardy to the crown of Germany, and founded anew the Germanic Roman Empire, which Charlemagne had failed to establish enduringly, but which now became one of the conspicuous facts of European history for more than eight hundred years, although seldom more than a shadow and a name. But the shadow and the name were those of the great Rome of antiquity, and the mighty memory it had left in the world gave a superior dignity and rank to these German emperors, even while it diminished their actual power as kings of Germany. It conferred upon them, indeed, more than rank and dignity; it bestowed an "office" which the ideas and feelings of that age could not suffer to remain vacant. The Imperial office seemed to be required, in matters temporal, to balance and to be the complement of the Papal office in matters spiritual. "In nature and compass the government of these two potentates is the same, differing only in the sphere of its working; and it matters not whether we call the Pope a spiritual Emperor, or the Emperor a secular Pope." "Thus the Holy Roman Church and the Holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing, in two aspects; and Catholicism, the principle of the universal Christian society, is also Romanism; that is, rests upon Rome as the origin and type of its universality" (Bryce). These mediæval ideas of the "Holy Roman Empire," as it came to be called (not immediately, but after a time), gave importance to the imperial coronation thenceforth claimed by the German kings. It was a factitious importance, so far as concerned the immediate realm of those kings. In Germany, while it brought no increase to their material power, it tended to alarm feudal jealousies; it tended to draw the kings away from their natural identification with their own country; it tended to distract them from an effective royal policy at home, by foreign ambitions and aims; and altogether

it interfered seriously with the nationalization of Germany, and gave a longer play to the disrupting influences of feudalism in that country than in any other.

Italy, the Empire and the Papacy.

Otto I. had won Italy and the Imperial crown (962) very easily. For more than half a century the peninsula had been in a deplorable state. The elective Lombard crown, quarreled over by the ducal houses of Friuli, Spoleto, Ivrea, Provence, and others, settled nowhere with any sureness, and lost all dignity and strength, though several of the petty kings who wore it had been crowned emperors by the Pope. At Rome, all legitimate government, civil or ecclesiastical, had disappeared. The city and the Church had been for years under the rule of a family of courtisans, who made popes of their lovers and their sons. Southern Italy was being ravaged by the Saracens, who occupied Sicily, and Northern Italy was desolated by the Hungarians. Under these circumstances, Otto I., the German king, listened to an appeal from an oppressed queen, Adelaide, widow of a murdered king, and crossed the Alps (951), like a gallant knight, to her relief. He chastised and humbled the oppressor, rescued the queen, and married her. A few years later, on further provocation, he entered Italy again, deposed the troublesome King Berengar, caused himself to be crowned King of Italy, and received the imperial crown at Rome (962) from one of the vilest of a vile brood of popes, John XII. Soon afterwards, he was impelled to convoke a synod which deposed this disgraceful pope and elected in his place Leo VIII., who had been Otto's chief secretary. The citizens now conceded to the Emperor an absolute veto on papal elections, and the new pope confirmed their act. The German sovereigns, from that time, for many years, asserted their right to control the filling of the chair of St. Peter, and exercised the right on many occasions, though always with difficulty.

Nominally they were sovereigns of Rome and Italy; but during their long absences from the country they scarcely made a show of administrative government in it, and their visits were generally of the nature of expeditions for a reconquest of the land. Their claims of sovereignty were resisted more and more, politically throughout Italy and ecclesiastically at Rome. The Papacy emancipated itself from their control and acquired a natural leadership of Italian opposition to German imperial pretensions. The conflict between these two forces became, as will be seen later on, one of the dominating facts of European history for four centuries — from the eleventh to the fourteenth.

The Italian City-republics.

The disorder that had been scarcely checked in Italy since the Goths came into it, — the practical extinction of central authority after Charlemagne dropped his sceptre, and the increasing conflicts of the nobles among themselves, — had one consequence of remarkable importance in Italian history. It opened opportunities to many cities in the northern parts of the peninsula for acquiring municipal freedom, which they did not lack spirit to improve. They led the movement and set the example which created, a little later, so many vigorous communes in Flanders and France,

and imperial free cities in Germany at a still later day. They were earlier in winning their liberties, and they pushed them farther,—to the point in many cases of creating, as at Pisa, Genoa, Florence, and Venice, a republican city state. Venice, growing up in the security of her lagoons, from a cluster of fishing villages to a great city of palaces, had been independent from the beginning, except as she acknowledged for a time the nominal supremacy of the Eastern Emperor. Others won their way to independence through struggles that are now obscure, and developed, before these dark centuries reached their close, an energy of life and a splendor of genius that come near to comparison with the power and the genius of the Greeks. But, like the city-republics of Greece, they were perpetually at strife with one another, and sacrificed to their mutual jealousies, in the end, the precious liberty which made them great, and which they might, by a well settled union, have preserved.

The Saxon line of Emperors.

Such were the conditions existing or taking shape in Italy when the Empire of the West—the Holy Roman Empire of later times—was founded anew by Otho the Great. Territorially, the Empire as he left it covered Germany to its full extent, and two-thirds of Italy, with the Emperor's superiority acknowledged by the subject states of Burgundy, Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, Denmark, and Hungary—the last named with more dispute.

Otho the Great died in 972. His two immediate successors, Otho II. (973-983) and Otho III. (983-1002) accomplished little, though the latter had great ambitions, planning to raise Rome to her old place as the capital of the world; but he died in his youth in Italy, and was succeeded by a cousin, Henry II., whose election was contested by rivals in Germany, and repudiated in Italy. In the latter country the great nobles placed Ardoin, marquis of Ivrea, on the Lombard throne; but the factions among them soon caused his overthrow, and, Henry, crossing the Alps, reclaimed the crown.

The Franconian Emperors.

Henry II. was the last of the Saxon line, and upon his death, in 1024, the House of Franconia came to the throne, by the election of Conrad II., called "the Salic." Under Conrad, the kingdom of Burgundy, afterwards called the kingdom of Arles (which is to be distinguished from the French Duchy of Burgundy—the northwestern part of the old kingdom), was reunited to the Empire, by the bequest of its last king, Rudolph III. Conrad's son, grandson, and great grandson succeeded him in due order; Henry III. from 1039 to 1056; Henry IV. from 1056 to 1106; Henry V. from 1106 to 1125. Under Henry III. the Empire was at the summit of its power. Henry II., exercising the imperial prerogative, had raised the Duke of Hungary to royal rank, giving him the title of king. Henry III. now forced the Hungarian king to acknowledge the imperial supremacy and pay tribute. The German kingdom was ruled with a strong hand and peace among its members compelled. "In Rome, no German sovereign had ever been so absolute. A disgraceful contest between three claimants of the papal chair had shocked even the reckless apathy of Italy. Henry deposed

them all and appointed their successor." "The synod passed a decree granting to Henry the right of nominating the supreme pontiff; and the Roman priesthood, who had forfeited the respect of the world even more by habitual simony than by the flagrant corruption of their manners, were forced to receive German after German as their bishop, at the bidding of a ruler so powerful, so severe, and so pious. But Henry's encroachments alarmed his own nobles no less than the Italians, and the reaction, which might have been dangerous to himself, was fatal to his successor. A mere chance, as some might call it, determined the course of history. The great Emperor died suddenly in A. D. 1056, and a child was left at the helm, while storms were gathering that might have demanded the wisest hand" (Bryce).

Hildebrand and Henry IV.

The child was Henry IV., of unfortunate memory; the storms which beset him blew from Rome. The Papacy, lifted from its degradation by Henry's father and grandfather, had recovered its boldness of tone and enlarged its pretensions and claims. It had come under the influence of an extraordinary man, the monk Hildebrand, who swayed the councils of four popes before he became pope himself (1073), and whose pontifical reign as Gregory VII. is the epoch of greatest importance in the history of the Roman Church. The overmastering ascendancy of the popes, in the Church and over all who acknowledge its communion, really began when this invincible monk was raised to the papal throne. He broke the priesthood and the whole hierarchy of the West to blind obedience by his relentless discipline. He isolated them, as an order apart, by enforcing celibacy upon them; and he extinguished the corrupting practices of simony. Then, when he had marshalled the forces of the Church, he proclaimed its independence and its supremacy in absolute terms. In the growth of feudalism throughout Europe, the Church had become compromised in many ways with the civil powers. Its bishoprics and abbeys had acquired extensively the nature of fiefs, and bishops and abbots were required to do homage to a secular lord before they could receive an "investiture" of the rich estates which had become attached by a feudal tenure to their sees. The ceremony of investiture, moreover, included delivery of the crozier and the pastoral ring, which were the very symbols of their spiritual office. Against this dependence of the Church upon temporal powers, Gregory now arrayed it in revolt, and began the "War of Investitures," which lasted for half a century. The great battle ground was Germany; the Emperor, of necessity, was the chief opponent; and Henry IV., whose youth had been badly trained, and whose authority had been weakened by a long, ill-guarded minority, was at a disadvantage in the contest. His humiliation at Canossa (1077), when he stood through three winter days, a suppliant before the door of the castle which lodged his haughty enemy, praying to be released from the dread penalties of excommunication, is one of the familiar tableaux of history. He had a poor revenge seven years later, when he took Rome, drove Gregory into the castle St. Angelo, and seated an anti-pope in the Vatican. But his triumph was brief. There came to the rescue

of the beleaguered Pope certain new actors in Italian history, whom it is now necessary to introduce.

The Normans in Italy and Sicily.

The settlement of predatory Northmen on the Seine, which took the name of Normandy and the constitution of a ducal fief of France, had long since grown into an important half-independent state. Its people—now called Normans in the smoother speech of the South—had lost something of their early rudeness, and had fallen a little under the spell of the rising chivalry of the age; but the goad of a warlike temper which drove their fathers out of Norway still pricked the sons and sent them abroad, in restless search of adventures and gain. Some found their way into the south of Italy, where Greeks, Lombards and Saracens were fighting merrily, and where a good sword and a tough lance were tools of the only industry well-paid. Presently there was banded among them there a little army, which found itself a match for any force that Greek or Lombard, or other opponent, could bring against it, and which proceeded accordingly to work its own will in the land. It seized Apulia (1042) and divided it into twelve countships, as an aristocratic republic. Pope Leo IX. led an army against it and was beaten and taken prisoner (1053). To release himself he was compelled to grant the duchy they had taken to them, as a fief of the Church, and to extend his grant to whatever they might succeed in taking, beyond it. The chiefs of the Normans thus far had been, in succession, three sons of a poor gentleman in the Cotentin, Tancred by name, who now sent a fourth son to the scene. This new comer was Robert, having the surname of Guiscard, who became the fourth leader of the Norman troop (1057), and who, in a few years, assumed the title of Duke of Calabria and Apulia. His duchies comprised, substantially, the territory of the later kingdom of Naples. A fifth brother, Roger, had meantime crossed to Sicily, with a small following of his countrymen, and, between 1060 and 1090, had expelled the Saracens from that island, and possessed it as a fief of his brother's duchy. But in the next generation these relations between the two conquests were practically reversed. The son of Roger received the title of King of Sicily from the Pope, and Calabria and Apulia were annexed to his kingdom, through the extinction of Robert's family.

These Normans of Southern Italy were the allies who came to the rescue of Pope Gregory, when the Emperor, Henry IV., besieged him in Castle St. Angelo. He summoned Robert Guiscard as a vassal of the Church, and the response was prompt. Henry and his Germans retreated when the Normans came near, and the latter entered Rome (1084). Accustomed to pillage, they began, soon, to treat the city as a captured place, and the Romans rose against them. They retaliated with torch and sword, and once more Rome suffered from the destroying rage of a barbarous soldiery let loose. "Neither Goth nor Vandal, neither Greek nor German, brought such desolation on the city as this capture by the Normans" (Milman). Duke Robert made no attempt to hold the ruined capital, but withdrew to his own dominions. The Pope went with him, and died soon afterwards (1085), unable to return to Rome. But the imperious temper he had imparted

to the Church was lastingly fixed in it, and his lofty pretensions were even surpassed by the pontiffs who succeeded him. He spoke for the Papacy the first syllables of that awful proclamation that was sounded in its finality, after eight hundred years, when the dogma of infallibility was put forth.

Norman Conquest of England.

The Normans in Italy established no durable power. In another quarter they were more fortunate. Their kinsmen, the Danes, who subjugated England and annexed it to their own kingdom in 1016, had lost it again in 1042, when the old line of kings was restored, in the person of Edward, called the Confessor. But William, Duke of Normandy, had acquired, in the course of these shiftings of the English crown, certain claims which he put forth when Edward died, and when Harold, son of the great Earl Godwine, was elected king to succeed him, in 1066. To enforce his claim, Duke William, commissioned by the Pope, invaded England, in the early autumn of that year, and won the kingdom in the great and decisive battle of Senlac, or Hastings, where Harold was slain. On Christmas Day he was crowned, and a few years sufficed to end all resistance to his authority. He established on the English throne a dynasty which, though shifting sometimes to collateral lines, has held it to the present day.

The Norman Conquest, as estimated by its greatest historian, Professor Freeman, wrought more good effects than ill to the English people. It did not sweep away their laws, customs or language, but it modified them all, and not unfavorably; while "it aroused the old national spirit to fresh life, and gave the conquered people fellow-workers in their conquerors." The monarchy was strengthened by William's advantages as a conqueror, used with the wisdom and moderation of a statesman. Feudalism came into England stripped of its disrupting forces; and the possible alternative of absolutism was hindered by potent checks. At the same time, the Conquest brought England into relations with the Continent which might otherwise have arisen very slowly, and thus gave an early importance to the nation in European history.

The Crusades.

At the period now reached in our survey, all Europe was on the eve of a profounder excitement and commotion than it had ever before known—one which stirred it for the first time with a common feeling and with common thoughts. A great cry ran through it, for help to deliver the holy places of the Christian faith from the infidels who possessed them. The pious and the adventurous, the fanatical and the vagrant, rose up in one motley and tumultuous response to the appeal, and mobs and armies (hardly distinguishable) of Crusaders—warriors of the Cross—began to whiten the highways into Asia with their bones. The first movement, in 1096, swept 300,000 men, women and children, under Peter the Hermit, to their death, with no other result; but nearly at the same time there went an army, French and Norman for the most part, which made its way to Jerusalem, took the city by assault (1099) and founded a kingdom there, which defended itself for almost a hundred years. Long before it fell, it was pressed sorely by the surrounding Moslems and

cried to Europe for help. A Second Crusade, in 1147, accomplished nothing for its relief, but spent vast multitudes of lives; and when the feeble kingdom disappeared, in 1187, and the Sepulchre of the Saviour was defiled again by unbelievers, Christendom grew wild, once more, with passion, and a Third Crusade was led by the redoubtable Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, of Germany, King Richard Cœur de Lion, of England, and King Philip Augustus of France. The Emperor perished miserably on the way and his army was wasted in its march; the French and English exhausted themselves in sieges which won nothing of durable advantage to the Christian world; the Sultan Saladin gathered most of the laurels of the war.

The Turks on the Scene.

The armies of Islam which the Crusaders encountered in Asia Minor and the Holy Land were no longer, in their leadership, of the race of Mahomet. The religion of the Prophet was still triumphant in the East, but his nation had lost its lordship, and Western Asia had submitted to new masters. These were the Turks—Turks of the House of Seljuk—first comers of their swarm from the great Aral basin. First they had been disciples, won by the early armed missionaries of the Crescent; then servants and mercenaries, hired to fight its battles and guard its princes, when the vigor of the Arab conquerors began to be sapped, and their character to be corrupted by luxury and pride; then, at last, they were masters. About the middle of the ninth century, the Caliph at Bagdad became a puppet in their hands, and the Moslem Empire in Asia (Africa and Spain being divided between rival Caliphs) soon passed under their control.

These were the possessors of Jerusalem and its sacred shrines, whose grievous and insulting treatment of Christian pilgrims, in the last years of the eleventh century, had stirred Europe to wrath and provoked the great movement of the Crusades. The movement had important consequences, both immediate and remote; but its first effects were small in moment compared with those which lagged after. To understand either, it will be necessary to glance back at the later course of events in the Eastern or Byzantine Empire.

The Byzantine Empire.

The fortunes of the Empire, since it gave up Syria and Egypt to the Saracens, had been, on the whole, less unhappy than the dark prospect at that time. It had checked the onrush of Arabs at the Taurus mountain range, and retained Asia Minor; it had held Constantinople against them through two terrible sieges; it had fought for three centuries, and finally subdued, a new Turanian enemy, the Bulgarians, who had established a kingdom south of the Danube, where their name remains to the present day. The history of its court, during much of the period, had been a black and disgusting record of conspiracies, treacheries, murders, mutilations, usurpations and foul vices of every description; with now and then a manly figure climbing to the throne and doing heroic things, for the most part uselessly; but the system of governmental administration seems to have been so well constructed that it worked with a certain independence of its vile or imbecile heads, and the country

was probably better and better governed than its court.

At Constantinople, notwithstanding frequent tumults and revolutions, there had been material prosperity and a great gathering of wealth. The Saracen conquests, by closing other avenues of trade between the East and the West, had concentrated that most profitable commerce in the Byzantine capital. The rising commercial cities of Italy—Amalphi, Venice, Genoa, Pisa—seated their enterprises there. Art and literature, which had decayed, began then to revive, and Byzantine culture, on its surface, took more of superiority to that of Teutonic Europe.

The conquests of the Seljuk Turks gave a serious check to this improvement of the circumstances of the Empire. Momentarily, by dividing the Moslem power in Asia, they had opened an opportunity to an energetic Emperor, Nicephorus Phocas, to recover northern Syria and Cilicia (961-969). But when, in the next century, they had won a complete mastery of the dominions of the Caliphate of Bagdad, they speedily swept back the Byzantines, and overran and occupied the most of Asia Minor and Armenia. A decisive victory at Manzikert, in 1071, when the emperor of the moment was taken prisoner and his army annihilated, gave them well nigh the whole territory to the Hellespont. The Empire was nearly reduced to its European domain, and suffered ten years of civil war between rivals for the throne.

At the end of that time it acquired a ruler, in the person of Alexius Comnenus, who is the generally best known of all the Byzantine line, because he figures notably in the stories of the First Crusade. He was a man of crafty abilities and complete unscrupulousness. He took the Empire at its lowest state of abasement and demoralization. In the first year of his reign he had to face a new enemy. Robert Guiscard, the Norman, who had conquered a dukedom in Southern Italy, thought the situation favorable for an attack on the Eastern Empire, and for winning the imperial crown. Twice he invaded the Greek peninsula (1081-1084) and defeated the forces brought against him by Alexius; but troubles in Italy recalled him on the first occasion, and his death brought the second expedition to naught.

Such was the situation of the Byzantines when the waves of the First Crusade, rolling Asia-ward, surged up to the gates of Constantinople. It was a visitation that might well appal them,—these hosts of knights and vagabonds, fanatics and freebooters, who claimed and proffered help in a common Christian war with the infidels, and who, nevertheless, had no Christian communion with them—schismatics as they were, outside the fold of the Roman shepherd. There is not a doubt that they feared the crusading Franks more than they feared the Turks. They knew them less, and the little hearsay knowledge they had was of a lawless, barbarous, fighting feudalism in the countries of the West,—more rough and uncouth, at least, than their own defer methods of murdering and mutilating one another. They received their dangerous visitors with nervousness and suspicion; but Alexius Comnenus proved equal to the delicate position in which he found himself placed. He burdened his soul with lies and perfidies; but he managed affairs so wonderfully that the Empire plucked the best

fruits of the first Crusades, by recovering a great part of Asia Minor, with all the coasts of the Euxine and the Ægean, from the weakened Turks. The latter were so far shaken and depressed by the hard blows of the Crusaders that they troubled the Byzantines very little in the century to come.

But against this immediate gain to the Eastern Empire from the early Crusades, there were serious later offsets. The commerce of Constantinople declined rapidly, as soon as the Moslem blockade of the Syrian coast line was broken. It lost its monopoly. Trade ran back again into other reopened channels. The Venetians and Genoese became more independent. Formerly, they had received privileges in the Empire as a gracious concession. Now they dictated the terms of their commercial treaties and their naval alliances. Their rivalries with one another involved the Empire in quarrels with both, and a state of things was brought about which had much to do with the catastrophe of 1204, when the fourth Crusade was diverted to the conquest of Constantinople, and a Latin Empire supplanted the Empire of the Roman-Greeks.

Effects of the Crusades.

Briefly noted, these were the consequences of the early Crusades in the East. In western Europe they had slower, but deeper and more lasting effects. They weakened feudalism, by sending abroad so many of the feudal lords, and by impoverishing so many more; whereby the towns gained more opportunity for enfranchisement, and the crown, in France particularly, acquired more power. They checked smaller wars and private quarrels for a time, and gave in many countries unwonted seasons of peace, during which the thoughts and feelings of men were acted on by more civilizing influences. They brought men into fellowship who were only accustomed to fight one another, and thus softened their provincial and national antipathies. They expanded the knowledge—the experience—the ideas—of the whole body of those who visited the East and who survived the adventurous expedition; made them acquainted with civilizations at least more polished than their own; taught them many things which they could only learn in those days by actual sight, and sent them back to their homes throughout Europe, to be instructors and missionaries, who did much to prepare Western Christendom for the Renaissance or new birth of a later time. The twelfth century—the century of the great Crusades—saw the gray day-break in Europe after the long night of darkness which settled down upon it in the fifth. In the thirteenth it reached the brightening dawn, and in the fifteenth it stood in the full morning of the modern day. Among all the movements by which it was pushed out of darkness into light, that of the Crusades would appear to have been the most important; important in itself, as a social and political movement of great change, and important in the seeds that it scattered for a future harvest of effects.

In both the Byzantine and Arabian civilizations of the East there was much for western Europe to learn. Perhaps there was more in the last named than in the first; for the Arabs, when they came out from behind their deserts, and exchanged the nomadic life for the life of cities, had shown an amazing avidity for the lingering

science of old Greece, which they encountered in Egypt and Syria. They had preserved far more of it, and more of the old fineness of feeling that went with it, than had survived in Greece itself, or in any part of the Teutonized empire of Rome. The Crusaders got glimpses of its influence, at least, and a curiosity was awakened, which sent students into Moorish Spain, and opened scholarly interchanges which greatly advanced learning in Europe.

Rising Power of the Church.

Not the least important effect of the Crusades was the atmosphere of religion which they caused to envelope the great affairs of the time, and which they made common in politics and society. The influence of the Church was increased by this; and its organization was powerfully strengthened by the great monastic revival that followed presently: the rise of purer and more strictly disciplined orders of the "regular" (that is the secluded or monastic) clergy—Cistercians, Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, etc.; as well as the creation of the great military-religious orders—Knights Templars, Knights of the Hospital of St. John, Teutonic Knights, and others, which were immediately connected with the Crusades.

To say that the Church gained influence is to say that the clergy gained it, and that the chief of the clergy, the Pope, concentrated the gain in himself. The whole clerical body was making encroachments in every field of politics upon the domain of the civil authority, using shrewdly the advantages of superior learning, and busying itself more and more in temporal affairs. The popes after Gregory VII. maintained his high pretensions and pursued his audacious course. In most countries they encountered resistance from the Crown; but the brunt of the conflict still fell upon the emperors, who, in some respects, were the most poorly armed for it.

Guelfs and Ghibellines.

Henry IV., who outlived his struggle with Gregory, was beaten down at last—dethroned by a graceless son, excommunicated by a relentless Church and denied burial when he died (1106) by its clergy. The rebellious son, Henry V., in his turn fought the same battle over for ten years, and forced a compromise which saved about half the rights of investiture that his father had claimed. His death (1125) ended the Franconian line, and the imperial crown returned for a few years to the House of Saxony, by the election of the Duke Lothaire. But the estates of the Franconian family had passed, by his mother, to Frederick of Hohenstaufen, duke of Swabia; and now a bitter feud arose between the House of Saxony and the House of Hohenstaufen or Swabia,—a feud that was the most memorable and the longest lasting in history, if measured by the duration of party strifes which began in it and which took their names from it. For the raging factions of Guelfs and Ghibellines which divided Italy for two centuries had their beginning in this Swabian-Saxon feud, among the Germans. The Guelfs were the partisans of the House of Saxony; the Ghibellines were the party of the Hohenstaufens. The Hohenstaufens triumphed when Lothaire died (1138), and made Conrad of their House Emperor. They held the crown, moreover, in their family for four generations,

extending through more than a century; and so it happened that the German name of the German party of the Hohenstaufens came to be identified in Italy with the party or faction in that country which supported imperial interests and claims in the free cities and against the popes. Whereupon the opposed party name was borrowed from Germany likewise and applied to the Italian faction which took ground against the Emperors—although these Italian Guelfs had no objects in common with the partisans of Saxony.

The Hohenstaufens in Italy.

The first Hohenstaufen emperor was succeeded (1152) by his nephew Frederick I., called Barbarossa, because of his red beard. The long reign of Frederick, until 1190, was mainly filled with wars and contentions in Italy, where he pushed the old quarrel of the Empire with the Papacy, and where, furthermore, he resolutely undertook to check the growing independence of the Lombard cities. Five times during his reign he led a great army into the peninsula, like a hostile invader, and his destroying marches through the country, of which he claimed to be sovereign, were like those of the barbarians who came out of the North seven centuries before. The more powerful cities, like Milan, were undoubtedly oppressing their weaker neighbors, and Barbarossa assumed to be the champion of the latter. But he smote impartially the weak and the strong, the village and the town, which provoked his arrogant temper in the slightest degree. Milan escaped his wrath on the first visitation, but went down before it when he came again (1158), and was totally destroyed, the inhabitants being scattered in other towns. Even the enemies of Milan were moved to compassion by the savageness of this punishment, and joined, a few years later, in rebuilding the prostrate walls and founding Milan anew. A great "League of Lombardy" was formed by all the northern towns, to defend their freedom against the hated Emperor, and the party of the Ghibellines was reduced for the time to a feeble minority. Meantime Barbarossa had forced his way into Rome, stormed the very Church of St. Peter, and seated an anti-pope on the throne. But a sudden pestilence fell upon his army, and he fled before it, out of Italy, almost alone. Yet he never relaxed his determination to bend both the Papacy and the Lombard republics to his will. After seven years he returned, for the fifth time, and it proved to be the last. The League met him at Legnano (1176) and administered to him an overwhelming defeat. Even his obstinacy was then overcome, and after a truce of six years he made peace with the League and the Pope, on terms which conceded most of the liberties that the cities claimed. It was in the reign of Frederick that the name "Holy Roman Empire" began, it seems, to be used.

Frederick died while on a crusade and was succeeded (1190) by his son, Henry VI., who had married the daughter and heiress of the King of Sicily and who acquired that kingdom in her right. His short reign was occupied mostly in subduing the Sicilian possession. When he died (1197) his son Frederick was a child. Frederick succeeded to the crown of Sicily, but his rights in Germany (where his father had already caused him to be crowned "King of the Romans")—the step preliminary to an imperial election)

were entirely ignored. The German crown was disputed between a Swabian and a Saxon claimant, and the Saxon, Otho, was King and Emperor in name, until 1218, when he died. But he, too, quarreled with a pope, about the lands of the Countess Matilda, which she gave to the Church; and his quarrel was with Innocent III., a pope who realized the autocracy which Hildebrand had looked forward to, and who lifted the Papacy to the greatest height of power it ever attained. To cast down Otho, Innocent took up the cause of Frederick, who received the royal crown a second time, at Aix-la-Chapelle (1215) and the imperial crown at Rome (1220). Frederick II. (his designation) was one of the few men of actual genius who have ever sprung from the sovereign families of the world; a man so far in advance of his time that he appears like a modern among his mediæval contemporaries. He was superior to the superstitions of his age,—superior to its bigotries and its provincialisms. His large sympathies and cosmopolitan frame of mind were acted upon by all the new impulses of the epoch of the crusades, and made him reflect, in his brilliant character, as in a mirror, the civilizing processes that were working on his generation.

Between such an emperor as Frederick II. and such popes as Innocent III. and his immediate successors, there could not fail to be collision and strife. The man who might, perhaps, under other circumstances, have given some quicker movement to the hands which measure human progress on the dial of time, spent his life in barely proving his ability to live and reign under the anathemas and proscriptions of the Church. But he fought a losing fight, even when he seemed to be winning victories in northern Italy, over the Guelf cities of Lombardy, and when the party of the Ghibellines appeared to be ascendant throughout the peninsula. His death (1250) was the end of the Hohenstaufens as an imperial family. His son, Conrad, who survived him four years, was king of Sicily and had been crowned king of Germany; but he never wore the crown imperial. Conrad's illegitimate brother, Manfred, succeeded on the Sicilian throne; but the implacable Papacy gave his kingdom to Charles of Anjou, brother of King Louis IX. of France, and invited a crusade for the conquest of it. Manfred was slain in battle, Conrad's young son, Conradin, perished on the scaffold, and the Hohenstaufens disappeared from history. Their rights, or claims, in Sicily and Naples, passed to the Spanish House of Aragon, by the marriage of Manfred's daughter to the Aragonese king; whence long strife between the House of Anjou and the House of Aragon, and a troubled history for the Neapolitans and the Sicilians during some centuries. In the end, Anjou kept Naples, while Aragon won Sicily; the kings in both lines called themselves Kings of Sicily, and a subsequent re-union of the two crowns created a very queerly named "Kingdom of the Two Sicilies."

Germany and the Empire.

After the death of Frederick II., the German kings, while maintaining the imperial title, practically abandoned their serious attempts to enforce an actual sovereignty in Italy. The Holy Roman Empire, as a political factor comprehending more than Germany, now ceased in

reality to exist. The name lived on, but only to represent a flattering fiction for magnifying the rank and importance of the German kings. In Italy, the conflict, as between Papacy and Empire, or between Lombard republican cities and Empire, was at an end. No further occasion existed for an imperial party, or an anti-imperial party. The Guelph and Ghibelline names and divisions had no more the little meaning that first belonged to them. But Guelphs and Ghibellines raged against one another more furiously than before, and generations passed before their feud died out.

While the long, profitless Italian conflict of the Emperors went on, their kingship in Germany suffered sorely. As they grasped at a shadowy imperial title, the substance of royal authority slipped from them. Their frequent prolonged absence in Italy gave opportunities for enlarged independence to the German princes and feudal lords; their difficulties beyond the Alps forced them to buy support from their vassals at home by fatal concessions and grants; their neglect of German affairs weakened the ties of loyalty, and provoked revolts. The result might have been a dissolution of Germany so complete as to give rise to two or three strong states, if another potent influence had not worked injury in a different way. This came from the custom of equalized inheritance which prevailed among the Germans. The law of primogeniture, which already governed hereditary transmissions of territorial sovereignty in many countries, even where it did not give an undivided private estate, as in England, to the eldest son of a family, got footing in Germany very late and very slowly. At the time now described, it was the quite common practice to divide principalities between all the sons surviving a deceased duke or margrave. It was this practice which gave rise to the astonishing number of petty states into which Germany came to be divided, and the forms of which are still intact. It was this, in the main, which prevented the growth of any states to a power that would absorb the rest. On the other hand, the flimsy, half fictitious general constitution which the Empire substituted for such an one as the Kingdom of Germany would naturally have grown into, made an effective centralization of sovereignty—easy as the conditions seemed to be prepared for it—quite impossible.

Free Cities in Germany and their Leagues.

One happy consequence of this state of things was the enfranchisement, either wholly or nearly so, of many thriving cities. The growth of cities, as centers of industry and commerce, and the development of municipal freedom among them, was considerably later in Germany than in Italy, France and the Netherlands; but the independence gained by some among them was more entire than in the Low Countries or in France, and more lasting than in Italy.

Most of the free cities of Germany were directly or immediately subject to the Emperor, and wholly independent of the princes whose territories surrounded them; whence they were called "imperial cities." This relationship bound them to the Empire by strong ties; they had less to fear from it than from the nearer small potentates of their country; and it probably drew a considerable part of such strength as it possessed,

in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, from their support. Their own power was being augmented at this period by the formation of extensive Leagues among them, for common defense, and for the protection, regulation and extension of their trade. In that age of lawless violence, there was so little force in government, everywhere, and so entire a want of co-operation between governments, that the operations of trade were exposed to piracy, robbery, and black-mail, on every sea and in every land. By the organization of their Leagues, the energetic merchants of north-western Europe did for themselves what their half-civilized governments failed to do for them. They not only created effective agencies for the protection of their trade, but they legislated, nationally and internationally, for themselves, establishing codes and regulations, negotiating commercial treaties, making war, and exercising many functions and powers that seem strange to modern times. The great Hansa, or Hanseatic League, which rose to importance in the thirteenth century among the cities in the north of Germany, was the most extensive, the longest lasting and the most formidable of these confederations. It controlled the trade between Germany, England, Russia, the Scandinavian countries, and the Netherlands, and through the latter it made exchanges with southern Europe and the East. It waged successful war with Denmark, Sweden and Norway combined, in defiance of the opposition of the Emperor and the Pope. But the growth of its power engendered an arrogance which provoked enmity in all countries, while the slow crystalizing of nationalities in Europe, with national sentiments and ambitions, worked in all directions against the commercial monopoly of the Hansa towns. By the end of the fifteenth century their league had begun to break up and its power to decline. The lesser associations of similar character—such as the Rhenish and the Swabian—had been shorter-lived.

The Great Interregnum.

These city-confederations represented in their time the only movement of concentration that appeared in Germany. Every other activity seemed tending toward dissolution. Headship there was none for a quarter of a century after Frederick II. died. The election of the Kings, who took rank and title as Emperors when crowned by the Pope, had now become the exclusive privilege of three prince-bishops and four temporal princes, who acquired the title of Electors. Jealous of one another, and of all the greater lords outside their electoral college, it was against their policy to confer the scepter on any man who seemed likely to wield it with a strong hand. For twenty years—a period in German history known as the Great Interregnum—they kept the throne practically vacant. Part of the Electors were bribed to choose Richard, Earl of Cornwall, brother of the English King Henry III., and the other part gave their votes to Alfonso, King of Castile. Alfonso never came to be crowned, either as King or Emperor; Richard was crowned King, but exercised no power and lived mostly in his own country. The Empire was virtually extinct; the Kingdom hardly less so. Burgundy fell away from the imperial jurisdiction even more than Italy did. Considerable parts of it passed to France.

Rise of the House of Austria.

At last, in 1273, the interregnum was ended by the election of a German noble to be King of Germany. This was Rodolph, Count of Hapsburg,—lord of a small domain and of little importance from his own possessions, which explains, without doubt, his selection. But Rodolph proved to be a vigorous king, and he founded a family of such lasting stamina and such self-seeking capability that it secured in time permanent possession of the German crown, and acquired, outside of Germany, a great dominion of its own. He began the aggrandizement of his House by taking the fine duchy of Austria from the kingdom of Bohemia and bestowing it upon his sons. He was energetic in improving opportunities like this, and energetic, too, in destroying the castles of robber-knights and hanging the robbers on their own battlements; but of substantial authority or power he had little enough. He never went to Rome for the imperial crown; nor troubled himself much with Italian affairs.

On Rodolph's death (1291), his son Albert of Austria was a candidate for the crown. The Electors rejected him and elected another poor noble, Adolphus of Nassau; but Adolphus displeased them after a few years, and they decreed his deposition, electing Albert in his place. War followed and Adolphus was killed. Albert's reign was one of vigor, but he accomplished little of permanent effect. He planted one of his sons on the throne of Bohemia, where the reigning family had become extinct; but the new king died in a few months, much hated, and the Bohemians resisted an Austrian successor. In 1308, Albert was assassinated, and the electors raised Count Henry of Luxemburg to the throne, as Henry VII. Henry VII. was the first king of Germany since the Hohenstaufens who went to Italy (1310) for the crown of Lombardy and the crown of the Cæsars, both of which he received. The Ghibelline party was still strong among the Italians. In the distracted state of that country there were many patriots—the poet Dante prominent among them—who hoped great things from the reappearance of an emperor; but the enthusiastic welcome he received was mainly from those furious partisans who looked for a party triumph to be won under the new emperor's lead. When they found that he would not let himself be made an instrument of faction in the unhappy country, they turned against him. His undertakings in Italy promised nothing but failure, when he died suddenly (1313), from poison, as the Germans believed. His successor in Germany, chosen by the majority of the electors, was Lewis of Bavaria; but Frederick the Fair of Austria, supported by a minority, disputed the election, and there was civil war for twelve years, until Frederick, a prisoner, so won the heart of Lewis that the latter divided the throne with him and the two reigned together.

France under the Capetians.

While Germany and the fictitious Empire linked with it were thus dropping from the foremost place in western Europe into the background, several kingdoms were slowly emerging out of the anarchy of feudalism, and acquiring the organization of authority and law which creates stable and substantial power. France for

two centuries, under the first three Capetian kings, had made little progress to that end. At the accession (1103) of the fourth of those kings, namely, Louis VI., it is estimated that the actual possessions of the Crown, over which it exercised sovereignty direct, equalled no more than about five of the modern departments of France; while twenty-nine were in the great fiefs of Flanders, Burgundy, Champagne, Normandy, Brittany, Anjou, Vermandois, and Boulogne, where the royal authority was but nominal; thirty-three, south of the Loire, were hardly connected with the Crown, and twenty-one were then dependent on the Empire. The actual "France," as a kingdom, at that time, was very small. "The real domain of Louis VI. was almost confined to the five towns of Paris, Orleans, Estampes, Melun, and Compiègne, and to estates in their neighbourhood." But the strengthening of the Crown was slightly begun in the reign of this king, by his wise policy of encouraging the enfranchisement of the communes, as noted before, which introduced a helpful alliance between the monarchy and the burgher-class, or third estate, as it came to be called, of the cities, against the feudal aristocracy.

But progress in that direction was slight at first and slowly made. Louis VII., who came to the throne in 1137, acquired momentarily the great duchy of Aquitaine, or Guienne, by his marriage with Eleanor, who inherited it; but he divorced her, and she married Henry Plantagenet, who became Henry II., King of England, being at the same time Duke of Normandy, by inheritance from his mother, and succeeding his father in Anjou, Maine and Touraine. Eleanor having carried to him the great Aquitanian domain of her family, he was sovereign of a larger part of modern France than owned allegiance to the French king.

French recovery of Normandy and Anjou.

But the next king in France, Philip, called Augustus (1180), who was the son of Louis VII., wrought a change of these circumstances. He was a prince of remarkable vigor, and he rallied with rare ability all the forces that the Crown could command. He wrested Vermandois from the Count of Flanders, and extorted submission from the rebellious Duke of Burgundy. Suspending his projects at home for a time, to go crusading to the Holy Land in company with King Richard of England, he resumed them with fresh energy after Richard's death. The latter was succeeded by his mean brother John, who seems to have been hated with unanimity. John was accused of the murder of his young nephew, Arthur of Brittany, who disputed the inheritance from Richard. As Duke of Normandy and Anjou, John, though King of England, was nevertheless a vassal of the King of France. Philip summoned him, on charges, to be tried by his peers. John failed to answer the summons, and the forfeiture of his fiefs was promptly declared. The French king stood well prepared to make the confiscation effective, while John, in serious trouble with his English subjects, could offer little resistance. Thus the Norman realm of the English kings—their original dominion—was lost beyond recovery, and with it Anjou and Maine. They held Guienne and Poitou for some years; but the bases of the French monarchy were broadened immensely from the day when

the great Norman and Angevin fiefs became royal domain.

The Albigenes.

Events in the south of France, during Philip's reign, prepared the way for a further aggrandisement of the Crown. Ancient Latin civilization had lingered longer there, in spirit, at least, than in the central and northern districts of the kingdom, and the state of society intellectually was both livelier and more refined. It was the region of Europe where thought first showed signs of independence, and where the spiritual despotism of Rome was disputed first. A sect arose in Languedoc which took its name from the district of Albi, and which offended the Church perhaps more by the freedom of opinion than it claimed than by the heresy of the opinions themselves. These Albigeois, or Albigenses, had been at issue with the clergy of their country and with the Papacy for some years before Innocent III., the pontifical autocrat of his age, proclaimed a crusade against them (1208), and launched his sentence of excommunication against Raymond, Count of Toulouse, who gave them countenance if not sympathy. The fanatical Simon de Montfort, father of the great noble of like name who figures more grandly in English history, took the lead of the Crusade, to which bigots and brutal adventurers flocked together. Languedoc was wasted with fire and sword, and after twenty years of intermittent war, in which Peter of Aragon took part, assisting the Albigeois, the Count of Toulouse purchased peace for his ruined land by ceding part of it to the king of France, and giving his daughter in marriage to the king's brother Alphonso,—by which marriage the remainder of the country was transferred, a few years later, to the French crown.

The Battle of Bouvines.

Philip Augustus, in whose reign this brutal crushing of Provençal France began, took little part in it, but he saw with no unwillingness another too powerful vassal brought low. The next blow of like kind he struck with his own hand. John of England had quarreled with the mighty Pope Innocent III.; his kingdom had been placed under interdict and his subjects absolved from their allegiance. Philip of France eagerly offered to become the executor of the papal decree, and gathered an army for the invasion of England, to oust John from his throne. But John hastened now to make peace with the Church, submitting himself, surrendering his kingdom to the Pope, and receiving it back as a papal fief. This accomplished, the all-powerful pontiff persuaded the French king to turn his army against the Count of Flanders, who had never been reduced to a proper degree of submission to his feudal sovereign. He seems to have become the recognized head of a body of nobles who showed alarm and resentment at the growing power of the Crown, and the war which ensued was quite extraordinary in its political importance. King John of England came personally to the assistance of the Flemish Count, because of the hatred he felt towards Philip of France. Otho, Emperor of Germany, who had been excommunicated and deposed by the Pope, and who was struggling for his crown with the young Hohenstaufen, Frederick II., took part in the melee, because John was his uncle, and be-

cause the Pope was for Philip, and because Germany dreaded the rising power of France. So the war, which seemed at first to be a trifling affair in a corner, became in fact a grand clearing storm, for the settlement of many large issues, important to all Europe. The settlement was accomplished by a single decisive battle, fought at Bouvines (1214), not far from Tournay. It established effectively in France the feudal superiority and actual sovereignty of the king. It evoked a national spirit among the French people, having been their first national victory, won under the banners of a definite kingdom, over foreign foes. It was a triumph for the Papacy and the Church and a crushing blow to those who dared resist the mandates of Rome. It sent King John back to England so humbled and weakened that he had little stomach for the contest which awaited him there, and the grand event of the signing of Magna Charta next year was more easily brought about. It settled the fate of Otho of Germany, and cleared the bright opening of the stormy career of Frederick II., his successor. Thus the battle of Bouvines, which is not a famous field in common knowledge, must really be numbered among the great and important battles of the world.

When Philip Augustus died in 1223, the regality which he bequeathed to his son, Louis VIII., was something vastly greater than that which came to him from his predecessors. He had enhanced both the dignity and the power, both the authority and the prestige, of the Crown, and made a substantial kingdom of France. Louis VIII. enlarged his dominions by the conquest of Lower Poitou and the taking of Rochelle from the English; but he sowed the seeds of future weakness in the monarchy by creating great duchies for his children, which became as troublesome to later kings as Normandy and Anjou had been to those before him.

Saint Louis.

Louis IX.—Saint Louis in the calendar of the Catholic Church—who came to the throne in 1226, while a child of eleven years, was a king of so noble a type that he stands nearly alone in history. Marcus Aurelius, the Emperor, and King Alfred of England, are the only sovereigns who seem worthy to be compared with him; and even the purity of those rare souls is not quite so simple and so selfless, perhaps, as that which shines in the beautiful character of this most Christian king. His goodness was of that quality which rises to greatness—above all other measures of greatness in the distinction of men. It was of that quality which even a wicked world is compelled to feel and to bend to as a power, much exceeding the power of state-craft or of the sword. Of all the kings of his line, this Saint Louis was probably the one who had least thought of a royal interest in France distinct from the interest of the people of France; and the one who consciously did least to aggrandize the monarchy and enlarge its powers; but no king before him or after him was so much the true architect of the foundations of the absolute French monarchy of later times. His constant purpose was to give peace to his kingdom and justice to his people; to end violence and wrongdoing. In pursuing this purpose, he gave a new character and a new influence to the royal courts,—established them in public confidence,—accus-

tomed his subjects to appeal to them; he denounced the brutal senselessness of trials by combat, and commanded their abolition; he gave encouragement to the study and the introduction of Roman law, and so helped to dispel the crude political as well as legal ideas that feudalism rested on. His measures in these directions all tended to the undermining of the feudal system and to the breaking down of the independence of the great vassals who divided sovereignty with the king. At the same time the upright soul of King Louis, devotedly pious son of the Church as he was, yielded his conscience to it, and the just ordinances of his kingdom, no more than he yielded to the haughty turbulence of the great vassals of the crown.

The great misfortunes of the reign of Saint Louis were the two calamitous Crusades in which he engaged (1248-1254, and 1270), and in the last of which he died. They were futile in every way—as unwisely conducted as they were unwisely conceived; but they count among the few errors of a noble, great life. Regarded altogether, in the light which after-history throws back upon it, the reign of Louis IX. is more loftily distinguished than any other in the annals of France.

Philip the Fair and Pope Boniface.

There is little to distinguish the reign of St. Louis' son, Philip III., "le Hardi," "the Rash" (1270-1285), though the remains of the great fief of Toulouse were added in his time to the royal domain; but under the grandson of St. Louis, the fourth Philip, surnamed "le Bel," there was a season of storms in France. This Philip was unquestionably a man of clear, cold intellect, and of powerful, unbending will. There was nothing of the soldier in him, much of the lawyer-like mind and disposition. The men of the gown were his counsellors; he advanced their influence, and promoted the acceptance in France of the principles of the Roman or civil law, which were antagonistic to feudal ideas. In his attitude towards the Papacy—which had declined greatly in character and power within the century past—he was extraordinarily bold. His famous quarrel with Pope Boniface VIII. resulted in humiliations to the head of the Church from which, in some respects, there was no recovery. The quarrel arose on questions connected chiefly with the taxing of the clergy. The Pope launched one angry Bull after another against the audacious king, and the latter retorted with Ordinances which were as effective as the Bulls. Excommunication was defied; the Inquisition was suppressed in France; appeal taken to a General Council of the Church. At last Boniface suffered personal violence at the hands of a party of hired ruffians, in French pay, who attacked him at his country residence, and received such indignities that he expired soon after of shame and rage. The pope immediately succeeding died a few months later, and dark suspicions as to the cause of his death were entertained; for he gave place (1305) to one, Clement V., who was the tool of the French king, bound to him by pledges and guarantees before his election. This Pope Clement removed the papal residence from Rome to Avignon, and for a long period—the period known as "the Babylonish Captivity"—the Holy See was subservient to the monarchy of France.

In this contest with the Papacy, Philip threw himself on the support of the whole body of his

people, convoking (1302) the first meeting of the Three Estates—the first of the few general Parliaments—ever assembled in France.

Destruction of the Templars.

A more sinister event in the reign of Philip IV. was his prosecution and destruction of the famous Order of the Knights Templars. The dark, dramatic story has been told many times, and its incidents are familiar. Perhaps there will never be agreement as to the bottom of truth that might exist in the charges brought against the Order; but few question the fact that its blackest guilt in the eyes of the French King was its wealth, which he coveted and which he was resolved to find reasons for taking to himself. The knights were accused of infidelity, blasphemy, and abominable vices. They were tried, tortured, tempted to confessions, burned at the stake; and their lands and goods were divided between the Crown and the Knights of St. John.

Flemish Wealth and Independence.

The wilful king had little mercy in his cold heart and few scruples in his calculating brain. His character was not admirable; but the ends which he compassed were mostly good for the strength and independence of the monarchy of France, and, on the whole, for the welfare of the people subject to it. Even the disasters of his reign had sometimes their good effect: as in the case of his failure to subjugate the great county of Flanders. Originally a fief of the Kings of France, it had been growing apart from the French monarchy, through the independent interests and feelings that rose in it with the increase of wealth among its singularly industrious and thrifty people. The Low Countries, or Netherlands, on both sides of the Rhine, had been the first in western Europe to develop industrial arts and the trade that goes with them in a thoroughly intelligent and systematic way. The Flemings were leaders in this industrial development. Their country was full of busy cities,—communes, with large liberties in possession,—where prosperous artisans, pursuing many crafts, were organized in guilds and felt strong for the defense of their chartered rights. Ghent exceeded Paris in riches and population at the end of the thirteenth century. Bruges was nearly its equal; and there were many of less note. The country was already a prize to be coveted by kings; and the kings of France, who claimed the rights of feudal superiority over its count, had long been seeking to make their sovereignty direct, while the spirit of the Flemings carried them more and more toward independence.

In 1294, Philip IV. became involved in war with Edward I. of England over Guienne. Flanders, which traded largely with England and was in close friendship with the English king and people, took sides with the latter, and was basely abandoned when Philip and Edward made peace, in 1302. The French king then seized his opportunity to subjugate the Flemings, which he practically accomplished for a time, mastering all of their cities except Ghent. His need and his greed made the burden of taxes which he now laid on these new subjects very heavy and they were soon in revolt. By accident, and the folly of the French, they won a

fearfully decisive victory at Courtray, where some thousands of the nobles and knights of France charged blindly into a canal, and were drowned, suffocated and slaughtered in heaps. The carnage was so great that it broke the strength of the feudal chivalry of France, and the French crown, while it lost Flanders, yet gained power from the very disaster.

In 1314, Philip IV. died, leaving three sons, who occupied the throne for brief terms in succession: Louis X., surnamed Hutin (disorder), who survived his father little more than a year; Philip V., called "the Long" (1316-1322), and Charles IV., known as "the Fair" (1322-1328). With the death of Charles the Fair, the direct line of the Capetian Kings came to an end, and Philip, Count of Valois, first cousin of the late kings, and grandson of Philip III., came to the throne, as Philip VI.—introducing the Valois line of kings.

Claims of Edward III. of England.

The so-called Salic law, excluding females, in France, from the throne, had now, in the arrangement of these recent successions, been affirmed and enforced. It was promptly disputed by King Edward III. of England, who claimed the French crown by right of his mother, daughter of Philip IV. and sister of the last three kings. His attempt to enforce this claim was the beginning of the wicked, desolating "Hundred Years War" between England and France, which well-nigh ruined the latter, while it contributed in the former to the advancement of the commons in political power.

England after the Norman Conquest.

The England of the reign of Edward III., when the Hundred Years War began, was a country quite different in condition from that which our narrative left, at the time it had yielded (about 1071) to William the Norman conqueror. The English people were brought low by that subjugation, and the yoke which the Normans laid upon them was heavy indeed. They were stripped of their lands by confiscation; they were disarmed and disorganized; every attempt at rebellion failed miserably, and every failure brought wider confiscations. The old nobility suffered most and its ranks were thinned. England became Norman in its aristocracy and remained English in its commons and its villinage.

Modified Feudalism in England.

Before the Conquest, feudalism had crept into its southern parts and was working a slow change of its old free Germanic institutions. But the Normans quickened the change and widened it. At the same time they controlled it in certain ways, favorably both to the monarchy and the people. They established a feudal system, but it was a system different from that which broke up the unity of both kingdoms of the Franks. William, shrewd statesman that he was, took care that no dangerous great fiefs should be created; and he took care, too, that every landlord in England should swear fealty direct to the king,—thus placing the Crown in immediate relations with all its subjects, permitting no intermediary lord to take their first allegiance to himself and pass it on at second hand to a mere crowned overlord.

The effect of this diluted organization of feudalism in England was to make the monarchy so

strong, from the beginning, that both aristocracy and commons were naturally put on their defence against it, and acquired a feeling of association, a sense of common interest, a habit of alliance, which became very important influences in the political history of the nation. In France, as we have seen, there had been nothing of this. There, at the beginning, the feudal aristocracy was dominant, and held itself so haughtily above the commons, or Third Estate, that no political co-operation between the two orders could be thought of when circumstances called for it. The kings slowly undermined the aristocratic power, using the communes in the process; and when, at last, the power of the monarchy had become threatening to both orders in the state, they were separated by too great an alienation of feeling and habit to act well together.

It was the great good fortune of England that feudalism was curbed by a strong monarchy. It was the greater good fortune of the English people that their primitive Germanic institutions—their folk-moots, and their whole simple popular system of local government—should have had so long and sturdy a growth before the feudal scheme of society began seriously to intrude upon them. The Norman conqueror did no violence to those institutions. He claimed to be a lawful English king, respecting English laws. The laws, the customs, the organization of government, were, indeed, greatly modified in time; but the modification was slow, and the base of the whole political structure that rose in the Anglo-Norman kingdom remained wholly English.

Norman Influences in England.

The Normans brought with them into England a more active, enterprising, enquiring spirit than had animated the land before. They brought an increase of learning and of the appetite for knowledge. They brought a more educated taste in art, to improve the building of the country and its workmanship in general. They brought a wider acquaintance with the affairs of the outside world, and drew England into political relations with her continental neighbors, which were not happy for her in the end, but which may have contributed for a time to her development. They brought, also, a more powerful organization of the Church, which gave England trouble in later days.

The Conqueror's Sons.

When the Conqueror died (1087), his eldest son Robert succeeded him in Normandy, but he wished the crown of England to go to his son William, called Rufus, or "the Red." He could not settle the succession by his will, because in theory the succession was subject to the choice or assent of the nobles of the realm. But, in fact, William Rufus became king through mere tardiness of opposition; and when, a few months after his coronation, a formidable rebellion broke out among the Normans in England, who preferred his wayward brother Robert, it was the native English who sustained him and established him on the throne. The same thing occurred again after William Rufus died (1100). The Norman English tried again to bring in Duke Robert, while the native English preferred the younger brother, Henry, who was born among them. They won the day. Henry I., called Beauclerc, the

Scholar, was seated on the throne. Unlike William Rufus, who had no gratitude for the support the English gave him, and ruled them harshly, Henry showed favor to his English subjects, and, during his reign of thirty-five years, the two races were so effectually reconciled and drawn together that little distinction between them appears thereafter.

Henry acquired Normandy, as well as England, uniting again the two sovereignties of his father. His thriftless brother, Robert, had pledged the dukedom to William Rufus, who lent him money for a crusading expedition. Returning penniless, Robert tried to recover his heritage; but Henry claimed it and made good the claim.

Anarchy in Stephen's Reign.

At Henry's death, the succession fell into dispute. He had lost his only son. His daughter, Matilda, first married to the Emperor Henry V., had subsequently wedded Count Geoffrey of Anjou, by whom she had a son. Henry strove, during his life, to bind his nobles by oath to accept Matilda and her son as his successors. But on his death (1135) their promises were broken. They gave the crown to Stephen of Blois, whose mother was Henry's sister; whereupon there ensued the most dreadful period of civil war and anarchy that England ever knew. Stephen, at his coronation, swore to promises which he did not keep, losing many of his supporters for that reason; the Empress Matilda and her young son Henry had numerous partisans; and each side was able to destroy effectually the authority of the other. "The price of the support given to both was the same—absolute licence to build castles, to practise private war, to hang their private enemies, to plunder their neighbours, to coin their money, to exercise their petty tyrannies as they pleased." "Castles innumerable sprang up, and as fast as they were built they were filled with devils; each lord judged and taxed and coined. The feudal spirit of disintegration had for once its full play. Even party union was at an end, and every baron fought on his own behalf. Feudalism had its day, and the completeness of its triumph ensured its fall" (Stubbs).

Angevin Kings of England.

At length, in 1153, peace was made by a treaty which left Stephen in possession of the throne during his life, but made Henry, already recognized as Duke of Normandy, his heir. Stephen died the following year, and Henry II., now twenty-one years old, came quietly into his kingdom, beginning a new royal line, called the Angevin kings, because of their descent from Geoffrey of Anjou; also taking the name Plantagenets from Geoffrey's fashion of wearing a bit of broom, *Planta Genista*, in his hat.

Henry II. proved, happily, to be a king of the strong character that was needed in the England of that wretched time. He was bold and energetic, yet sagacious, prudent, politic. He loved power and he used it with an unsparing hand; but he used it with wise judgment, and England was the better for it. He struck hard and persistently at the lawlessness of feudalism, and practically ended it forever as a menace to order and unity of government in England. He destroyed hundreds of the castles which had sprung

up throughout the land in Stephen's time, to be nests of robbers and strongholds of rebellion. He humbled the turbulent barons. He did in England, for the promotion of justice, and for the enforcement of the royal authority, what Louis IX. did a little later in France: that is, he reorganized and strengthened the king's courts, creating a judicial system which, in its most essential features, has existed to the present time. His organizing hand brought system and efficiency into every department of the government. He demanded of the Church that its clergy should be subject to the common laws of the kingdom, in matters of crime, and to trial before the ordinary courts; and it was this most just reform of a crying abuse—the exemption of clerics from the jurisdiction of secular courts—which brought about the memorable collision of King Henry with Thomas Becket, the inflexible archbishop of Canterbury. Becket's tragical death made a martyr of him, and placed Henry in a penitential position which checked his great works of reform; but, on the whole, his reign was one of splendid success, and shines among the epochs that throw light on the great after-career of the English nation.

Aside from his importance as an English statesman, Henry II. figured largely, in his time, among the most powerful of the monarchs of Europe. His dominions on the continent embraced much more of the territory of modern France than was ruled directly by the contemporary French king, though nominally he held them as a vassal of the latter. Normandy came to him from his grandfather; from his father he inherited the large possessions of the House of Anjou; by his marriage with Eleanor of Aquitaine (divorced by Louis VII. of France, as mentioned already) he acquired her wide and rich domain. On the continent, therefore, he ruled Normandy, Maine, Touraine, Anjou, Guienne, Poitou and Gascony. He may be said to have added Ireland to his English kingdom, for he began the conquest. He held a great place, in his century, and historically he is a notable figure in the time.

His rebellious, undutiful son Richard, Cœur de Lion, the Crusader, the hard fighter, the knight of many rude adventures, who succeeded Henry II. in 1189, is popularly better known than he; but Richard's noisy brief career shows poorly when compared with his father's life of thoughtful statesmanship. It does not show meanly, however, like that of the younger son, John, who came to the throne in 1199. The story of John's probable murder of his young nephew, Arthur, of Brittany, and of his consequent loss of all the Angevin lands, and of Normandy (excepting only the Norman islands, the Jerseys, which have remained English to our own day) has been briefly told heretofore, when the reign of Philip Augustus of France was under review.

The whole reign of John was ignominious. He quarreled with the Pope—with the inflexible Innocent III., who humbled many kings—over a nomination to the Archbishopric of Canterbury (1205); his kingdom was put under interdict (1208); he was threatened with deposition; and when, in affright, he surrendered, it was so abjectly done that he swore fealty to the Pope, as a vassal to his suzerain, consenting to hold his kingdom as a fief of the Apostolic See.

The triumph of the Papacy in this dispute brought one great good to England. It made

Stephen Langton Archbishop of Canterbury, and thereby gave a wise and righteous leader to the opponents of the king's oppressive rule. Lords and commons, laity and clergy, were all alike sufferers from John's greed, his perfidy, his mean devices and his contempt of law. Langton rallied them to a sober, stern, united demonstration, which awed King John, and compelled him to put his seal to Magna Charta—the grand Charter of English liberties (1215). A few weeks later he tried to annul what he had done, with encouragement from the Pope, who anathematized the Charter and all who had to do with it. Then certain of the barons, in their rage, offered the English crown to the heir of France, afterwards Louis VIII.; and the French prince actually came to England (1216) with an army to secure it. But before the forces gathered on each side were brought to any decisive battle, John died. Louis' partisans then dropped away from him and the next year, after a defeat at sea, he returned to France.

Henry III. and the Barons' War.

John left a son, a lad of nine years, who grew to be a better man than himself, though not a good king, for he was weak and untruthful in character, though amiable and probably well-meaning. He held the throne for fifty-six years, during which long time, after his minority was passed, no minister of ability and honorable character could get and keep office in the royal service. He was jealous of ministers, preferring mere administrative clerks; while he was docile to favorites, and picked them for the most part from a swarm of foreign adventurers whom the nation detested. The Great Charter of his father had been reaffirmed in his name soon after he received the crown, and in 1225 he was required to issue it a third time, as the condition of a grant of money; but he would not rule honestly in compliance with its provisions, and sought continually to lay and collect heavy taxes in unlawful ways. He spent money extravagantly, and was foolish and reckless in foreign undertakings, accepting, for example, the Kingdom of Sicily, offered to his son Edmund by the Pope, whose gift could only be made good by force of arms. At the same time he was servile to the popes, whose increasing demands for money from England were rousing even the clergy to resistance. So the causes of discontent grew abundantly until they brought it to a serious head. All classes of the people were drawn together again, as they had been to resist the aggressions of John. The great councils of the kingdom, or assemblies of barons and bishops (which had taken the place of the witenagemot of the old English time, and which now began to be called Parliaments), became more and more united against the king. At last the discontent found a leader of high capacity and of heroic if not blameless character, in Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester. Simon de Montfort was of foreign birth,—son of that fanatical crusader of the same name, who spread ruin over the fair country of the Albigeois. The English earldom of Leicester had passed to his family, and the younger Simon, receiving it, came to England and became an Englishman. After some years he threw himself into the struggle with the Crown, and his leadership was soon recognized. In 1258, a parliament held at London compelled the king to consent to the appointment of an extraordinary

commission of twenty-four barons, clothed with full power to reform the government. The commission was named at a subsequent meeting of parliament, the same year, at Oxford, where the grievances to be redressed were set forth in a paper known as the Provisions of Oxford. From the twenty-four commissioners there were chosen fifteen to be the King's Council. This was really the creation of a new constitution for the kingdom, and Henry swore to observe it. But ere long he procured a bull from the Pope, absolving him from his oath, and he began to prepare for throwing off the restraints that had been put upon him. The other side took up arms, under Simon's lead; but peace was preserved for a time by referring all questions in dispute to the arbitration of Louis IX. of France. The arbiter decided against the barons (1264) and Montfort's party refused to abide by the award. Then followed the civil conflict known as the Barons' War. The king was defeated and taken prisoner, and was obliged to submit to conditions which practically transferred the administration of the government to three counsellors, of whom Simon de Montfort was the chief.

Development of the English Parliament.

In January, 1265, a memorable parliament was called together. It was the first national assembly in which the larger element of the English Commons made its appearance; for Montfort had summoned to it certain representatives of borough towns, along with the barons, the bishops and the abbots, and along, moreover, with representative knights, who had been gaining admittance of late years to what now became a convocation of the Three Estates. The parliamentary model thus roughly shaped by the great Earl of Leicester was not continuously followed until another generation came; but it is his glory, nevertheless, to have given to England the norm and principle on which its unexampled parliament was framed.

By dissensions among themselves, Simon de Montfort and his party soon lost the great advantage they had won, and on another appeal to arms they were defeated (1265) by the king's valiant and able son, afterwards King Edward I., and Montfort was slain. It was seven years after this before Edward succeeded his father, and nine before he came to the throne, because he was absent on a Crusade; but when he did, it was to prove himself, not merely one of the few statesmen-kings of England, but one large enough in mind to take lessons from the vanquished enemies of the Crown. He, in reality, took up the half-planned constitutional work of Simon de Montfort, in the development of the English Parliament as a body representative of all orders in the nation, and carried it forward to substantial completion. He did it because he had wit to see that the people he ruled could be led more easily than they could be driven, and that their free-giving of supplies to the Crown would be more open-handed than their giving under compulsion. The year 1295 "witnessed the first summons of a perfect and model parliament; the clergy represented by their bishops, deans, archdeacons, and elected proctors; the barons summoned severally in person by the king's special writ, and the commons summoned by writs addressed to the sheriffs, directing them to send up two elected knights from each shire, two elected citizens from each city, and two

cleeted burghers from each borough" (Stubbs). Two years later, the very fundamental principle of the English Constitution was established, by a Confirmation of the Charters, conceded in Edward's absence by his son, but afterwards assented to by him, which definitely renounced the right of the king to tax the nation without its consent.

Thus the reign of Edward I. was really the most important in the constitutional history of England. It was scarcely less important in the history of English jurisprudence; for Edward was in full sympathy with the spirit of an age in which the study and reform of the law were wonderfully awakened throughout Europe. The great statutes of his reign are among the monuments of Edward's statesmanship, and not the least important of them are those by which he checked the encroachments of the Church and its dangerous acquisition of wealth.

At the same time, the temper of this vigorous king was warlike and aggressive. He subdued the Welsh and annexed Wales as a principality to England. He enforced the feudal supremacy which the English kings claimed over Scotland, and, upon the Scottish throne becoming vacant, in 1290, seated John Balliol, as a vassal who did homage to him. The war of Scottish Independence then ensued, of which William Wallace and Robert Bruce were the heroes. Wallace perished on an English scaffold in 1305; Bruce, the next year, secured the Scottish crown, and eventually broke the bonds in which his country was held.

Edward I. died in 1307, and his kingly capability died with him. He transmitted neither spirit nor wisdom to his son, the second Edward, who gave himself and his kingdom up to foreign favorites, as his grandfather had done. His angry subjects practically took the government out of his hands (1310), and confided it to a body of twenty-one members, called Ordainers. His reign of twenty years was one of protracted strife and disorder; but the constitutional power of Parliament made gains. In outward appearance, however, there was nothing to redeem the wretchedness of the time. The struggle of factions was pushed to civil war; while Scotland, by the great blow struck at Bannockburn (1314), made her independence complete. In 1322, Thomas, Earl of Lancaster, whose descent was as royal as the king's, but who headed the opponents of Edward and Edward's unworthy favorites, was defeated in battle, taken prisoner, and brought to the block. This martyrdom, as it was called, embalmed Lancaster's memory in the hearts of the people.

Edward III. and his French Claims.

The queen of Edward II., Isabella of France, daughter of Philip the Fair, made, at last, common cause with his enemies. In January, 1327, he was forced to formally resign the crown, and in September of the same year he was murdered, the queen, with little doubt, assenting to the deed. His son, Edward III., who now came to the throne, founded claims to the crown of France upon the rights of his mother, whose three brothers, as we have seen, had been crowned in succession and had died, bringing the direct line of royalty in France to an end. By this claim the two countries were plunged into the miseries of the dreadful Hundred Years War, and the progress of civilization in Europe was seriously checked.

Recovery of Christian Spain.

Before entering that dark century of war, it will be necessary to go back a little in time, and carry our survey farther afield, in the countries of Europe more remote from the center of the events we have already scanned. In Spain, for example, there should be noticed, very briefly, the turning movement of the tide of Mahometan conquest which drove the Spanish Christians into the mountains of the North. In the eighth century, their little principality of Asturia had widened into the small kingdom of Leon, and the eastern county of Leon had taken the name of Castella (Castile) from the number of forts or castles with which it bristled, on the Moorish border. East of Leon, in the Pyrenees, there grew up about the same time the kingdom of Navarre, which became important in the eleventh century, under an enterprising king, Sancho the Great, who seized Castile and made a separate kingdom of it, which he bequeathed to his son. The same Navarrese king extended his dominion over a considerable part of the Spanish March, which Charlemagne had wrested from the Moors in the ninth century, and out of this territory the kingdom of Aragon was presently formed. These four kingdoms, of Leon, Navarre, Castile, and Aragon, were shuffled together and divided again, in changing combinations, many times during the next century or two; but Castile and Leon were permanently united in 1230. Meantime Portugal, wrested from the Moors, became a distinct kingdom; while Navarre was reduced in size and importance. Castile, Aragon, and Portugal are from that time the Christian Powers in the Peninsula which carried on the unending war with their Moslem neighbors. By the end of the thirteenth century they had driven the Moors into the extreme south of the peninsula, where the latter, thenceforth, held little beyond the small kingdom of Granada, which defended itself for two centuries more.

Moorish Civilization and its Decay.

The Christians were winners and the Moslems were losers in this long battle, because adversity had disciplined the one and prosperity had relaxed and vitiated the other. Success bred disunion, and the spoils of victory engendered corruption, among the followers of Mahomet, very quickly in their career. The middle of the eighth century was hardly passed when the huge empire they had conquered broke in twain, and two Caliphates on one side of the Mediterranean, imitated the two Roman Empires on the other. We have seen how the Caliphate of the East, with its seat at Bagdad, went steadily to wreck; but fresh converts of Islam, out of deserts at the North, were in readiness, there, to gather the fragments and construct a new Mahometan power. In the West, where the Caliphs held their court at Cordova, the same crumbling of their power befell them, through feuds and jealousies and the decay of a sensuous race; but there were none to rebuild it in the Prophet's name. The Moor gave way to the Castilian in Spain for reasons not differing very much from the reasons which explain the supplanting of the Arab by the Turk in the East.

While its grandeur lasted in Spain,—from the eighth to the eleventh centuries—the empire of the Saracens, or Moors, was the most splendid of its age. It developed a civilization which must

have been far finer, in the superficial showing, and in much of its spirit as well, than anything found in Christian Europe at that time. Its religious temper was less fierce and intolerant. Its intellectual disposition was towards broader thinking and freer inquiry. Its artistic feeling was truer and more instinctive. It took lessons from classic learning and philosophy before Germanized Europe had become aware of the existence of either, and it gave the lessons at second hand to its Christian neighbors. Its industries were conducted with a knowledge and a skill that could be found among no other people. Says Dr. Draper: "Europe at the present day does not offer more taste, more refinement, more elegance, than might have been seen, at the epoch of which we are speaking, in the capitals of the Spanish Arabs. Their streets were lighted and solidly paved. Their houses were frescoed and carpeted; they were warmed in winter by furnaces, and cooled in summer with perfumed air brought by underground pipes from flower beds. They had baths, and libraries, and dining halls, fountains of quicksilver and water. City and country were full of conviviality, and of dancing to lute and mandolin. Instead of the drunken and gluttonous wassail orgies of their northern neighbors, the feasts of the Saracens were marked with sobriety."

The brilliancy of the Moorish civilization seems like that of some short-lived flower, which may spring from a thin soil of no lasting fertility. The qualities which yielded it had their season of ascendancy over the deeper-lying forces that worked in the Gothic mind of Christian Spain; but time exhausted the one, while it matured the other.

Mediæval Spanish Character.

There seems to be no doubt that the long conflict of races and religions in the peninsula affected the character of the Spanish Christians more profoundly, both for good and for ill, than it affected the people with whom they strove. It hardened and energized them, preparing them for the bold adventures they were soon to pursue in a new-found world, and for a lordly career in all parts of the rounded globe. It embittered and gave fierceness to a sentiment among them which bore some likeness to religion, but which was, in reality, the partisanship of a church, and not the devotion of a faith. It tended to put bigotry in the place of piety—religious rancor in the place of charity—priests and images in the place of Christ—much more among the Spaniards than among other peoples; for they, alone, were Crusaders against the Moslem for eight hundred years.

Early Free Institutions in Spain.

The political effects of those centuries of struggle in the peninsula were also remarkable and strangely mixed. In all the earlier stages of the national development, until the close of the mediæval period, there seems to have been as promising a growth of popular institutions, in most directions, as can be found in England itself. Apparently, there was more good feeling between classes than elsewhere in Europe. Nobles, knights and commons fought side by side in so continuous a battle that they were more friendly and familiar in acquaintance with one another. Moreover, the ennobled and the knighted were greatly more numerous in Spain

than in the neighboring countries. The kings were lavish of such honors in rewarding valor, on every battlefield and after every campaign. It was impossible, therefore, for so great a distance to widen between the grandee and the peasant or the burgher as that which separated the lord and the citizen in Germany or France.

The division of Christian Spain into several petty kingdoms, and the circumstances under which they were placed, retarded the growth of monarchical power, and yet did not tend to a feudal disintegration of society; because the pressure of its perpetual war with the infidels forced the preservation of a certain degree of unity, sufficient to be a saving influence. At the same time, the Spanish cities became prosperous, and naturally, in the circumstances of the country, acquired much freedom and many privileges. The inhabitants of some cities in Aragon enjoyed the privileges of nobility as a body; the magistrates of other cities were ennobled. Both in Aragon and Castile, the towns had deputies in the Cortes before any representatives of boroughs sat in the English Parliament; and the Cortes seems to have been, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a more potent factor in government than any assembly of estates in any other part of Europe.

But something was wanting in Spain that was not wanting in England and in the Netherlands, for example, to complete the evolution of a popular government from this hopeful beginning. And the primary want, it would seem, was a political sense or faculty in the people. To illustrate this in one particular: the Castilian Commons did not grasp the strings of the national purse when they had it in their hands, as the practical Englishmen did. They allowed the election of deputies from the towns to slip out of their hands and to become an official function of the municipalities, where it was corrupted and controlled by the Crown. In Aragon, the popular rights were more efficiently maintained, perhaps; but even there the political faculty of the people must have been defective, as compared with that of the nations in the North which developed free government from less promising germs. And, yet, it is possible that the whole subsequent failure of Spain may be fully explained by the ruinous prosperity of her career in the sixteenth century,—by the fatal gold it gave her from America, and the independent power it put into the hands of her kings.

Northern and North-eastern Europe.

While the Spaniards in their southern peninsula were wrestling with the infidel Moor, their Gothic kindred of Sweden, and the other Norse nations of that opposite extremity of Europe, had been casting off paganism and emerging from the barbarism of their piratical age, very slowly. It was not until the tenth and eleventh centuries that Christianity got footing among them. It was not until the thirteenth century that unity and order, the fruits of firm government, began to be really fixed in any part of the Scandinavian peninsulas.

The same is substantially true of the greater Slavic states on the eastern side of Europe. The Poles had accepted Christianity in the tenth century, and their dukes, in the same century, had assumed the title of kings. In the twelfth century they had acquired a large dominion and

exercised great power; but the kingdom was divided, was brought into collision with the Teutonic Knights, who conquered Prussia, and it fell into a disordered state. The Russians had been Christianized in the same missionary century—the tenth; but civilization made slow progress among them, and their nation was being divided and re-divided in shifting principalities by contending families and lords. In the thirteenth century they were overwhelmed by the fearful calamity of a conquest by Mongol or Tartar hordes, and fell under the brutal domination of the successors of Genghis Khan.

Latin Conquest of Constantinople.

At Constantinople, the old Greek-Roman Empire of the East had been passing through singular changes since we noticed it last. The dread with which Alexius Comnenius saw the coming of the Crusaders in 1097 was justified by the experience of his successors, after little more than a hundred years. In 1204, a crusade, which is sometimes numbered as the fourth and sometimes as the fifth in the crusading series, was diverted by Venetian influence from the rescue of Jerusalem to the conquest of Constantinople, ostensibly in the interest of a claimant of the imperial throne. The city was taken and pillaged, and the Greek line of Emperors was supplanted by a Frank or Latin line, of which Baldwin, Count of Flanders, was the first. But this Latin Empire was reduced to a fraction of the conquered dominion, the remainder being divided among several partners in the conquest; while two Greek princes of the fallen house saved fragments of the ancient realm in Asia, and throned themselves as emperors at Trebizond and Nicæa. The Latin Empire was maintained, feebly and without dignity, a little more than half a century; and then (1261) it was extinguished by the sovereign of its Nicæan rival, Michael Palæologus, who took Constantinople by a night surprise, helped by treachery within. Thus the Greek or Byzantine Empire was restored, but much shorn of its former European possessions, and much weakened by loss of commerce and wealth. It was soon involved in a fresh struggle for life with the Turks.

The Thirteenth Century.

We have now, in our general survey of European history, just passed beyond the thirteenth century, and it will be instructive to pause here a moment and glance back over the movements and events which distinguish that remarkable age. For the thirteenth century, while it belongs chronologically to mediæval times, seems nearer in spirit to the Renaissance—shows more of the travail of the birth of our modern mind and life—than the fourteenth, and even more than the greater part of the years of the fifteenth century.

For England, it was the century in which the enduring bases of constitutional government were laid down; within which *Magna Charta* and its Confirmations were signed; within which the Parliament of Simon de Montfort and the Parliaments of Edward I. gave a representative form and a controlling power to the wonderful legislature of the English nation. In France, it was the century of the Albigenses; of Saint Louis and his judicial reforms; and it stretched within two years of the first meeting of the States-

General of the kingdom. In Switzerland, it was the century which began the union of the three forest cantons. In Spain, it was the century which gave Aragon the “General Privilege” of Peter III.; in Hungary, it was the century of its Golden Bull. In Italy it was the century of Frederick II.,—the man of modern spirit set in mediæval circumstances; and it was the century, too, which moulded the city-republics that resisted and defeated his despotic pretensions. Everywhere, it was an age of impulses toward freedom, and of mighty upward strivings out of the chaos and darkness of the feudal state.

It was an age of vast energies, directed with practical judgment and power. It organized the great league of the Hansa Towns, which surpassed, as an enterprise of combination in commercial affairs, the most stupendous undertakings of the present time. It put the weavers and traders of Flanders on a footing with knights and princes. In Venice and Genoa it crowned the merchant like a king. It sent Marco Polo to Cathay, and inoculated men with the itch of exploration from which they find no ease to this day.

It was the century which saw painting revived as a living art in the world by Cimabue and Giotto, and sculpture restored by Nicola Pisano. It was the age of great church-building in Italy, in Germany and in France. It was the century of St. Francis of Assisi, and of the creation of the mendicant orders in the Church,—a true religious reformation in its spirit, however unhappy in effect it may have been. It was the time of the high tide of mediæval learning; the epoch of Aquinas, of Duns Scotus, of Roger Bacon; the true birth-time of the Universities of Paris and Oxford. It was the century which educated Dante for his immortal work.

The Fourteenth Century.

The century which followed was a period of many wars—of ruinous and deadly wars, and miserable demoralizations and disorders, which depressed all Europe by their effects. In the front of them all was the wicked Hundred Years War, forced on France by the ambition of an English king to wear two crowns; while with it came the bloody insurrection of the *Jacquerie*, the ravages of the free companies, and ruinous anarchy everywhere. Then, in Italy, there was a duel to the death between Venice and Genoa; and a long, wasting contest of rivals for the possession of Naples. In Germany, a contested imperial election, and the struggle of the Swiss against the Austrian Dukes. In Flanders, repeated revolts under the two *Artevelde*s. In the East, the terrible fight of Christendom with the advancing Turk. And while men were everywhere so busily slaying one another, there came the great pestilence which they called the Black Death, to help them in the grim work, and Europe was half depopulated by it. At the same time, the Church, which might have kindled some beacon lights of faith and hope in the midst of all this darkness and terror, was sinking to its lowest state, and Rome had become an unruled robbers’ den.

There were a few voices heard, above the wailing and the battle-din of the afflicted age, which charmed and comforted it; voices which preached the pure gospel of Wycliffe and Huss,—which recited the great epic of Dante,—which syllabled the melodious verse of Petrarch and Chaucer,—

which told the gay tales of Boccaccio; but the pauses of peace in which men might listen to such messages and give themselves to such delights were neither many nor long.

The Hundred Years War.

The conflict between England and France began in Flanders, then connected with the English very closely in trade. Philip VI. of France forced the Count of Flanders to expel English merchants from his territory. Edward III. retaliated (1336) by forbidding the exportation of wool to Flanders, and this speedily reduced the Flemish weavers to idleness. They rose in revolt, drove out their count, and formed an alliance with England, under the lead of Jacob van Arteveld, a brewer, of Ghent. The next year (1337) Edward joined the Flemings with an army and entered France; but made no successful advance, although his fleet won a victory, in a sea-fight off Sluys, and hostilities were soon suspended by a truce. In 1341 they were renewed in Brittany, over a disputed succession to the dukedom, and the scattered sieges and chivalric combats which made up the war in that region for two years are described with minuteness by Froissart, the gossip chronicler of the time. After a second truce, the grimly serious stage of the war was reached in 1346. It was in that year that the English won the victory at Crécy, which was the pride and boast of their nation for centuries; and the next season they took Calais, which they held for more than two hundred years.

Philip died in 1350 and was succeeded by his son John. In 1355, Edward of England repeated his invasion, ravaging Artois, while his son, the Black Prince, from Guienne (which the English had held since the Angevin time), devastated Languedoc. The next year, this last named prince made another sally from Bordeaux, northwards, towards the Loire, and was encountered by the French king, with a splendid army, at Poitiers. The victory of the English in this case was more overwhelming than at Crécy, although they were greatly outnumbered. King John was taken prisoner and conveyed to London. His kingdom was in confusion. The dauphin called together the States-General of France, and that body, in which the commons, or third estate, attained to a majority in numbers, assumed powers and compelled assent to reforms which seemed likely to place it on a footing of equal importance with the Parliament of England. The leader of the third estate in these measures was Etienne or Stephen Marcel, provost of Paris, a man of commanding energy and courage. The dauphin, under orders from his captive father, attempted to nullify the ordinances of the States-General. Paris rose at the call of Marcel and the frightened prince became submissive; but the nobles of the provinces resented these high-handed proceedings of the Parisians and civil war ensued. The peasants, who were in great misery, took advantage of the situation to rise in support of the Paris burgesses, and for the redressing of their own wrongs. This insurrection of the Jacquerie, as it is known, produced horrible deeds of outrage and massacre on both sides, and seems to have had no other result. Paris, meantime (1358), was besieged and hard pressed; Marcel, suspected of an intended treachery, was killed, and with his death the whole attempt to assert popular rights fell to the ground.

The state of France at this time was one of measureless misery. It was overrun with freebooters—discharged soldiers, desperate homeless and idle men, and the ruffians who always bestir themselves when authority disappears. They roamed the country in bands, large and small, stripped it of what war had spared, and left famine behind them.

At length, in 1360, terms of peace were agreed upon, in a treaty signed at Bretigny, and fighting ceased, except in Brittany, where the war went on for four years more. By the treaty, all French claims upon Aquitaine and the dependencies were given up, and Edward acquired full sovereignty there, no longer owing homage, as a vassal, to the king of France. Calais, too, was ceded to England, and so heavy a ransom was exacted from the captive King John that he failed to collect money for the payment of it and died in London (1364).

Charles the Wise.

Charles V., who now ruled independently, as he had ruled for some years in his father's name, proved to be a more prudent and capable prince, and his counsellors and captains were wisely chosen. He was a man of studious tastes and of considerable learning for that age, with intelligence to see and understand the greater sources of evil in his kingdom. Above all, he had patience enough to plant better things in the seed and wait for them to grow, which is one of the grander secrets of statesmanship. By careful, judicious measures, he and those who shared the task of government with him slowly improved the discipline and condition of their armies. The "great companies" of freebooters, too strong to be put down, were lured out of the kingdom by an expedition into Spain, which the famous warrior Du Guesclin commanded, and which was sent against the detestable Pedro, called the Cruel, of Castile, whom the English supported. A stringent economy in public expenditure was introduced, and the management of the finances was improved. The towns were encouraged to strengthen their fortifications, and the state and feeling of the whole country were slowly lifted from the gloomy depth to which the war had depressed them.

At length, in 1369, Charles felt prepared to challenge another encounter with the English, by repudiating the ignominious terms of the treaty of Bretigny. Before the year closed, Edward's armies were in the country again, but accomplished nothing beyond the havoc which they wrought as they marched. The French avoided battles, and their cities were well defended. Next year the English returned, and the Black Prince earned infamy by a ferocious massacre of three thousand men, women, and children, in the city of Limoges, when he had taken it by storm. It was his last campaign. Already suffering from a mortal disease, he returned to England, and died a few years later. The war went on, with no decisive results, until 1375, when it was suspended by a truce. In 1377, Edward III. died, and the French king began war again with great success. Within three years he expelled the English from every part of France except Bayonne, Bordeaux, Brest, Cherbourg and Calais.

If he had lived a little longer, there might soon have been an end of the war. But he died in

1380, and fresh calamities fell upon unhappy France.

Rising Power of Burgundy.

The son who succeeded him, Charles VI., was an epileptic boy of twelve years, who had three greedy and selfish uncles to quarrel over the control of him, and to plunder the Crown of territory and treasures. One of these was the Duke of Burgundy, the first prince of a new great house which King John had foolishly created. Just before that fatuous king died, the old line of Burgundian dukes came to an end, and he had the opportunity, which wise kings before him would have improved very eagerly, to annex that fief to the crown. Instead of doing so, he gave it as an appanage to his son Philip, called "the Bold," and thus rooted a new plant of feudalism in France which was destined to cause much trouble. Another of the uncles was Louis, Duke of Anjou, heir to the crown of Naples under a will of the lately murdered Queen Joanna, and who was preparing for an expedition to enforce his claim. The third was Duke of Berry, upon whom his father, King John, had conferred another great appanage, including Berry, Poitou and Auvergne.

The pillage and misgovernment of the realm under these rapacious guardians of the young king was so great that desperate risings were provoked, the most formidable of which broke out in Paris. They were all suppressed, and with merciless severity. At the same time, the Flemings, who had again submitted to their count, revolted once more, under the lead of Philip van Arteveld, son of their former leader. The French moved an army to the assistance of the Count of Flanders, and the sturdy men of Ghent, who confronted it almost alone, suffered a crushing defeat at Roosebeke (1382). Philip van Arteveld fell in the battle, with twenty-six thousand of his men. Two years later, the Count of Flanders died, and the Duke of Burgundy, who had married his daughter, acquired that rich and noble possession. This beginning of the union of Burgundy and the Netherlands, creating a power by the side of the throne of France which threatened to overshadow it, and having for its ultimate consequence the casting of the wealth of the Low Countries into the lap of the House of Austria and into the coffers of Spain, is an event of large importance in European history.

Burgundians and Armagnacs.

When Charles VI. came of age, he took the government into his own hands, and for some years it was administered by capable men. But in 1392 the king's mind gave way, and his uncles regained control of affairs. Philip of Burgundy maintained the ascendancy until his death, in 1404. Then the controlling influence passed to the king's brother, the Duke of Orleans, between whom and the new Duke of Burgundy, John, called the Fearless, a bitter feud arose. John, who was unscrupulous, employed assassins to waylay and murder the Duke of Orleans, which they did in November, 1407. This foul deed gave rise to two parties in France. Those who sought vengeance ranged themselves under the leadership of the Count of Armagnac, and were called by his name. The Burgundians, who sustained Duke John, were in the main a party of the people; for the Duke had cultivated pop-

ularity, especially in Paris, by advocating liberal measures and extending the rights and privileges of the citizens.

The kingdom was kept in turmoil and terror for years by the war of these factions, especially in and about Paris, where the guild of the butchers took a prominent part in affairs, on the Burgundian side, arming a riotous body of men who were called Cabochiens, from their leader's name. In 1413 the Armagnacs succeeded in recovering possession of the capital and the Cabochiens were suppressed.

Second Stage of the Hundred Years War.

Meantime, Henry V. of England, the ambitious young Lancastrian king who came to the throne of that country in 1413, saw a favorable opportunity, in the distracted state of France, to reopen the questions left unsettled by the breaking of the treaty of Bretigny. He invaded France in 1415, as the rightful king coming to dethrone a usurper, and began by taking Harfleur at the mouth of the Seine, after a siege which cost him so heavily that he found it prudent to retreat towards Calais. The French intercepted him at Agincourt and forced him to give them battle. He had only twenty thousand men, but they formed a well disciplined and well ordered army. The French had gathered eighty thousand men, but they were a feudal mob. The battle ended, like those of Crécy and Poitiers, in the routing and slaughter of the French, with small loss to Henry's force. His army remained too weak in numbers, however, for operations in a hostile country, and the English king returned home, with a great train of captive princes and lords.

He left the Armagnacs and Burgundians still fighting one another, and disabling France as effectually as he could do if he stayed to ravage the land. In 1417 he came back and began to attack the strong cities of Normandy, one by one, taking Caen first. In the next year, by a horrible massacre, the Burgundian mob in Paris overcame the Armagnacs there, and reinstated Duke John of Burgundy in possession of the capital. The latter was already in negotiation with the English king, and evidently prepared to sacrifice the kingdom for whatever might seem advantageous to himself. But in 1419 Henry V. took Rouen, and, when all of Normandy submitted with its capital, he demanded nothing less than that great province, with Brittany, Guienne, Maine, Anjou and Touraine in addition, — or, substantially, the western half of France.

Burgundian and English Alliance.

Parleys were brought to an end in September of that year by the treacherous murder of Duke John. The Armagnacs slew him foully, at an interview to which he had been enticed, on the bridge of Montereau. His son, Duke Philip of Burgundy, now reopened negotiations with the invader, in conjunction with Queen Isabella (wife of the demented king), who had played an evil part in all the factious troubles of the time. These two, having control of the king's person, concluded a treaty with Henry V. at Troyes, according to the terms of which Henry should marry the king's daughter Catherine; should be administrator of the kingdom of France while Charles VI. lived, and should receive the crown

when the latter died. The marriage took place at once, and almost the whole of France north of the Loire seemed submissive to the arrangement. The States-General and the Parliament of Paris gave official recognition to it; the disinherited dauphin of France, whose own mother had signed away his regal heritage, retired, with his Armagnac supporters, to the country south of the Loire, and had little apparent prospect of holding even that.

Two Kings in France.

But a mortal malady had already stricken King Henry V., and he died in August, 1422. The unfortunate, rarely conscious French king, whose crown Henry had waited for, died seven weeks later. Each left an heir who was proclaimed king of France. The English pretender (Henry VI. in England, Henry II. in France) was an innocent infant, ten months old; but his court was in Paris, his accession was proclaimed with due ceremony at St. Denis, his sovereignty was recognized by the Parliament and the University of that city, and the half of France appeared resigned to the lapse of nationality which its acceptance of him signified. The true heir of the royal house of France (Charles VII.) was a young man of nearly mature age and of fairly promising character; but he was proclaimed in a little town of Berry, by a small following of lords and knights, and the nation for which he stood hardly seemed to exist.

The English supporters of the English king of France were too arrogant and overbearing to retain very long the good will of their allies among the French people. Something like a national feeling in northern France was aroused by the hostility they provoked, and the strength of the position in which Henry V. left them was steadily but slowly lost. Charles proved incapable, however, of using any advantages which opened to him, or of giving his better counsellors an opportunity to serve him with good effect, and no important change took place in the situation of affairs until the English laid siege, in 1428, to the city of Orleans, which was the stronghold of the French cause.

Jeanne d'Arc, the Maid of Orleans.

Then occurred one of the most extraordinary episodes in history: the appearance of the young peasant girl of Lorraine, Jeanne d'Arc, whose coming upon the scene of war was like the descent of an angel out of Heaven, sent with a Divine commission to rescue France. Belief in the inspiration of this simple maiden, who had faith in her own visions and voices, was easier for that age than belief in a rational rally of public energies, and it worked like a miracle on the spirit of the nation. But it could not have done so with effect if the untaught country girl of Domremy had not been endowed in a wonderful way, with a wise mind, as well as with an imaginative one, and with courage as well as with faith. When the belief in her inspired mission gave her power to lead the foolish king, and authority to command his disorderly troops, she acted almost invariably with understanding, with good sense, with a clear, unclouded judgment, with straightforward singleness of purpose, and with absolute personal fearlessness. She saw the necessity for saving Orleans; and when that had been done under her own captaincy (1429),

she saw how greatly King Charles would gain in prestige if he made his way to Rheims, and received, like his predecessors, a solemn coronation and consecration in the cathedral of that city. It was by force of her gentle obstinacy of determination that this was done, and the effect vindicated the sagacity of the Maid. Then she looked upon her mission as accomplished, and would have gone quietly home to her village; for she seems to have remained as simple in feeling as when she left her father's house, and was innocent to the end of any selfish pleasure in the fame she had won and the importance she had acquired. But those she had helped would not let her go; and yet they would not be guided by her without wrangle and resistance. She wished to move the army straight from Rheims to Paris, and enter that city before it had time to recover from the consternation it was in. But other counsellors retarded the march, by stopping to capture small towns on the way, until the opportunity for taking Paris was lost. The king, who had been braced up to a little energy by her influence, sank back into his indolent pleasures, and faction and frivolity possessed the court again. Jeanne strove with high courage against malignant opposition and many disheartenments, in the siege of Paris and after, exposing herself in battle with the bravery of a seasoned warrior; and her reward was to find herself abandoned at last, in a cowardly way, to the enemy, when she had led a sortie from the town of Compiègne, to drive back the Duke of Burgundy, who was besieging it. Taken prisoner, she was given up to the Duke, and sold by him to the English at Rouen.

That the Maid acted with supernatural powers was believed by the English as firmly as by the French; but those powers, in their belief, came, not from Heaven, but from Hell. In their view she was not a saint, but a sorceress. They paid a high price to the Duke of Burgundy for his captive, in order to put her on trial for the witchcraft which they held she had practised against them, and to destroy her mischievous power. No consideration for her sex, or her youth, or for the beauty and purity of character that is revealed in all the accounts of her trial, moved her judges to compassion. They condemned her remorselessly to the stake, and she was burned on the 31st of May, 1431, with no effort put forth on the part of the French or their ungrateful king to save her from that horrible fate.

End of the Hundred Years War.

After this, things went badly with the English, though some years passed before Charles VII. was roused again to any display of capable powers. At last, in 1435, a general conference of all parties in the war was brought about at Arras. The English were offered Normandy and Aquitaine in full sovereignty, but they refused it, and withdrew from the conference when greater concessions were denied to them. The Duke of Burgundy then made terms with King Charles, abandoning the English alliance, and obtaining satisfaction for the murder of his father. Charles was now able, for the first time in his reign, to enter the capital of his kingdom (May, 1436), and it is said that he found it so wasted by a pestilence and so ruined and deserted, that wolves came into the city, and that forty persons were devoured by them in a single week, some two years later.

Charles now began to show better qualities than had appeared in his character before. He adopted strong measures to suppress the bands of marauders who harassed and wasted the country, and to bring all armed forces in the kingdom under the control and command of the Crown. He began the creation of a disciplined and regulated militia in France. He called into his service the greatest French merchant of the day, Jacques Cœur, who successfully reorganized the finances of the state, and whose reward, after a few years, was to be prosecuted and plundered by malignant courtiers, while the king looked passively on, as he had looked on at the trial and execution of Jeanne d'Arc.

In 1449, a fresh attack upon the English in Normandy was begun; and as civil war—the War of the Roses—was then at the point of outbreak in England, they could make no effective resistance. Within a year, the whole of Normandy had become obedient again to the rule of the king of France. In two years more Guienne had been recovered, and when, in October, 1453, the French king entered Bordeaux, the English had been finally expelled from every foot of the realm except Calais and its near neighborhood. The Hundred Years War was at an end.

England under Edward III.

The century of the Hundred Years War had been, in England, one of few conspicuous events; and when the romantic tale of that war—the last sanguinary romance of expiring Chivalry—is taken out of the English annals of the time, there is not much left that looks interesting on the surface of things. Below the surface there are movements of no little importance to be found.

When Edward III. put forward his claim to the crown of France, and prepared to make it good by force of arms, the English nation had absolutely no interest of its own in the enterprise, from which it could derive no possible advantage, but which did, on the contrary, promise harm to it, very plainly, whatever might be the result. If the king succeeded, his English realm would become a mere minor appendage to a far more imposing continental dominion, and he and his successors might easily acquire a power independent and absolute, over their subjects. If he failed, the humiliation of failure would wound the pride and the prestige of the nation, while its resources would have been drained for naught. But these rational considerations did not suffice to breed any discoverable opposition to King Edward's ambitious undertaking. The Parliament gave sanction to it; most probably the people at large approved, with exultant expectations of national glory; and when Crécy and Poitiers, with victories over the hostile Scots, filled the measure of England's glory to overflowing, they were intoxicated by it, and had little thought then of the cost or the consequences.

But long before Edward's reign came to an end, the splendid pageantries of the war had passed out of sight, and a new generation was looking at, and was suffering from, the miseries and mortifications that came in its train. The attempt to conquer France had failed; the fruits of the victories of Crécy and Poitiers had been lost; even Guienne, which had been English ground since the days of Henry II., was mostly given up. And England was weak from the drain of money and men which the war had caused. The awful

plague of the 14th century, the Black Death, had smitten her people hard and left diminished numbers to bear the burden. There had been famine in the land, and grievous distress, and much sorrow.

But the calamities of this bitter time wrought beneficent effects, which no man then living is likely to have clearly understood. By plague, famine and battle, labor was made scarce, wages were raised, the half-enslaved laborer was speedily emancipated, despite the efforts of Parliament to keep him in bonds, and land-owners were forced to let their lands to tenant-farmers, who strengthened the English middle-class. By the demands of the war for money and men, the king was held more in dependence on Parliament than he might otherwise have been, and the plant of constitutional government, which began its growth in the previous century, took deeper root.

In the last years of his life Edward III. lost all of his vigor, and fell under the influence of a woman, Alice Perrers, who wronged and scandalized the nation. The king's eldest son, the Black Prince, was slowly dying of an incurable disease, and took little part in affairs; when he interfered, it seems to have been with some leanings to the popular side. The next in age of the living sons of Edward was a turbulent, proud, self-seeking prince, who gave England much trouble and was hated profoundly. This was John, Duke of Lancaster, called John of Gaunt, or Ghent, because of his birth in that city.

England under Richard II.

The Black Prince, dying in 1376, left a young son, Richard, then ten years old, who was immediately recognized as the heir to the throne, and who succeeded to it in the following year, when Edward III. died. The Duke of Lancaster had been suspected of a design to set Richard aside and claim the crown for himself. But he did not venture the attempt; nor was he able to secure even the regency of the kingdom during the young king's minority. The distrust of him was so general that Parliament and the lords preferred to invest Richard with full sovereignty even in his boyhood. But John of Gaunt, notwithstanding these endeavors to exclude him from any place of authority, contrived to attain a substantial mastery of the government, managing the war in France and the expenditure of public moneys in his own way, and managing them very badly. At least, he was held chiefly responsible for what was bad, and his name was heard oftenest in the mutterings of popular discontent. The peasants were now growing very impatient of the last fetters of villeinage which they wore, and very conscious of their right to complete freedom. Those feelings were strongly stirred in them by a heavy poll-tax which Parliament levied in 1381. The consequence was an outbreak of insurrection, led by one Wat the Tyler, which became formidable and dangerous. The insurgents began by making everybody they encountered swear to be true to King Richard, and to submit to no king named John, meaning John of Gaunt. They increased in numbers and boldness until they entered and took possession of the city of London, where they beheaded the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other obnoxious persons; but permitted no thieving to be done. The day after this occurred,

Wat Tyler met the young king at Smithfield, for a conference, and was suddenly killed by one of those who attended the king. The excuse made for the deed was some word of insolence on the part of the insurgent leader; but there is every appearance of a foul act of treachery in the affair. Richard on this occasion behaved boldly and with much presence of mind, acquiring by his courage and readiness a command over the angry rebels, which resulted in their dispersion.

The Wat Tyler rebellion appears to have manifested a more radically democratic state of thinking and feeling among the common people than existed again in England before the seventeenth century. John Ball, a priest, and others who were associated with Wat Tyler in the leadership, preached doctrines of social equality that would nearly have satisfied a Jacobin of the French Revolution.

This temper of political radicalism had no apparent connection with the remarkable religious feeling of the time, which the great reformer, Wyclif, had aroused; yet the two movements of the English mind were undoubtedly started by one and the same revolutionary shock, which it took from the grave alarms and anxieties of the age, and for which it had been prepared by the awakening of the previous century. Wyclif was the first English Puritan, and more of the spirit of the reformation of religion which he sought, than the spirit of Luther's reformation, went into the Protestantism that ultimately took form in England. The movement he stirred was a more wonderful anticipation of the religious revolt of the sixteenth century than any other which occurred in Europe; for that of Huss in Bohemia took its impulse from Wyclif and the English Lollards, as Wyclif's followers were called.

Richard was a weak but wilful king, and the kingdom was kept in trouble by his fitful attempts at independence and arbitrary rule. He made enemies of most of the great lords, and lost the good will and confidence of Parliament. He did what was looked upon as a great wrong to Henry of Bolingbroke, son of John of Gaunt, by banishing both him and the Duke of Norfolk from the kingdom, when he should have judged between them; and he made the wrong greater by seizing the lands of the Lancastrian house when John of Gaunt died. This caused his ruin. Henry of Bolingbroke, now Duke of Lancaster, came back to England (1399), encouraged by the discontent in the kingdom, and was immediately joined by so many adherents that Richard could offer little resistance. He was deposed by act of Parliament, and the Duke of Lancaster (a grandson of Edward III., as Richard was), was elected to the throne, which he ascended as Henry IV. By judgment of King and Parliament, Richard was presently condemned to imprisonment for life in Pomfret Castle; and, early in the following year, after a conspiracy in his favor had been discovered, he died mysteriously in his prison.

England Under Henry IV.

The reign of Henry IV., which lasted a little more than thirteen years, was troubled by risings and conspiracies, all originating among the nobles, out of causes purely personal or factious, and having no real political significance. But no events in English history are more commonly familiar, or seem to be invested with a higher

importance, than the rebellions of Owen Glendower and the Percys,—Northumberland and Harry Hotspur,—simply because Shakespeare has laid his magic upon what otherwise would be a story of little note. Wars with the always hostile Scots supplied other stirring incidents to the record of the time; but these came to a summary end in 1405, when the crown prince, James, of Scotland, voyaging to France, was driven by foul winds to the English coast and taken prisoner. The prince's father, King Robert, died on hearing the news, and James, the captive, was now entitled to be king. But the English held him for eighteen years, treating him as a guest at their court, rather than as a prisoner, and educating him with care, but withholding him from his kingdom.

To strengthen his precarious seat upon the throne, Henry cultivated the friendship of the Church, and seems to have found this course expedient, even at considerable cost to his popularity. For the attitude of the commons towards the Church during his reign was anything but friendly. They went so far as to pass a bill for the confiscation of Church property, which the Lords rejected; and they seem to have repented of an Act passed early in his reign, under which a cruel persecution of the Lollards was begun. The clergy and the Lords, with the favor of the king, maintained the barbarous law, and England for the first time saw men burned at the stake for heresy.

England Under Henry V. and Henry VI.

Henry IV. died in 1413, and was succeeded by his spirited and able, but too ambitious son, Henry V., the Prince Hal of Shakespeare, who gave up riotous living when called to the grave duties of government and showed himself to be a man of no common mould. The war in France, which he renewed, and the chief events of which have been sketched already, filled up most of his brief reign of nine years. His early death (1422) left two crowns to an infant nine months old. The English crown was not disputed. The French crown, though practically won by conquest, was not permanently secured, but was still to be fought for; and in the end, as we have seen, it was lost. No more need be said of the incidents of the war which had that result.

The infant king was represented in France by his elder uncle, the Duke of Bedford. In England, the government was carried on for him during his minority by a council, in which his younger uncle, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, occupied the chief place, but with powers that were jealously restricted. While the war in France lasted, or during most of the thirty-one years through which it was protracted after Henry V.'s death, it engrossed the English mind and overshadowed domestic interests, so that the time has a meagre history.

Soon after he came of age, Henry VI. married (1444) Margaret of Anjou, daughter of René, Duke of Anjou, who claimed to be King of Naples and Jerusalem. The marriage, which aimed at peace with France, and which had been brought about by the cession to that country of Maine and Anjou, was unpopular in England. Discontent with the feeble management of the war, and with the general weakness and incapability of the government, grew apace, and showed itself, among other exhibitions, in a

rebellion (1450) known as Jack Cade's, from the name of an Irishman who got the lead of it. Jack Cade and his followers took possession of London and held it for three days, only yielding at last to an offer of general pardon, after they had beheaded Lord Say, the most obnoxious adviser of the king. A previous mob had taken the head of the Earl of Suffolk, who was detested still more as the contriver of the king's marriage and of the humiliating policy in France.

The Wars of the Roses.

At length, the Duke of York, representing an elder line of royal descent from Edward III., took the lead of the discontented in the nation, and civil war was imminent in 1452; but pacific counsels prevailed for the moment. The king, who had always been weak-minded, and entirely under the influence of the queen, now sank for a time into a state of complete stupor, and was incapable of any act. The Lords in Parliament thereupon appointed the Duke of York Protector of England, and the government was vigorously conducted by him for a few months, until the king recovered. The queen, and the councillors she favored, now regained their control of affairs, and the opposition took arms.

The long series of fierce struggles between these two parties, which is commonly called the Wars of the Roses, began on the 22d of May, 1455, with a battle at St. Albans—the first of two that were fought on the same ground. At the beginning, it was a contest for the possession of the unfortunate, irresponsible king, and of the royal authority which resided nominally in his person. But it became, ere long, a contest for the crown which Henry wore, and to which the Duke of York denied his right. The Duke traced his ancestry to one son of Edward III., and King Henry to another son. But the Duke's forefather, Lionel, was prior in birth to the King's forefather, John of Gaunt, and, as an original proposition, the House of York was clearly nearer than the House of Lancaster to the royal line which had been interrupted when Richard II. was deposed. The rights of the latter House were such as it had gained prescriptively by half a century of possession.

At one time it was decided by the Lords that Henry should be king until he died, and that the Duke of York and his heirs should succeed him. But Queen Margaret would not yield the rights of her son, and renewed the war. The Duke of York was killed in the next battle fought. His son, Edward, continued the contest, and early in 1461, having taken possession of London, he was declared king by a council of Lords, which formally deposed Henry. The Lancastrians were driven from the kingdom, and Edward held the government with little disturbance for eight years. Then a rupture occurred between him and his most powerful supporter, the Earl of Warwick. Warwick put himself at the head of a rebellion which failed in the first instance, but which finally, when Warwick had joined forces with Queen Margaret, drove Edward to flight. The latter took refuge in the Netherlands (1470), where he received protection and assistance from the Duke of Burgundy, who was his brother-in-law. Henry VI. was now restored to the throne; but for no longer a time than six months. At the end of that period Edward landed again in England, with a small force, professing that he

came only to demand his dukedom. As soon as he found himself well received and strongly supported, he threw off the mask, resumed the title of king, and advanced to London, where the citizens gave him welcome. A few days later (April 14, 1471) he went out to meet Warwick and defeated and slew him in the fierce battle of Barnet. One more fight at Tewkesbury, where Queen Margaret was taken prisoner, ended the war. King Henry died, suspiciously, in the Tower, on the very night of his victorious rival's return to London, and Edward IV. had all his enemies under his feet.

England under the House of York.

For a few years England enjoyed peace within her borders, and the material effects of the protracted civil wars were rapidly effaced. Indeed, the greater part of England appears to have been lightly touched by those effects. The people at large had taken little part in the conflict, and had been less disturbed by it, in their industries and in their commerce, than might have been expected. It had been a strife among the great families, enlisting the gentry to a large extent, no doubt, but not the middle class. Hence its chief consequence had been the thinning and weakening of the aristocratic order, which relatively enhanced the political importance of the commons. But the commons were not yet trained to act independently in political affairs. Their rise in power had been through joint action of lords and commons against the Crown, with the former in the lead; they were accustomed to depend on aristocratic guidance, and to lean on aristocratic support. For this reason, they were not only unprepared to take advantage of the great opportunity which now opened to them, for decisively grasping the control of government, but they were unfitted to hold what they had previously won, without the help of the class above them. As a consequence, it was the king who profited by the decimation and impoverishment of the nobles, grasping not only the power which they lost, but the power which the commons lacked skill to use. For a century and a half following the Wars of the Roses, the English monarchy approached more nearly to absolutism than at any other period before or after.

The unsparing confiscations by which Edward IV. and his triumphant party crushed their opponents enriched the Crown for a time and made it independent of parliamentary subsidies. When supply from that source began to fall short, the king invented another. He demeaned himself so far as to solicit gifts from the wealthy merchants of the kingdom, to which he gave the name of "benevolences," and he practiced this system of royal beggary so persistently and effectually that he had no need to call Parliament together. He thus began, in a manner hardly perceived or resisted, the arbitrary and unconstitutional mode of government which his successors carried further, until the nation roused itself and took back its stolen liberties with vengeance and wrath.

Richard III. and the first of the Tudors.

Edward IV. died in 1483, leaving two young sons, the elder not yet thirteen. Edward's brother, Richard, contrived with amazing ability and unscrupulousness to acquire control of the government, first as Protector, and presently as

King. The young princes, confined in the Tower, were murdered there, and Richard III. might have seemed to be secure on his wickedly won throne; for he did not lack popularity, notwithstanding his crimes. But an avenger soon came, in the person of Henry, Earl of Richmond, who claimed the Crown. Henry's claim was not a strong one. Through his mother, he traced his lineage to John of Gaunt, as the Lancastrians had done; but it was the mistress and not the wife of that prince who bore Henry's ancestor. His grandfather was a Welsh chieftain, Sir Owen Tudor, who won the heart of the widowed queen of Henry V., Catherine of France, and married her. But the claim of Henry of Richmond, if a weak one genealogically, sufficed for the overthrow of the red-handed usurper, Richard. Henry, who had been in exile, landed in England in August, 1485, and was quickly joined by large numbers of supporters. Richard hastened to attack them, and was defeated and slain on Bosworth Field. With no more opposition, Henry won the kingdom, and founded, as Henry VII., the Tudor dynasty which held the throne until the death of Elizabeth.

Under that dynasty, the history of England took on a new character, disclosing new tendencies, new impulses, new currents of influence, new promises of the future. We will not enter upon it until we have looked at some prior events in other regions.

Germany.

If we return now to Germany, we take up the thread of events at an interesting point. We parted from the affairs of that troubled country while two rival Emperors, Louis IV., or Ludwig, of Bavaria, and Frederick of Austria, were endeavoring (1325) to settle their dispute in a friendly way, by sharing the throne together. Before noting the result of that chivalric and remarkable compromise, let us glance backward for a moment at the most memorable and important incident of the civil war which led to it.

Birth of the Swiss Confederacy.

The three cantons of Switzerland which are known distinctively as the Forest Cantons, namely, Schwytz (which gave its name in time to the whole country), Uri, and Unterwalden, had stood in peculiar relations to the Hapsburg family since long before Rudolph became Emperor and his house became the House of Austria. In those cantons, the territorial rights were held mostly by great monasteries, and the counts of Hapsburg for generations past had served the abbots and abbesses in the capacity of advocates, or champions, to rule their vassals for them and to defend their rights. Authority of their own in the cantons they had none. At the same time, the functions they performed so continually developed ideas in their minds, without doubt, which grew naturally into pretensions that were offensive to the bold mountaineers. On the other hand, the circumstances of the situation were calculated to breed notions and feelings of independence among the men of the mountains. They gave their allegiance to the Emperor—to the high sovereign who ruled over all, in the name of Rome—and they opposed what came between them and him. It is manifest that a threatening complication for them arose when the Count of Hapsburg became Emperor, which

occurred in 1273. They had no serious difficulty with Rudolph, in his time; but they wisely prepared themselves for what might come, by forming, or by renewing, in 1291, a league of the three cantons,—the beginning and nucleus of the Swiss Confederation, which has maintained its independence and its freedom from that day to this. The league of 1291 had existed something more than twenty years when the confederated cantons were first called upon to stand together in resistance to the Austrian pretensions. This occurred in 1315, during the war between Louis and Frederick, when Leopold, Duke of Austria, invaded the Forest Cantons and was disastrously beaten in a fight at the pass of Morgarten. The victory of the confederates and the independence secured by it gave them so much prestige that neighboring cities and cantons sought admission to their league. In 1332 Luzern was received as a member; in 1351, 1352, and 1353, Zurich, Glarus, Zug, and Bern came in, increasing the membership to eight. It took the name of the Old League of High Germany, and its members were known as Eidgenossen, or Confederates.

Such, in brief, are the ascertained facts of the origin of the Swiss Confederacy. There is nothing found in authentic history to substantiate the popular legend of William Tell.

The questions between the league and the Austrian princes, which continued to be troublesome for two generations, were practically ended by the two battles of Sempach and Naefels, fought in 1386 and 1388, in both of which the Austrians were overthrown.

The Emperor Louis IV. and the Papacy.

While the Swiss were gaining the freedom which they never lost, Germany at large was making little progress in any satisfactory direction. Peace had not been restored by the friendly agreement of 1325 between Ludwig and Frederick. The partisans of neither were contented with it. Frederick was broken in health and soon retired from the government; in 1330 he died. The Austrian house persisted in hostility to Louis; but his more formidable enemies were the Pope and the King of France. The period was that known in papal history as "the Babylonish Captivity," when the popes resided at Avignon and were generally creatures of the French court and subservient to its ambitions or its animosities. Philip of Valois, who now reigned in France, aspired to the imperial crown, which the head of the Church had conferred on the German kings, and which the same supreme pontiff might claim authority to transfer to the sovereigns of France. This is supposed to have been the secret of the relentless hostility with which Louis was pursued by the Papacy—himself excommunicated, his kingdom placed under interdict, and every effort made to bring about his deposition by the princes of Germany. But divided and depressed as the Germans were, they revolted against these malevolent pretensions of the popes, and in 1338 the electoral princes issued a bold declaration, asserting the sufficiency of the act of election to confer imperial dignity and power, and denying the necessity for any papal confirmation whatever. Had Louis been a commanding leader, and independent of the Papacy in his own feelings, he could probably have rallied a national sentiment on this issue that would have powerfully

affected the future of German history. But he lacked the needful character, and his troubles continued until he died (1347). A year before his death, his opponents had elected and put forward a rival emperor, Charles, the son of King John of Bohemia. Charles (IV.) was subsequently recognized as king without dispute, and secured the imperial crown. "It may be affirmed with truth that the genuine ancient Empire, which contained a German kingdom, came to an end with the Emperor Ludwig the Bavarian. None strove again after his death to restore the imperial power. The golden bull of his successor Charles IV. sealed the fate of the old Empire. Through it, and indeed through the entire conduct of Charles IV., King of Bohemia as he really was, and emperor scarcely more than in name, the imperial government passed more and more into the hands of the prince-electors, who came to regard the emperor no longer as their master, but as the president of an assembly in which he shared the power with themselves." "From the time of Charles IV. the main object and chief occupation of the emperors was not the Empire, but the aggrandisement and security of their own house. The Empire served only as the means and instrument of their purpose" (Döllinger).

The Golden Bull of Charles IV.

The Golden Bull referred to by Dr. Döllinger was an instrument which became the constitution, so to speak, of the Holy Roman or Germanic Empire. It prescribed the mode of the election of the King, and definitively named the seven Electors. It also conferred certain special powers and privileges on these seven princes, which raised them much above their fellows and gave them an independence that may be said to have destroyed every hope of Germanic unity. This was the one mark which the reign of Charles IV. left upon the Empire. His exertions as Emperor were all directed to the aggrandizement of his own family, and with not much lasting result. In his own kingdom of Bohemia he ruled with better effect. He made its capital, Prague, an important city, adorning it with noble buildings and founding in it the most ancient of German universities. This University of Prague soon sowed seeds from which sprang the first movement of religious reformation in Germany.

Charles IV., dying in 1378, was succeeded by his son Wenzel, or Wenceslaus, on the imperial throne as well as the Bohemian. Wenceslaus neglected both the Empire and the Kingdom, and the confusion of things in Germany grew worse. Some of the principal cities continued to secure considerable freedom and prosperity for themselves, by the combined efforts of their leagues; but everywhere else great disorder and oppression prevailed. It was at this time that the Swabian towns, to the number of forty-one, formed a union and waged unsuccessful war with a league which the nobles entered into against them. They were defeated, and crushingly dealt with by the Emperor.

In 1400 Wenceslaus was deposed and Rupert of the Palatinate was elected, producing another civil war, and reducing the Imperial government to a complete nullity. Rupert died in 1410, and, after some contention, Sigismund, or Sigismund, brother of Wenceslaus, was raised to the throne. He was Margrave of Brandenburg and King of

Hungary, and would become King of Bohemia when Wenceslaus died.

The Reformation of Huss in Bohemia.

Bohemia was about to become the scene of an extraordinary religious agitation, which John Huss, teacher and preacher in the new but already famous University of Prague, was beginning to stir. Huss, who drew more or less of his inspiration from Wyclif, anticipated Luther in the boldness of his attacks upon iniquities in the Church. In his case as in Luther's, the abomination which he could not endure was the sale of papal indulgences; and it was by his denunciation of that impious fraud that he drew on himself the deadly wrath of the Roman hierarchy. He was summoned before the great Council of the Church which opened at Constance in 1414. He obeyed the summons and went to the Council, bearing a safe-conduct from the Emperor which pledged protection to him until he returned. Notwithstanding this imperial pledge, he was imprisoned for seven months at Constance, and was then impatiently listened to and condemned to the stake. On the 6th of July, 1415, he was burned. In the following May, his friend and disciple, Jerome of Prague, suffered the same martyrdom. The Emperor, Sigismund, blustered a little at the insolent violation of his safe-conduct; but dared do nothing to make it effective.

In Bohemia, the excitement produced by these outrages was universal. The whole nation seemed to rise, in the first wide-spread aggressive popular revolt that the Church of Rome had yet been called upon to encounter. In 1419 there was an armed assembly of 40,000 men, on a mountain which they called Tabor, who placed themselves under the leadership of John Ziska, a nobleman, one of Huss' friends. The followers of Ziska soon displayed a violence of temper and a radicalism which repelled the more moderate Hussites, or Reformers, and two parties appeared, one known as the Taborites, the other as the Calixtines, or Utraquists. The former insisted on entire separation from the Church of Rome; the latter confined their demands to four reforms, namely: Free preaching of the Word of God; the giving of the Eucharistic cup to the laity; the taking of secular powers and of worldly goods from the clergy; the enforcing of Christian discipline by all authorities. So much stress was laid by the Calixtines on their claim to the chalice or cup (communion in both kinds) that it gave them their name. The breach between these parties widened until they were as hostile to each other as to the Catholics, and the Bohemian reform movement was ruined in the end by their division.

In 1419, the deposed Emperor Wenceslaus, who had still retained his kingdom of Bohemia, was murdered in his palace, at Prague. His brother, the Emperor Sigismund, was his heir; but the Hussites refused the crown to him, and resisted his pretensions with arms. This added a political conflict to the religious one, and Bohemia was afflicted with a frightful civil war for fifteen years. Ziska fortified mount Tabor and took possession of Prague. The Emperor and the Pope allied themselves, to crush an insurrection which was aimed against both. They summoned Christendom to a new crusade, and Sigismund led 100,000 men against Prague, in 1420.

Ziska met him and defeated him, and drove him, with his crusaders, from the country. The Taborites were now maddened by their success, and raged over the land, destroying convents and burning priests. Their doctrines, moreover, began to take on a socialist and republican character, threatening property in general and questioning monarchy, too. The well-to-do and conservative classes were more and more repelled from them.

In 1421 a second crusading army, 200,000 strong, invaded Bohemia and was scattered like chaff by Ziska (now blind) and his peasant soldiery. The next year they defeated the Emperor again; but in 1424 Ziska died, and a priest called Procopius the Great took his place. Under their new leader, the fierce Taborites were as invincible as they had been under Ziska. They routed an imperial army in 1426, and then carried the war into Austria and Silesia, committing fearful ravages. Still another crusade was set in motion against them by the Pope, and still another disastrous failure was made of it. Then Germany again suffered a more frightful visitation from the vengeful Hussites than before. Towns and villages were destroyed by hundreds, and wide tracks of ruin and death were marked on the face of the land, to its very center. Once more, and for the last time, in 1431, the Germans rallied a great force to retaliate these attacks, and they met defeat, as in all previous encounters, but more completely than ever before. Then the Pope and the Emperor gave up hope of putting down the indomitable revolutionists by force, and opened parleyings. The Pope called a council at Basel for the discussion of questions with the Hussites, and, finally, in 1433, their moderate party was prevailed upon to accept a compromise which really conceded nothing to them except the use of the cup in the communion. The Taborites refused the terms, and the two parties grappled each other in a fierce struggle for the control of the state. But the extremists had lost much of their old strength, and the Utraquists vanquished them in a decisive battle at Lipan, in May, 1434. Two years later Sigismund was formally acknowledged King of Bohemia and received in Prague. In 1437 he died. His son-in-law, Albert of Austria, who succeeded him, lived but two years, and the heir to the throne then was a son, Ladislaus, born after his father's death. This left Bohemia in a state of great confusion and disorder for several years, until a strong man, George Podiebrad, acquired the control of affairs.

Meantime, the Utraquists had organized a National Church of Bohemia, considerably divergent from Rome. It failed to satisfy the deeper religious feelings that were widely current among the Bohemians in that age, and there grew up a sect which took the name of "Unitas Fratrum," or "Unity of the Brethren," but which afterwards became incorrectly known as the Moravian Brethren. This sect, still existing, has borne an important part in the missionary history of the Christian world.

The Papacy.—The Great Schism.

The Papacy, at the time of its conflict with the Hussites, in Bohemia, was rapidly sinking to that lowest level of debasement which it reached in the later part of the fifteenth century. Its state was not yet so abhorrent as it came to be under the Borgias; but it had been brought even

more into contempt, perhaps, by the divisions and contentions of "the Great Schism." The so-called "Babylonish Captivity" of the series of popes who resided for seventy years at Avignon (1305-1376), and who were under French influence, had been humiliating to the Church; but the schism which immediately followed (1378-1417), when a succession of rival popes, or popes and antipopes, thundered anathemas and excommunications at one another, from Rome and from Avignon, was even more scandalous and shameful. Christendom was divided by the quarrel. France, Spain, Scotland, and some lesser states, gave their allegiance to the pope at Avignon; England, Germany and the northern kingdoms adhered to the pope at Rome. In 1402, an attempt to heal the schism was made by a general Council of the Church convened at Pisa. It decreed the deposition of both the contending pontiffs, and elected a third; but its authority was not recognized, and the confusion of the Church was only made worse by bringing three popes into the quarrel, instead of two. Twelve years later, another Council, held at Constance,—the same which burned Huss,—had more success. Europe had now grown so tired of the scandal, and so disgusted with the three pretenders to spiritual supremacy, that the action of the Council was backed by public opinion, and they were suppressed. A fourth pope, Martin V., whom the Council then seated in the chair of St. Peter (1417), was universally acknowledged, and the Great Schism was at an end.

But other scandals and abuses in the Church, which public opinion in Europe had already begun to cry loudly against, were untouched by these Councils. A subsequent Council at Basel, which met in 1431, attempted some restraints upon papal extortion (ignoring the more serious moral evils that claimed attention); but was utterly beaten in the conflict with Pope Eugenius IV., which this action brought on, and its decrees lost all effect. So the religious autocracy at Rome, sinking stage by stage below the foulest secular courts of the time, continued without check to insult and outrage, more and more, the piety, the common sense, and the decent feeling of Christendom, until the habit of reverence was quite worn out in the minds of men throughout the better half of Europe.

Rome and the last Tribune, Rienzi.

The city of Rome had fallen from all greatness of its own when it came to be dependent on the fortunes of the popes. Their departure to Avignon had reduced it to a lamentable state. They took with them, in reality, the sustenance of the city; for it lived, in the main, on the revenues of the Papacy, and knew little of commerce beyond the profitable traffic in indulgences, absolutions, benefices, relics and papal blessings, which went to Avignon with the head of the Church. Authority, too, departed with the Pope, and the wretched city was given up to anarchy almost uncontrolled. A number of powerful families—the Colonna, the Orsini, and others—perpetually at strife with one another, fought out their feuds in the streets, and abused and oppressed their neighbors with impunity. Their houses were impregnable castles, and their retainers were a formidable army.

It was while this state of things was at its worst that the famous Cola di Rienzi, "last of

the Tribunes," accomplished a revolution which was short-lived but extraordinary. He roused the people to action against their oppressors and the disturbers of their peace. He appealed to them to restore the republican institutions of ancient Rome, and when they responded, in 1347, by conferring on him the title and authority of a Tribune, he actually succeeded in expelling the turbulent nobles, or reducing them to submission, and established in Rome, for a little time, what he called "the Good Estate." But his head was quickly turned by his success; he was inflated with conceit and vanity; he became arrogant and despotic; the people tired of him, and after a few months of rule he was driven from Rome. In 1354 he came back as a Senator, appointed by the Pope, who thought to use him for the restoration of papal authority; but his influence was gone, and he was slain by a riotous mob.

The return of the Pope to Rome in 1376 was an event so long and ardently desired by the Roman people that they submitted themselves eagerly to his government. But his sovereignty over the States of the Church was substantially lost, and the regaining of it was the principal object of the exertions of the popes for a long subsequent period.

The Two Sicilies.

In Southern Italy and Sicily, since the fall of the Hohenstaufens (1268), the times had been continuously evil. The rule of the French conqueror, Charles of Anjou, was hard and unmerciful, and the power he established became threatening to the Papacy, which gave the kingdom to him. In 1282, Sicily freed itself, by the savage massacre of Frenchmen which bears the name of the Sicilian Vespers. The King of Aragon, Peter III., whose queen was the Hohenstaufen heiress, supported the insurrection promptly and vigorously, took possession of the island, and was recognized by the people as their king. A war of twenty years' duration ensued. Both Charles and Peter died and their sons continued the battle. In the end, the Angevin house held the mainland, as a separate kingdom, with Naples for its capital, and a younger branch of the royal family of Aragon reigned in the island. But both sovereigns called themselves Kings of Sicily, so that History, ever since, has been forced to speak puzzlingly of "Two Sicilies." For convenience it seems best to distinguish them by calling one the kingdom of Naples and the other the kingdom of Sicily. On the Neapolitan throne there came one estimable prince, in Robert, who reigned from 1309 to 1343, and who was a friend of peace and a patron of arts and letters. But after him the throne was befouled by crimes and vices, and the kingdom was made miserable by civil wars. His grand-daughter Joanna, or Jane, succeeded him. Robert's elder brother Caribert had become King of Hungary, and Joanna now married one of that king's sons—her cousin Andrew. At the end of two years he was murdered (1345) and the queen, a notoriously vicious woman, was accused of the crime. Andrew's brother, Louis, who had succeeded to the throne in Hungary, invaded Naples to avenge his death, and Joanna was driven to flight. The country then suffered from the worst form of civil war—a war carried on by the hireling ruffians of the "free companies" who roamed about Italy in

that age, selling their swords to the highest bidders. In 1351 a peace was brought about which restored Joanna to the throne. The Hungarian King's son, known as Charles of Durazzo, was her recognized heir, but she saw fit to disinherit him and adopt Louis, of the Second House of Anjou, brother of Charles V. in France. Charles of Durazzo invaded Naples, took the queen prisoner and put her to death. Louis of Anjou attempted to displace him, but failed. In 1383 Louis died, leaving his claims to his son. Charles of Durazzo was called to Hungary, after a time, to take the crown of that kingdom, and left his young son, Ladislaus, on the Neapolitan throne. The Angevin claimant, Louis II., was then called in by his partisans, and civil war was renewed for years. When Ladislaus reached manhood he succeeded in expelling Louis, and he held the kingdom until his death, in 1414. He was succeeded by his sister, Joanna II., who proved to be as wicked and dissolute a woman as her predecessor of the same name. She incurred the enmity of the Pope, who persuaded Louis III., son of Louis II., to renew the claims of his house. The most renowned "condottiere" (or military contractor, as the term might be translated), of the day, Attendolo Sforza, was engaged to make war on Queen Joanna in the interest of Louis. On her side she obtained a champion by promising her dominions to Alfonso V., of Aragon and Sicily. The struggle went on for years, with varying fortunes. The fickle and treacherous Joanna revoked her adoption of Alfonso, after a time, and made Louis her heir. When Louis died, she bequeathed her crown to his brother René, Duke of Lorraine. Her death occurred in 1435, but still the war continued, and nearly all Italy was involved in it, taking one side or the other. Alfonso succeeded at last (1442) in establishing himself at Naples, and René practically gave up the contest, although he kept the title of King of Naples. He was the father of the famous English Queen Margaret of Anjou, who fought for her weak-minded husband and her son in the Wars of the Roses.

While the Neapolitan kingdom was passing through these endless miseries of anarchy, civil war, and evil government, the Sicilian kingdom enjoyed a more peaceful and prosperous existence. The crown, briefly held by a cadet branch of the House of Aragon, was soon reunited to that of Aragon; and under Alfonso, as we have seen, it was once more joined with that of Naples, in a "Kingdom of the Two Sicilies." But both these unions were dissolved on the death of Alfonso, who bequeathed Aragon and Sicily to his legitimate heir, and Naples to a bastard son.

The Despots of Northern Italy.

In Northern Italy a great change in the political state of many among the formerly free commonwealths had been going on since the thirteenth century. The experience of the Greek city-republics had been repeated in them. In one way and another, they had fallen under the domination of powerful families, who had established a despotic rule over them, sometimes gathering several cities and their surrounding territory into a considerable dominion, and obtaining from the Emperor or the Pope a formally conferred and hereditary title. Thus the Visconti had established themselves at Milan, and had become a ducal house. After a few generations they gave

way to the military adventurer, Francesco Sforza, son of the Sforza who made war for Louis III. of Anjou on Joanna II. of Naples. In Verona, the Della Scala family reigned for a time, until Venice overcame them; at Modena and Ferrara, the Estes; at Mantua, the Gonzagas; at Padua, the Carraras.

The Italian Republics.

In other cities, the political changes were of a different character. Venice, which grew rich and powerful with extraordinary rapidity, was tyrannically governed by a haughty and exclusive aristocracy. In commerce and in wealth she surpassed all her rivals, and her affairs were more shrewdly conducted. She held large possessions in the East, and she was acquiring an extensive dominion on the Italian mainland. The Genoese, who were the most formidable competitors of Venice in commerce, preserved their democracy, but at some serious expense to the administrative efficiency of their government. They were troubled by a nobility which could only be turbulent and could not control. They fought a desperate but losing fight with the Venetians, and were several times in subjection to the dukes of Milan and the kings of France. Pisa, which had led both Venice and Genoa in the commercial race at the beginning, was ruined by her wars with the latter, and with Florence, and sank, in the fourteenth century, under the rule of the Visconti, who sold their rights to the Florentines.

Florence.

The wonderful Florentine republic was the one which preserved its independence under popular institutions the longest, and in which they bore the most splendid fruit. For a period that began in the later part of the thirteenth century, the government of Florence was so radically democratic that the nobles (*grandi*) were made ineligible to office, and could only qualify themselves for election to any place in the magistracy by abandoning their order and engaging in the labor of some craft or art. The vocations of skilled industry were all organized in guilds, called *Arti*, and were divided into two classes, one representing what were recognized as the superior arts (*Arti Major*, embracing professional and mercantile callings, with some others); the other including the commoner industries, known as the *Arti Minori*. From the heads, or *Priors*, of the *Arti* were chosen a Signory, changed every two months, which was entrusted with the government of the republic. This popular constitution was maintained in its essential features through the better part of a century, but with continual resistance and disturbance from the excluded nobles, on one side, and from the common laboring people, on the other, who belonged to no art-gild and who, therefore, were excluded likewise from participation in political affairs. Between these two upper and lower discontents, the bourgeois constitution gave way at last. The mob got control for a time; but only, as always happens, to bring about a reactionary revolution, which placed an oligarchy in power; and the oligarchy made smooth the way for a single family of great wealth and popular gifts and graces to rise to supremacy in the state. This was the renowned family which began to rule in Florence in 1435, when Cosimo de' Medici entered on the office of *Gonfaloniere*. The Medici were not despots, of

the class of the Visconti, or the Sforzas, or the Estes. They governed under the old constitutional forms, with not much violation of anything except the spirit of them. They acquired no princely title, until the late, declining days of the house. Their power rested on influence and prestige, at first, and finally on habit. They developed, and enlisted in their own support, as something reflected from themselves, the pride of the city in itself,—in its magnificence,—in its great and liberal wealth,—in its patronage of letters and art,—in its fame abroad and the admiration with which men looked upon it.

Through all the political changes in Florence there ran an unending war of factions, the bitterest and most inveterate in history. The control of the city belonged naturally to the Guelfs, for it was the head and front of the Guelfic party in Italy. "Without Florence," says one historian, "there would have been no Guelfs." But neither party scrupled to call armed help from the outside into its quarrels, and the Ghibellines were able, nearly as often as the Guelfs, to drive their opponents from the city. For the ascendancy of one faction meant commonly the flight or expulsion of every man in the other who had importance enough to be noticed. It was thus that Dante, an ardent Ghibelline, became an exile from his beloved Florence during the later years of his life. But the strife of Guelfs with Ghibellines did not suffice for the partisan rancor of the Florentines, and they complicated it with another split of factions, which bore the names of the Bianchi and the Neri, or the Whites and the Blacks.

For two or three centuries the annals of Florence are naught, one thinks in reading them, but an unbroken tale of strife within, or war without—of tumult, riot, revolution, disorder. And yet, underneath, there is an amazing story to be found, of thrift, industry, commerce, prosperity, wealth, on one side, and of the sublimest genius, on another, giving itself, in pure devotion, to poetry and art. The contradiction of circumstances seems irreconcilable to our modern experience, and we have to seek an explanation of it in the very different conditions of mediæval life.

It is with certainty a fact that Florence, in its democratic time, was phenomenal in genius, and in richness of life,—in prosperity both material and intellectual; and it is reasonable to credit to that time the planting and the growing of fruits which ripened surpassingly in the Medicean age.

The Ottomans and the Eastern Empire.

So little occasion has arisen for any mention of the lingering Eastern Empire, since Michael Palæologus, the Greek, recovered Constantinople from the Franks (1261), that its existence might easily be forgotten. It had no importance until it fell, and then it loomed large again, in history, not only by the tragic impression of its fall upon the imaginations of men, but by the potent consequences of it.

For nearly two hundred years, the successors of Palæologus, still calling themselves "Emperors of the Romans," and ruling a little Thracian and Macedonian corner of the old dominion of the Eastern Cæsars, struggled with a new race of Turks, who had followed the Seljuk horde out of the same Central Asian region. One of the first known leaders of this tribe was Osman, or Othman, after whom they are sometimes called

Osmanlis, but more frequently Ottoman Turks. They appeared in Asia Minor about the middle of the thirteenth century, attacking both Christian and Mahometan states, and gradually extending their conquest over the whole. About the end of the first century of their career, they passed the straits and won a footing in Europe. In 1361, they took Hadrianople and made it their capital. Their sultan at this time was Amurath.

As yet, they did not attack Constantinople. The city itself was too strong in its fortifications; but beyond the walls of the capital there was no strength in the little fragment of Empire that remained. It appealed vainly to Western Europe for help. It sought to make terms with the Church of Rome. Nothing saved it for the moment but the evident disposition of the Turk to regard it as fruit which would drop to his hand in due time, and which he might safely leave waiting while he turned his arms against its more formidable neighbors. He contented himself with exacting tribute from the emperors, and humiliating them by commands which they dared not disobey. In the Servians, the Bosnians, and the Bulgarians, Amurath found worthier foes. He took Sophia, their principal city, from the latter, in 1382; in 1389 he defeated the two former nations in the great battle of Kossova. At the moment of victory he was assassinated, and his son Bajazet mounted the Ottoman throne. The latter, at Nicopolis (1396), overwhelmed and destroyed the one army which Western Europe sent to oppose the conquering march of his terrible race. Six years later, he himself was vanquished and taken prisoner in Asia by a still more terrible conqueror,—the fiendish Timour or Tamerlane, then scourging the eastern Continent. For some years the Turks were paralyzed by a disputed succession; but under Amurath II., who came to the throne in 1421, their advance was resumed, and in a few years more their long combat with the Hungarians began.

Hungary and the Turks.

The original line of kings of Hungary having died out in 1301, the influence of the Pope, who claimed the kingdom as a fief of the papal see, secured the election to the throne of Charles Robert, or Caribert, of the Naples branch of the House of Anjou. He and his son Louis, called the Great, raised the kingdom to notable importance and power. Louis added the crown of Poland to that of Hungary, and on his death, leaving two daughters, the Polish crown passed to the husband of one and the Hungarian crown to the husband of the other. This latter was Sigismund of Luxemburg, who afterwards became Emperor, and also King of Bohemia. Under Sigismund, Hungary was threatened on one side by the Turks, and ravaged on the other by the Hussites of Bohemia. He was succeeded (1437) by his son-in-law, Albert of Austria, who lived only two years, and the latter was followed by Wladislaus, King of Poland, who again united the two crowns, though at the cost of a distracting civil war with partisans of the infant son of Albert. It was in the reign of this prince that the Turks began their obstinate attacks on Hungary, and thenceforth, for two centuries and more, that afflicted country served Christendom as a battered bulwark which the new warriors of Islam could beat and disfigure but could not break down. The hero of these first Hungarian wars with the Turks was John Huniades, or Hun-

yady, a Wallachian, who fought them with success until a peace was concluded in 1444. But King Wladislaus was persuaded the same year by a papal agent to break the treaty and to lead an expedition against the enemy's lines. The result was a calamitous defeat, the death of the king, and the almost total destruction of his army. Huniades now became regent of the kingdom, during the minority of the late King Albert's young son, Ladislaus.

He suffered one serious defeat at the hands of the Turks, but avenged it again and again, with help from an army of volunteers raised in all parts of Europe by the exertions of a zealous monk named Capistrano. When Huniades died, in 1456, his enemies already controlled the worthless young king, Ladislaus, and the latter pursued him in his grave with denunciations as a traitor and a villain. In 1458, Ladislaus died, and Mathias, a son of Huniades, was elected king. After he had settled himself securely upon the throne, Mathias turned his arms, not against the Turks, but against the Hussites of Bohemia, in an attempt to wrest the crown of that kingdom from George Podiebrad.

The Fall of Constantinople.

Meantime, the Turkish Sultan, Mohammed II., had accomplished the capture of Constantinople and brought the venerable Empire of the East—Roman, Greek, or Byzantine, as we choose to name it—to an end. He was challenged to the undertaking by the folly of the last Emperor, Constantine Palæologus, who threatened to support a pretender to Mohammed's throne. The latter began serious preparations at once for a siege of the long coveted city, and opened his attack in April, 1453. The Greeks, even in that hour of common danger, were too hotly engaged in a religious quarrel to act defensively together. Their last preceding emperor had gone personally to the Council of the Western Church, at Florence, in 1439, with some of the bishops of the Greek Church, and had arranged for the submission of the latter to Rome, as a means of procuring help from Catholic Europe against the Turks. His successor, Constantine, adhered to this engagement, professed the Catholic faith and observed the Catholic ritual. His subjects in general repudiated the imperial contract with scorn, and avowedly preferred a Turkish master to a Roman shepherd. Hence they took little part in the defense of the city. Constantine, with the small force at his command, fought the host of besiegers with noble courage and obstinacy for seven weeks, receiving a little succor from the Genoese, but from no other quarter. On the 29th of May the walls were carried by storm; the Emperor fell, fighting bravely to the last; and the Turks became masters of the city of Constantine. There was no extensive massacre of the inhabitants; the city was given up to pillage, but not to destruction, for the conqueror intended to make it his capital. A number of fugitives had escaped, before, or during the siege, and made their way into Italy and other parts of Europe, carrying an influence which was importantly felt, as we shall presently see; but 60,000 captives, men, women and children, were sold into slavery and scattered throughout the Ottoman Empire.

Greece and most of the islands of the Ægean soon shared the fate of Constantinople, and the

subjugation of Servia and Bosnia was made complete. Mohammed was even threatening Italy when he died, in 1481.

Renaissance.

We have now come, in our hasty survey of European history, to the stretch of time within which historians have quite generally agreed to place the ending of the state of things characteristic of the Middle Ages, and the beginning of the changed conditions and the different spirit that belong to the modern life of the civilized world. The transition in European society from mediæval to modern ways, feelings, and thoughts has been called Renaissance, or new birth; but the figure under which this places the conception before one's mind does not seem to be really a happy one. There was no birth of anything new in the nature of the generations of men who passed through that change, nor in the societies which they formed. What occurred to make changes in both was an expansion, a liberation, an enlightenment—an opening of eyes, and of ears, and of inner senses and sensibilities. There was no time and no place that can be marked at which this began; and there is no cause nor chain of causes to which it can be traced. We have found signs of its coming, here and there, in one token of movement and another, all the way through later mediæval times—at least since the first Crusades. In the thirteenth century there was a wonderful quickening of all the many processes which made it up. In the fourteenth century they were checked; but still they went on. In the fifteenth they revived with greater energy than before; and in the sixteenth they rose to their climax in intensity and effect.

That which took place in European society was not a re-naissance so much as the re-wakening of men to a day-light existence, after a thousand years of sunless night,—moonlighted at the best. The truest descriptive figure is that which represents these preludes to our modern age as a morning dawn and daybreak.

Probably foremost among the causes of the change in Western Europe from the mediæval to the modern state, we must place those influences that extinguished the disorganizing forces in feudalism. Habits and forms of the feudal arrangement remained troublesome in society, as they do in some measure to the present day; but feudalism as a system of social disorder and disintegration was by this time cleared away. We have noted in passing some of the undermining agencies by which it was destroyed: the crusading movements; the growth and enfranchisement of cities; the spread of commerce; the rise of a middle class; the study of Roman law; the consequent increase of royal authority in France,—all these were among the causes of its decline. But possibly none among them wrought such quick and deadly harm to feudalism as the introduction of gunpowder and fire-arms in war, which occurred in the fourteenth century. When his new weapons placed the foot-soldier on a fairly even footing in battle with the mailed and mounted knight, the feudal military organization of society was ruined beyond remedy. The changed conditions of warfare made trained armies, and therefore standing armies, a necessity; standing armies implied centralized authority; with centralized authority the feudal condition disappeared.

If these agencies in the generating of the new movement of civilization which we call Modern are placed before the subtler and more powerful influence of the printing press, it is because they had to do a certain work in the world before the printing press could be an efficient educator. Some beginning of a public, in our modern sense, required to be created, for letters to act upon. Until that came about, the copyists of the monasteries and of the few palace libraries existing were more than sufficient to satisfy all demands for the multiplication of ancient writings or the publication of new ones. The printer, if he had existed, would have starved for want of employment. He would have lacked material, moreover, to work upon; for it was the rediscovery of a great ancient literature which made him busy when he came.

Invention of Printing.

The preparation of Europe for an effective use of the art of printing may be said to have begun in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when the great universities of Paris, Bologna, Naples, Padua, Modena, and others, came into existence, to be centers of intellectual irritation—disputation—challenge—groping inquiry. But it was not until the fourteenth century, when the labors and the influence of Petrarch and other scholars and men of genius roused interest in the forgotten literature of ancient Rome and Greece, that the craving and seeking for books grew considerable. Scholars and pretended scholars from the Greek Empire then began to find employment, in Italy more especially, as teachers of the Greek language, and a market was opened for manuscripts of the older Greek writings, which brought many precious ones to light, after long burial, and multiplied copies of them. From Italy, this revival of classic learning crept westward and northward somewhat slowly, but it went steadily on, and the book as a commodity in the commerce of the world rose year by year in importance, until the printer came forward, about the middle of the fifteenth century, to make it abundant and cheap.

Whether John Gutenberg, at Mentz, in 1454, or Laurent Coster, at Haarlem, twenty years earlier, executed the first printing with movable types, is a question of small importance, except as a question of justice between the two possible inventors, in awarding a great fame which belongs to one or both. The grand fact is, that thought and knowledge took wings from that sublime invention, and ideas were spread among men with a swift diffusion that the world had never dreamed of before. The slow wakening that had gone on for two centuries became suddenly so quick that scarcely more than fifty years, from the printing of the first Bible, sufficed to inoculate half of Europe with the independent thinking of a few boldly enlightened men.

The Greek Revival.

If Gutenberg's printing of Pope Nicholas' letter of indulgence, in 1454, was really the first achievement of the new-born art, then it followed by a single year the event commonly fixed upon for the dating of our Modern Era, and it derived much of its earliest importance indirectly from that event. For the fall of Constantinople, in 1453, was preceded and followed by a flight of Greeks to Western Europe, bearing such treas-

ures as they could save from the Turks. Happily those treasures included precious manuscripts; and among the fugitives was no small number of educated Greeks, who became teachers of their language in the West. Thus teaching and text were offered at the moment when the printing press stood ready to make a common gift of them to every hungry student. This opened the second of the three stages which the late John Addington Symonds defined in the history of scholarship during the Renaissance: "The first is the age of passionate desire; Petrarch poring over a Homer he could not understand, and Boccaccio in his maturity learning Greek, in order that he might drink from the well-head of poetic inspiration, are the heroes of this period. They inspired the Italians with a thirst for antique culture. Next comes the age of acquisition and of libraries. Nicholas V., who founded the Vatican Library in 1453, Cosmo de' Medici, who began the Medicean Collection a little earlier, and Poggio Bracciolani, who ransacked all the cities and convents of Europe for manuscripts, together with the teachers of Greek, who in the first half of the fifteenth century escaped from Constantinople with precious freights of classic literature, are the heroes of this second period." "Then came the third age of scholarship—the age of the critics, philologists, and printers. . . . Florence, Venice, Basle, and Paris groaned with printing presses. The Aldi, the Stephani, and Froben, toiled by night and day, employing scores of scholars, men of supreme devotion and of mighty brain, whose work it was to ascertain the right reading of sentences, to accentuate, to punctuate, to commit to the press, and to place beyond the reach of monkish hatred or of envious time, that everlasting solace of humanity which exists in the classics. All subsequent achievements in the field of scholarship sink into insignificance beside the labours of these men, who needed genius, enthusiasm, and the sympathy of Europe for the accomplishment of their titanic task. Virgil was printed in 1470, Homer in 1488, Aristotle in 1498, Plato in 1512. They then became the inalienable heritage of mankind. . . . This third age in the history of the Renaissance Scholarship may be said to have reached its climax in Erasmus [1465–1536]; for by this time Italy had handed on the torch of learning to the northern nations" (Symonds).

Art had already had its new birth in Italy; but it shared with everything spiritual and intellectual the wonderful quickening of the age, and produced the great masters of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: Michael Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Titian, in Italy, the Brothers Van Eyck in Flanders, Holbein and Dürer, in Germany, and the host of their compeers in that astonishing age of artistic genius.

Portuguese Explorations.

A ruder and more practical direction in which the spirit of the age manifested itself conspicuously and with prodigious results was that of exploring navigation, to penetrate the unknown regions of the globe and find their secrets out. But, strangely, it was none of the older maritime and commercial peoples who led the way in this: neither the Venetians, nor the Genoese, nor the Catalans, nor the Flemings, nor the Hansa Leaguers, nor the English, were early in the search for new countries and new routes of trade. The

grand exploit of "business enterprise" in the fifteenth century, which changed the face of commerce throughout the world, was left to be performed by the Portuguese, whose prior commercial experience was as slight as that of any people in Europe. And it was one great man among them, a younger son in their royal family, Prince Henry, known to later times as "the Navigator," who woke the spirit of exploration in them and pushed them to the achievement which placed Portugal, for a time, at the head of the maritime states. Beginning in 1434, Prince Henry sent expedition following expedition down the western coast of Africa, searching for the southern extremity of the continent, and a way round it to the eastward—to the Indies, the goal of commercial ambition then and long after. In our own day it seems an easy thing to sail down the African coast to the Cape; but it was not easy in the middle of the fifteenth century; and when Prince Henry died, in 1460, his ships had only reached the mouth of the Gambia, or a little way beyond it. His countrymen had grown interested, however, in the pursuit which he began, and expeditions were continued, not eagerly but at intervals, until Bartolomew Diaz, in 1486, rounded the southern point of the continent without knowing it, and Vasco da Gama, in 1497, passed beyond, and sailed to the coast of India.

Discovery of America.

Five years before this, Columbus, in the service of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, had made the more venturesome voyage westward, and had found the New World of America. That the fruits of that surpassing discovery fell to Spain, is one of the happenings of history which one need not try to explain; since (if we except the Catalans among them) there were no people in Europe less inclined to ocean adventure than the Spaniards. But they had just finished the conquest of the Moors; their energies, long exercised in that struggle, demanded some new outlet, and the Genoese navigator, seeking money and ships, and baffled in all more promising lands, came to them at the right moment for a favorable hearing. So Castile won the amazing prize of adventure, which seems to have belonged by more natural right to Genoa, or Venice, or Bruges, or Lubeck, or Bristol.

The immediate material effects of the finding of the new way to the Asiatic side of the world were far more important than the effects of the discovery of America, and they were promptly felt. No sooner had the Portuguese secured their footing in the eastern seas, and on the route thither, which they proceeded vigorously to do, than the commerce of Europe with that rich region of spices and silks, and curious luxuries which Europe loved, abandoned its ancient channels and ran quickly into the new one. There were several strong reasons for this: (1) the carriage of goods by the longer ocean route was cheaper than by caravan routes to the Mediterranean; (2) the pestilent Moorish pirates of the Barbary Coast were escaped; (3) European merchants found heavy advantages in dealing directly with the East instead of trading at second hand through Arabs and Turks. So the commerce of the Indies fled suddenly away from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic; fled from Venice, from Genoa, from Marseilles, from Barcelona, from Constantinople, from Alexandria; fled, too, from many cities of

the arrogant Hanse league in the North, which had learned the old ways of traffic and were slow to catch the idea of a possible change. At the outset of the rearrangement of trade, the Portuguese won and held, for a time, the first handling of East Indian commodities, while Dutch, English and German traders — especially the first named — met them at Lisbon and took their wares for distribution through central and northern Europe. But, in no long time, the Dutch and English went to India on their own account, and ousted the Portuguese from their profitable monopoly.

Commercially, the discovery of America had little effect on Europe for a century or two. Politically, it had vast consequences in the sixteenth century, which came, in the main, from the power and prestige that accrued to Spain. But perhaps its most important effects were those moral and intellectual ones which may be attributed to the sudden, surprising enlargement of the geographical horizon of men. The lifting of the curtain of mystery which had hung so long between two halves of the world must have compelled every man, who thought at all, to suspect that other curtains of mystery might be hiding facts as simple and substantial, waiting for their Columbus to disclose them; and so the bondage of the mediæval mind to that cowardice of superstition which fears inquiry, must surely have been greatly loosened by the startling event. But the Spaniards, who rushed to the possession of the new-found world, showed small signs of any such effect upon their minds; and perhaps it was the greedy thought of their possession which excluded it.

Nationalization of Spain.

The Spaniards were one of half-a-dozen peoples in Western Europe who had just arrived, in this fifteenth century, at a fairly consolidated nationality, and were prepared, for the first time in their history, to act with something like organic unity in the affairs of the world. It was one of the singular birth-marks of the new era in history, that so many nations passed from the inchoate to the definite form at so nearly the same time. The marriage of Isabella of Castile to Ferdinand of Aragon, in 1469, effected a permanent union of the two crowns, and a substantial incorporation of the greater part of the Spanish peninsula into a single strong kingdom, made yet stronger in 1491 by the conquest of Grenada and subjugation of the last of the Spanish Moors.

Louis XI. and the Nationalizing of France.

The nationalizing of France had been a simultaneous but quite different process. From the miserably downfallen and divided state in which it was left by the Hundred Years War, it was raised by a singular king, who employed strange, ignoble methods, but employed them with remarkable success. This was Louis XI., who owes to Sir Walter Scott's romance of "Quentin Durward" an introduction to common fame which he could hardly have secured otherwise; since popular attention is not often drawn to the kind of cunning and hidden work in politics which he did.

Louis XI., on coming to the throne in 1461, found himself surrounded by a state of things which seemed much like a revival of the feudal

state at its worst, when Philip Augustus and Louis IX. had to deal with great vassals who rivalled or overtopped them in power. The reckless granting of appanages to children of the royal family had raised up a new group of nobles, too powerful and too proud to be loyal and obedient subjects of the monarchy. At the head of them was the Duke of Burgundy, whose splendid dominion, extended by marriage over most of the Netherlands, raised him to a place among the greater princes of Europe, and who quite outshone the King of France in everything but the royal title. It was impossible, under the circumstances, for the crown to establish its supremacy over these powerful lords by means direct and open. The craft and dishonesty of Louis found methods more effectual. He cajoled, beguiled, betrayed and cheated his antagonists, one by one. He played the selfishness and ambitions of each against the others, and he skilfully evoked something like a public opinion in his kingdom against the whole. At the outset of his reign the nobles formed a combination against him which they called the League of the Public Weal, but which aimed at nothing but fresh gains to the privileged class and advantages to its chiefs. Of alliance with the people against the crown, as in England, there was no thought. Louis yielded to the League in appearance, and cunningly went beyond its demands in his concessions, making it odious to the kingdom at large, and securing to himself the strong support of the States-General of France, when he appealed to it.

The tortuous policy of Louis was aided by many favoring circumstances and happenings. It was favored not least, perhaps, by the hot-headed character of Charles the Bold, who succeeded his father, Philip, in the Duchy of Burgundy, in 1467. Charles was inspired with a great and not unreasonable ambition, to make his realm a kingdom, holding a middle place between France and Germany. He had abilities, but he was of a passionate and haughty temper, and no match for the cool, perfidious, plotting King of France. The latter, by skilful intrigue, involved him in a war with the Swiss, which he conducted imprudently, and in which he was defeated and killed (1477). His death cleared Louis' path to complete mastery in France, and he made the most of his opportunity. Charles left only a daughter, Mary of Burgundy, and her situation was helpless. Louis lost no time in seizing the Duchy of Burgundy, as a fief of France, and in the pretended exercise of his rights as godfather of the Duchess Mary. He also took possession of Franche Comté, which was a fief of the Empire, and he put forward claims in Flanders, Artois, and elsewhere. But the Netherlanders, while they took advantage of the young duchess' situation, and exacted large concessions of chartered privileges from her, yet maintained her rights; and before the first year of her orphanage closed, she obtained a champion by marriage with the Archduke Maximilian of Austria, son of the Emperor, Frederick III. Maximilian was successful in war with Louis; but the latter succeeded, after all, in holding Burgundy, which was thenceforth absorbed in the royal domain of France and gave no further trouble to the monarchy, while he won some important extensions of the northwestern frontiers of his kingdom.

Before the death of Louis XI. the French crown regained Anjou, Maine, and Provence, by inheritance from the last representative of the great second House of Anjou. Thus the kingdom which he left to his son, Charles VIII. (1483), was a consolidated nation, containing in its centralized government the germs of the absolute monarchy of a later day.

Italian Expedition of Charles VIII.

Charles VIII. was a loutish and uneducated boy of eight years when his father died. His capable sister Anne carried on the government for some years, and continued her father's work by defeating a revolt of the nobles, and by marrying the young king to the heiress of Brittany—thereby uniting to the crown the last of the great semi-independent fiefs. When Charles came of age, he conceived the idea of recovering the kingdom of Naples, which the House of Anjou claimed, and which he looked upon as part of his inheritance from that House. He was incited to the enterprise, moreover, by Ludovico il Moro, or Louis the Moor, an intriguing uncle of the young Duke of Milan, who conspired to displace his nephew. In 1494 Charles crossed the Alps with a large and well-disciplined army, and met with no effectual opposition. The Medici of Florence and the Pope had agreed together to resist this French intrusion, which they feared; but the invading force proved too formidable, and the Florentines, then under the influence of Savonarola, looked to it for their liberation from the Medicean rule, already oppressive. Accordingly Charles marched triumphantly through the peninsula, making some stay at Rome. On his approach to Naples, the Aragonese King, Alfonso, abdicated in favor of his son, Ferdinand II., and died soon after. Ferdinand, shut out of Naples by an insurrection, fled to Sicily, and Charles entered the city, where the populace welcomed him with warmth. Most of the kingdom submitted within a few weeks, and the conquest seemed complete, as it had been easy.

But what they had won so easily the French held with a careless hand, and they lost it with equal ease. While they revelled and caroused in Naples, abusing the hospitality of their new subjects, and gathering plunder with reckless greed, a dangerous combination was formed against them, throughout the peninsula. Before they were aware, it had put them in peril, and Charles was forced to retreat with haste, in the spring of 1495, leaving an inadequate garrison to hold the Neapolitan capital. In Lombardy, he had to fight with the Venetians, and with his protégé, Louis the Moor, now Duke of Milan. He defeated them, and regained France in November. Long before that time, the small force he left at Naples had been overcome, and Ferdinand had recovered his kingdom.

In one sense, the French had nothing to show for this their first expedition of conquest. In another sense they had much to show and their gain was great. They had made their first acquaintance with the superior culture of Italy. They had breathed the air beyond the Alps, which was then surcharged with the inspirations of the Renaissance. Both the ideas and the spoil they brought back were of more value to France than can be easily estimated. They had returned laden with booty, and much of it was in

treasures of art, every sight of which was a lesson to the sense of beauty and the taste of the people among whom they were shown. The experience and the influence of the Italian expedition were undoubtedly very great, and the Renaissance in France, as an artistic and a literary birth, is reasonably dated from it.

Italian Wars of Louis XII.

Charles VIII. died suddenly in 1498 and was succeeded by his cousin, of the Orleans branch of the Valois family, Louis XII. The new king was weak in character, but not wicked. His first thought on mounting the throne was of the claims of his family to other thrones, in Italy. Besides the standing Angevin claim to the kingdom of Naples, he asserted rights of his own to the duchy of Milan, as a descendant of Valentina Visconti, heiress of the ducal house which the Sforzas supplanted. In 1499 he sent an army against Louis the Moor, and the latter fled from Milan without an attempt at resistance. Louis took possession of the duchy with the greatest good will of the people; but, before half a year had passed, French taxes, French government, and French manners had disgusted them, and they made an attempt to restore their former tyrant. The attempt failed, and Louis the Moor was imprisoned in France for the remainder of his life.

Milan secured, Louis XII. began preparations to repeat the undertaking of Charles VIII. against Naples. The Neapolitan crown had now passed to an able and popular king, Frederick, and Frederick had every reason to suppose that he would be supported and helped by his kinsman, Ferdinand of Aragon, the well-known consort of Isabella of Castile. Ferdinand had the power to hold the French king in check; but instead of using it for the defense of the Neapolitan branch of his house, he secretly and treacherously agreed with Louis to divide the kingdom of Naples with him. Under these circumstances, the conquest was easily accomplished (1501). The betrayed Frederick surrendered to Louis, and lived as a pensionary in France until his death. The Neapolitan branch of the House of Aragon came to an end.

Louis and Ferdinand speedily quarreled over the division of their joint conquest. The treacherous Spaniard cheated the French king in treaty negotiations, gaining time to send forces into Italy which expelled the French. It was in this war that the Spanish general, Gonsalvo di Cordova, won the reputation which gave him the name of "the Great Captain"; and it was likewise in this war that the chivalric French knight, Bayard, began the winning of his fame.

The League of Cambrai and the Holy League.

Naples had again slipped from the grasp of France, and this time it had passed to Spain. Louis XII. abandoned the tempting kingdom to his rival, and applied himself to the establishing of his sovereignty over Milan and its domain. Some territory formerly belonging to the Milanese had been ceded to Venice by the Sforzas. He himself had ceded another district or two to the republic in payment for services rendered. Ferdinand of Spain had made payments in the same kind of coin, from his Neapolitan realm, for Venetian help to secure it. The warlike Pope Julius

II. saw Rimini and other towns formerly belonging to the States of the Church now counted among the possessions of the proud mistress of the Adriatic. All of these disputants in Italy resented the gains which Venice had gathered at their expense, and envied and feared her somewhat insolent prosperity. They accordingly suspended their quarrels with one another, to form a league for breaking her down and for despoiling her. The Emperor Maximilian, who had grievances of his own against the Venetians, joined the combination, and Florence was bribed to become a party to it by the betrayal of Pisa into her hands. Thus was formed the shameful League of Cambrai (1508). The French did most of the fighting in the war that ensued, though Pope Julius, who took the field in person, easily proved himself a better soldier than priest. The Venetians were driven for a time from the greater part of the dominion they had acquired on the mainland, and were sorely pressed. But they made terms with the Pope, and it then became his interest, not merely to stop the conquests of his allies, but to press them out of Italy, if possible. He began accordingly to intrigue against the French, and presently had a new league in operation, making war upon them. It was called a Holy League, because the head of the Church was its promoter, and it embraced the Emperor, King Ferdinand of Spain, King Henry VIII. of England, and the Republic of Venice. As the result of the ruthless and destructive war which they waged, Louis XII., before he died, in 1515, saw all that he had won in Lombardy stripped from him and restored to the Sforzas—the old family of the Dukes of Milan; Venice recovered most of her possessions, but never regained her former power, since the discovery of the ocean route to India, round the Cape of Good Hope, was now turning the rich trade of the East, the great source of her wealth, into the hands of the Portuguese; the temporal dominion of the Popes was enlarged by the recovery of Bologna and Perugia and by the addition of Parma and Piacenza; and Florence, which had been a republic since the death of Savonarola, was forced to submit anew to the Medici.

The Age of Infamous Popes.

The fighting Pope, Julius II., who made war and led armies, while professing to be the vicar of Him who brought the message of good-will and peace to mankind, was very far from being the worst of the popes of his age. He was only worldly, thinking much of his political place as a temporal sovereign in Italy, and little of his spiritual office as the head of the Church of Christ. As the sovereign of Rome and the Papal States, Julius II. ran a brilliant career, and is one of the splendid figures of the Italian renaissance. Patron of Michael Angelo and Raphael, projector of St. Peter's, there is a certain grandeur in his character to be admired, if we could forget the pretended apostolic robe which he smirched with perfidious politics and stained with blood.

But the immediate predecessors of Julius II., Sixtus IV. and Alexander VI., had had nothing in their characters to lure attention from the hideous examples of bestial wickedness which they set before the world. Alexander, especially, the infamous Borgia,—systematic murderer and robber, liar and libertine,—accomplished practitioner of every crime and every vice that

was known to the worst society of a depraved generation, and shamelessly open in the foulest of his doings,—there is scarcely a pagan monster of antiquity that is not whitened by comparison with him. Yet he sat in the supposed seat of St. Peter for eleven years, to be venerated as the Vicar of Christ, the "Holy Father" of the Christian Church; his declarations and decrees in matters of faith to be accepted as infallible inspirations; his absolution to be craved as a passport to Heaven; his anathema to be dreaded as a condemnation to Hell!

This evil and malignant being died in 1503, poisoned by one of his own cups, which he had brewed for another. Julius II. reigned until 1513; and after him came the Medicean Pope, Leo X., son of Lorenzo the Magnificent,—princely and worldly as Julius, but in gentler fashion; loving ease, pleasure, luxury, art, and careless of all that belonged to religion beyond its ceremonies and its comfortable establishment of clerical estates. Is it strange that Christendom was prepared to give ear to Luther?

Luther and the Reformation.

When Luther raised his voice, he did but renew a protest which many pure and pious and courageous men before him had uttered, against evils in the Church and falsities and impostures in the Papacy. But some of them, like Arnold of Brescia, like Peter Waldo, and the Albigenses, had been too far in advance of their time, and their revolt was hopeless from the beginning. Wyclif's movement had been timed unfortunately in an age of great commotions, which swallowed it up. That of Huss had roused an ignorant peasantry, too uncivilized to represent a reformed Christianity, and had been ruined by the fierceness of their misguided zeal. The Reformation of Savonarola, at Florence, had been nobly begun, but not wisely led, and it had spent its influence at the end on aims less religious than political.

But there occurred a combination, when Luther arose, of character in himself, of circumstances in his country, and of temper in his generation, which made his protest more lastingly effective. He had high courage, without rashness. He had earnestness and ardor, without fanaticism. He had the plain good sense and sound judgment which win public confidence. His substantial learning put him on terms with the scholars of his day, and he was not so much refined by it as to lose touch with the common people. A certain coarseness in his nature was not offensive to the time in which he lived, but rather belonged among the elements of power in him. His spirituality was not fine, but it was strong. He was sincere, and men believed in him. He was open, straightforward, manly, commanding respect. His qualities showed themselves in his speech, which went straight to its mark, in the simplest words, moulding the forms and phrases of the German language with more lasting effect than the speech of any other man who ever used it. Not many have lived in any age or any country who possessed the gift of so persuasive a tongue, with so powerful a character to command the hearing for it.

And the generation to which Luther spoke really waited for a bold voice to break into the secret of its thoughts concerning the Church. It had inherited a century of alienation from

quarreling popes and greedy, corrupted priests; and now there had been added in its feeling the deep abhorrence roused by such villains as the Borgia in the papal chair, and by their creatures and minions in the priesthood of the Church. If it is crediting too much to the common multitude of the time to suppose them greatly sickened by the vices and corruptions of their priests, we may be sure, at least, that they were wearied and angered by the exactions from them, which a vicious hierarchy continually increased. The extravagance of the Papacy kept pace with its degradation, and Christendom groaned under the burden of the taxes that were wrung from it in the name of the lowly Saviour of mankind.

Nowhere in Europe were the extortions of the Church felt more severely than in Germany, where the serfdom of the peasants was still real and hard, and where the depressing weight of the feudal system had scarcely been lifted from society at all. Feudalism had given way in that country less than in any other. Central authority remained as weak, and national solidification as far away, as ever. Of organic unity in the heterogeneous bundle of electoral principalities, duchies, margravates and free cities which made up the nominal realm of the King of the Romans, there was no more at the beginning of the sixteenth century than there had been in the twelfth. But that very brokenness and division in the political state of Germany proved to be one of the circumstances which favored the Protestant Reformation of the Church. Had monarchical authority established itself there as in France, then the Austro-Spanish family which wielded it, with the concentrated bigotry of their narrow-minded race, would have crushed the religious revolt as completely in Saxony as they did in Austria and Bohemia.

The Ninety-five Theses.

The main events of the Reformation in Germany are so commonly known that no more than the slightest sketching of them is needed here. Letters of indulgence, purporting to grant a remission of the temporal and purgatorial penalties of sin, had been sold by the Church for centuries; but none before Pope Leo X. had made merchandise of them in so peddler-like and shameful a fashion as that which scandalized the intelligent piety of Europe in 1517. Luther, then a professor in the new University of Wittenberg, Saxony, could not hide his indignation, as most men did. He stood forth boldly and challenged the impious fraud, in a series of propositions or theses, which, after the manner of the time, he nailed to the door of Wittenberg Church. Just that bold action was needed to let loose the pent-up feeling of the German people. The ninety-five theses were printed and went broadcast through the land, to be read and to be listened to, and to stir every class with independent ideas. It was the first great appeal made to the public opinion of the world, after the invention of printing had put a trumpet to the mouths of eloquent men, and the effect was too amazing to be believed by the careless Pope and his courtiers.

Political Circumstances.

But more than possibly — probably, indeed — the popular feeling stirred up would never have accomplished the rupture with Rome and the religious independence to which North Germany

attained in the end, if political motives had not coincided with religious feelings to bring certain princes and great nobles into sympathy with the Monk of Wittenberg. The Elector of Saxony, Luther's immediate sovereign, had long been in opposition to the Papacy on the subject of its enormous collections of money from his subjects, and he was well pleased to have the hawking of indulgences checked in his dominions. Partly for this reason, partly because of the pride and interest with which he cherished his new University, partly from personal liking and admiration of Luther, and partly, too, no doubt, in recognition of the need of Church reforms, he gave Luther a quiet protection and a concealed support. He was the strongest and most influential of the princes of the Empire, and his obvious favor to the movement advanced it powerfully and rapidly.

At first, there was no intention to break with the Papacy and the Papal Church,—certainly none in Luther's mind. His attitude towards both was conciliatory in every way, except as concerned the falsities and iniquities which he had protested against. It was not until the Pope, in June, 1520, launched against him the famous Bull, "Exurge Domine," which left no alternative between abject submission and open war, that Luther and his followers cast off the authority of the Roman Church and its head, and grounded their faith upon Holy Scripture alone. By formally burning the Bull, Luther accepted the papal challenge, and those who believed with him were ready for the contest.

The Diet of Worms.

In 1521, the reformer was summoned before a Diet of the Empire, at Worms, where a hearing was given him. The influence of the Church, and of the young Austro-Spanish Emperor, Charles V., who adhered to it, was still great enough to procure his condemnation; but they did not dare to deal with him as Huss had been dealt with. He was suffered to depart safely, pursued by an imperial edict which placed the ban of the Empire on all who should give him countenance or support. His friends among the nobles spirited him away and concealed him in a castle, the Wartburg, where he remained for several months, employed in making his translation of the Bible. Meantime, the Emperor had been called away from Germany by his multifarious affairs, in the Netherlands and Spain, and had little attention to give to Luther and the questions of religion for half-a-dozen years. He was represented in Germany by a Council of Regency, with the Elector of Saxony at the head of it; and the movement of reformation, if not encouraged in his absence, was at least considerably protected. It soon showed threatening signs of wildness and fanaticism in many quarters; but Luther proved himself as powerful in leadership as he had been in agitation, and the religious passion of the time was controlled effectively, on the whole.

Organization of the Lutheran Church.

Before the close of the year 1521, Pope Leo X. died, and his successor, Adrian, while insisting upon the enforcement of the Edict of Worms against Luther and his supporters, yet acknowledged the corruptions of the Church and promised a reformation of them. His promises came

too late; his confessions only gave testimony to the independent reformers which their opponents could not impeach. There was no longer any thought of cleansing the Church of Rome, to abide in it. A separated — a restored Church — was clearly determined on, and Luther framed a system of faith and discipline which was adopted in Saxony, and then accepted very generally by the reformed Churches throughout Germany. In 1525, the Elector Frederick of Saxony died. He had quietly befriended the Lutherans and tolerated the reform, but never identified himself with them. His brother, John, who succeeded him, made public profession of his belief in the Lutheran doctrines, and authoritatively established the church system which Luther had introduced. The Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, the Margrave of Brandenburg, and the Dukes of Mecklenburg, Pomerania and Zell, followed his example; while the imperial cities of Frankfort, Nuremberg, Bremen, Strasburg, Brunswick, Nordhausen, and others, formally ranged themselves on the same side. By the year 1526, when a diet at Spire declared the freedom of each state in the Empire to deal with the religious reform according to its own will, the Reformation in Germany was a solidly organized fact. But those of the reform had not yet received their name, of "Protestants." That came to them three years later, when the Roman party had rallied its forces in a new diet at Spire, to undo the declaration of 1526, and the leaders of the Lutheran party recorded their solemn protest.

The Austro-Burgundian Marriage.

To understand the situation politically, during the period of struggle for and against the Reformation, it will be necessary to turn back a little, for the noting of important occurrences which have not been mentioned.

When Albert II., who was King of Hungary and Bohemia, as well as King of the Romans (Emperor-elect, as the title came to be, soon afterwards), died, in 1439, he was succeeded by his second cousin Frederick III., Duke of Styria, and from that time the Roman or imperial crown was held continuously in the Austrian family, becoming practically hereditary. But Frederick did not succeed to the duchy of Austria, and he failed of election to the throne in Hungary and Bohemia. Hence his position as Emperor was peculiarly weak and greatly impoverished, through want of revenue from any considerable possessions of his own. During his whole long reign, of nearly fifty-four years, Frederick was humiliated and hampered by his poverty; the imperial authority was brought very low, and Germany was in a greatly disordered state. There were frequent wars between its members, and between Austria and Bohemia, with rebellions in Vienna and elsewhere; while the Hungarians were left to contend with the aggressive Turks, almost unhelped.

But in 1477 a remarkable change in the circumstances and prospects of the family of the Emperor Frederick III. was made by the marriage of his son and heir, Maximilian, to Mary, the daughter and heiress of the wealthy and powerful Duke of Burgundy, Charles the Bold. The bridegroom was so poor that the bride is said to have loaned him the money which enabled him to make a fit appearance at the wedding. She had lost, as we saw, the duchy of

Burgundy, but the valiant arm of Maximilian enabled her to hold the Burgundian county, Franche Comté, and the rich provinces of the Netherlands, which formed at that time, perhaps, the most valuable principality in Europe. The Duchess Mary lived only five years after her marriage; but she left a son, Philip, who inherited the Netherlands and Franche Comté, and Maximilian ruled them as his guardian.

In 1493, the Emperor Frederick died, and Maximilian, who had been elected King of the Romans some years before, succeeded him in the imperial office. He was never crowned at Rome, and he took the title, not used before, of King of Germany and Emperor-elect. He was Archduke of Austria, Duke of Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, and Count of Tyrol; and, with his guardianship in the Low Countries, he rose greatly in importance and power above his father. But he accomplished less than might possibly have been done by a ruler of more sureness of judgment and fixity in purpose. His plans were generally beyond his means, and the failures in his undertakings were numerous. He was eager to interfere with the doings of Charles VIII. and Louis XIII. in Italy; but the Germanic diet gave him so little support that he could do nothing effective. He joined the League of Cambrai against Venice, and the Holy League against France, but bore no important part in either. His reign was signalized in Germany by the division of the nation into six administrative "Circles," afterwards increased to ten, and by the creation of a supreme court of appeal, called the Imperial Chamber, — both of which measures did something towards the diminution of private wars and disorders.

The Austro-Spanish Marriage.—Charles V.

But Maximilian figures most conspicuously in history as the immediate ancestor of the two great sovereign dynasties — the Austrian and the Austro-Spanish — which sprang from his marriage with Mary of Burgundy and which dominated Europe for a century after his death. His son Philip, heir to the Burgundian sovereignty of the Netherlands, married (1496) Joanna, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. Two children, Charles and Ferdinand, were the fruit of this marriage. Charles, the elder, inherited more crowns and coronets than were ever gathered, in reality, by one sovereign, before or since. Ferdinand and Isabella had united by their marriage the kingdoms of Aragon and Castile, and, by the conquest of Granada and the partial conquest of Navarre, the entire peninsula, except Portugal, was subsequently added to their joint dominion. Joanna inherited the whole, on the death of Isabella, in 1504, and the death of Ferdinand, in 1516. She also inherited from her father, Ferdinand, the kingdom of the Two Sicilies — which he had reunited — and the island of Sardinia. Philip, on his side, already in possession of the Netherlands and Franche Comté, was heir to the domain of the House of Austria. Both of these great inheritances descended in due course to Charles, and he had not long to wait for them. His father, Philip, died in 1506, and his mother, Joanna, lost her mind, through grief at that event. The death of his Spanish grandfather, Ferdinand, occurred in 1516, and that of his Austrian grandfather, the Emperor Maximilian, followed three

years later. At the age of twenty years (representing his mother in her incapacity) Charles found himself sovereign of Spain, and America, of Sicily, Naples, Sardinia, the Low Countries, Franche Comté, Austria, and the duchies associated with it. The same year (1519) he was chosen King of Germany and Emperor-elect, after a keen contest over the imperial crown, in which Francis I. of France and Henry VIII. of England were his competitors. On attaining this dignity, he conferred the Austrian possessions on his brother Ferdinand. But he remained the most potent and imposing monarch that Europe had seen since Charlemagne. He came upon the stage just as Luther had marshalled, in Germany, the reforming forces of the new era, against intolerable iniquities in the Papal Church. Unfortunately, he came, with his vast armament of powers, to resist the demands of his age, and to be the champion of old falsities and wrongs, both in Church and State. There was nothing in the nature of the man, nor in his education, nor in the influences which bore upon him, from either the Spanish or the Austrian side of his family, to put him in sympathy with lifting movements or with liberal ideas. He never formed a conception of the world in which it looked larger to his eyes, or signified more to him, than the globe upon his scepter.

So, naturally enough, this Cæsar of the Renaissance (Charles V. in Germany and Charles I. in Spain) did his utmost, from the day he climbed the throne, to thrust Europe back into the murk of the fourteenth century, which he found it pretty nearly escaped from. He did not succeed; but he gave years of misery to several countries by his exertions, and he resigned the task to a successor whom the world is never likely to tire of abhorring and despising.

The end of popular freedom in Spain.

The affairs which called Charles V. away from Germany, after launching his ineffectual edict of Worms against Luther and Luther's supporters, grew in part out of disturbances in his kingdom of Spain. His election to the imperial office had not been pleasing to the Spaniards, who anticipated the complications they would be dragged into by it, the foreign character which their sovereign (already foreign in mind by his education in the Netherlands) would be confirmed in, and the indifference with which their grievances would be regarded. For their grievances against the monarchy had been growing serious in the last years of Ferdinand, and since his death. The crown had gained power in the process of political centralization, and its aggrandizement from the possession of America began to loom startlingly in the light of the conquest of Mexico, just achieved. During the absence of Charles in Germany, his former preceptor, Cardinal Adrian, of Utrecht, being in charge of the government as regent, a revolt broke out at Toledo which spread widely and became alarming. The insurgents organized their movement under the name of the Santa Junta, or Holy League, and having obtained possession of the demented Queen, Joanna, they assumed to act for her and with her authority. This rebellion was suppressed with difficulty; but the suppression was accomplished (1521-1522), and it proved to be the last struggle for popular freedom in Spain. The government used its victory with an unsparing determination

to establish absolute powers, and it succeeded. The conditions needed for absolutism were already created, in fact, by the deadly blight which the Inquisition had been casting upon Spain for forty years. Since the beginning of the frightful work of Torquemada, in 1483, it had been diligently searching out and destroying every germ of free thought and manly character that gave the smallest sign of fruitfulness in the kingdom; and the crushing of the Santa Junta may be said to have left few in Spain who deserved a better fate than the political, the religious and the intellectual servitude under which the nation sank.

Persecution of the Spanish Moriscoes.

Charles, whose mind was dense in its bigotry, urged on the Inquisition, and pointed its dreadful engines of destruction against the unfortunate Moriscoes, or Moors, who had been forced to submit to Christian baptism after their subjugation. Many of these followers of Mahomet had afterwards taken up again the prayers and practices of their own faith, either secretly or in quiet ways, and their relapse appears to have been winked at, more or less. For they were a most useful people, far surpassing the Spaniards in industry, in thrift and knowledge of agriculture, and in mechanical skill. Many of the arts and manufactures of the kingdom were entirely in their hands. It was ruinous to interfere with their peaceful labors. But Charles, as heathenish as the Grand Turk when it suited his ends to be so, could look on these well-behaved and useful Moors with no eyes but the eyes of an orthodox piety, and could take account of nothing but their infidel faith. He began, therefore, in 1524, the heartless, senseless and suicidal persecution of the Moriscoes which exterminated them or drove them from the land, and which contributed signally to the making of Spain an exemplary pauper among the nations.

Despotism of Charles V. in the Netherlands.

In his provinces of the Low Countries, Charles found more than in Spain to provoke his despotic bigotry. The Flemings and the Dutch had been tasting of freedom too much for his liking, in recent years, and ideas, both political and religious, had been spreading among them, which were not the ideas of his august mind, and must therefore, of necessity, be false. They had already become infected with the rebellious anti-papal doctrines of Luther. Indeed, they had been even riper than Luther's countrymen for a religious revolution, when he sounded the signal note which echoed through all northern Europe. In Germany, the elected emperor could fulminate an edict against the audacious reformers, but he had small power to give force to it. In the Netherlands, he possessed a sovereignty more potent, and he took instant measures to exercise the utmost arbitrariness of which he could make it capable. The Duchess Margaret, his aunt, who had been governess of the provinces, was confirmed by him in that office, and he enlarged the powers in her commission. His commands practically superseded the regular courts, and subjected the whole administration of justice to his arbitrary will and that of his representative. At the same time they stripped the States of their legislative functions and reduced them to insignificance. Having thus trampled on the civil liberties of the provinces, he borrowed the

infernal enginery of the Inquisition, and introduced it for the destruction of religious freedom. Its first victims were two Augustine monks, convicted of Lutheranism, who were burned at Brussels, in July, 1523. The first martyr in Holland was a priest who suffered impalement as well as burning, at the Hague, in 1525. From these beginnings the persecution grew crueler as the alienation of the stubborn Netherlanders from the Church of Rome widened; and Charles did not cease to fan its fires with successive proclamations or "placards," which denounced and forbade every reading of Scripture, every act of devotion, every conversation of religion, in public or private, which the priests of the Church did not conduct. "The number of Netherlanders who were burned, strangled, beheaded, or buried alive, in obedience to his edicts, . . . have been placed as high as 100,000 by distinguished authorities, and have never been put at a lower mark than 50,000."

Charles V. and Francis I. in Italy.

These exercises of an autocratic piety in Spain and the Low Countries may be counted, perhaps, among the pleasures of the young Emperor during the earlier years of his reign. His more serious affairs were connected mainly with his interests or ambitions in Italy, which seemed to be threatened by the King of France. The throne in that country was now occupied by Francis I., a cousin of Louis XII., who had succeeded the latter in 1515, and who had taken up anew the Italian projects in which Louis failed. In the first year of his reign, he crossed the Alps with an army, defeated the Swiss whom the Duke of Milan employed against him, and won the whole duchy by that single fight. This re-establishment of the French at Milan was regarded with exceeding jealousy by the Austrian interest, and by the Pope. Maximilian, shortly before his death, had made a futile effort to dislodge them, and Charles V., on coming to the throne, lost no time in organizing plans to the same end. He entered into an alliance with Pope Leo X., by a treaty which bears the same date as the Edict of Worms against Luther, and there can be little doubt that the two instruments were part of one understanding. Both parties courted the friendship of Henry VIII. of England, whose power and importance had risen to a high mark, and Henry's able minister, Cardinal Wolsey, figured notably in the diplomatic intrigues which went on during many years.

War began in 1521, and in three months the French were expelled from nearly every part of the Milanese territory. Pope Leo X. lived just long enough to receive the news. His successor was Adrian VI., former tutor of the Emperor, who made vain attempts to arrange a peace. Wolsey had brought Henry VIII. of England into the alliance against Francis, expecting to win the papal tiara through the Emperor's influence; but he was disappointed.

Francis made an effort in 1523 to recover Milan; but was crippled at the moment of sending his expedition across the Alps by the treason of the most powerful noble of France, the Constable, Charles, Duke of Bourbon. The Constable had been wronged and affronted by the King's mother, and by intriguers at court, and he revenged himself basely by going over to the enemies of his country. In the campaigns which followed (1523-

1524), the French had ill-success, and lost their chivalrous and famous knight, Bayard, in one of the last skirmishes of their retreat. Another change now occurred in the occupancy of the papal throne, and Wolsey's ambitious schemes were foiled again. The new Pope was Giulio de' Medici, who took the name of Clement VII.

Once more the King of France, in October, 1524, led his forces personally into Italy and laid siege to Pavia. It was a ruinous undertaking. He was defeated overwhelmingly in a battle fought before Pavia (February 24, 1525) and taken prisoner. After a captivity in Spain of nearly a year, he regained his freedom disgracefully, by signing and solemnly swearing to a treaty which he never intended to observe. By this treaty he not only renounced all claims to Milan, Naples, Genoa, and other Italian territory, but he gave up the duchy of Burgundy. Released in good faith on these terms, in the early part of 1526, he perfidiously repudiated the treaty, and began fresh preparations for war. He found the Italians now as ready to oust the Spaniards from their peninsula with French help, as they had been ready before to expel the French with help from Spain. The papal interest was in great alarm at the power acquired by the Emperor, and Venice and Milan shared the feeling. A new "Holy Alliance" was accordingly formed, with the Pope at its head, and with Henry VIII. of England for its "Protector." But before this League took the field with its forces, Rome and Italy were stricken and trampled, as though by a fresh invasion of Goths.

Sack of Rome, by the army of the Constable.

The imperial army, quartered in the duchy of Milan, under the command of the Constable Bourbon, was scantily paid and fed. The soldiers were forced to plunder the city and country for their subsistence, and, of course, under those circumstances, there was little discipline among them. The region which they terrorized was soon exhausted, by their robberies and by the stoppage of industries and trade. It then became necessary for the Constable to lead them to new fields, and he moved southwards. His forces were made up in part of Spaniards and in part of Germans—the latter under a Lutheran commander, and enlisted for war with the Pope and for pillage in Italy. He directed the march to Rome, constrained, perhaps, by the demands of his soldiery, but expecting, likewise, to crush the League by seizing its apostolic head. On the 5th of May, 1527, his 40,000 brigands arrived before the city. At daybreak, the next morning, they assaulted the walls irresistibly and swarmed over them. Bourbon was killed in the assault, and his men were left uncontrolled masters of the venerable capital of the world. They held it for seven months, pillaging and destroying, committing every possible excess and every imaginable sacrilege. Rome is believed to have suffered at their hands more lasting defacement and loss of the splendors of its art than from the sacking of Vandals or Goths.

The Pope held out in Castle St. Angelo for a month and then surrendered. The hypocritical Charles V., when he learned what his imperially commissioned bandits had done, made haste to express horror and grief, but did not hasten to check or repair the outrage in the least. Pope Clement was not released from captivity until a

great money-payment had been extorted from him, with the promise of a general council of the Church to reform abuses and to eradicate Lutheranism.

Spanish Domination in Italy.

Europe was shocked by the barbarity of the capture of Rome, and the enemies leagued against Charles were stimulated to more vigorous exertions. Assisted with money from England, Francis sent another army into Italy, which took Genoa and Pavia and marched to Naples, blockading the city by sea and land. But the siege proved fatal to the French army. So many perished of disease that the survivors were left at the mercy of the enemy, and capitulated in September, 1528.

The great Genoese Admiral, Andrea Doria, had been offended, meantime, by King Francis, and had excited his fellow citizens to a revolution, which made Genoa, once more, an independent republic, with Doria at its head. Shortly before this occurred, Florence had expelled the Medici and reorganized her government upon the old republican basis. But the defeat of the French before Naples ended all hope of Italian liberty; since the Pope resigned himself after that event to the will of the Emperor, and the papal and imperial despotisms became united as one, to exterminate freedom from the peninsula. Florence was the first victim of the combination. The city was besieged and taken by the Emperor's troops, in compliance with the wishes of the Pope, and the Medici, his relatives, were restored. Francis continued war feebly until 1529, when a peace called the "Ladies Peace" was brought about, by negotiations between the French King's mother and the Emperor's aunt. This was practically the end of the long French wars in Italy.

Germany.

Such were the events which, in different quarters of the world, diverted the attention of the Emperor during several years from Luther and the Reformation in Germany. The religious movement in those years had been making a steady advance. Yet its enemies gained control of another Diet held at Spire in 1529 and reversed the ordinance of the Diet of 1526, by which each state had been left free to deal in its own manner with the edict of Worms. Against this action of the Diet, the Lutheran princes and the representatives of the Lutheran towns entered their solemn protest, and so acquired the name, "Protestants," which became in time the accepted and adopted name of all, in most parts of the world, who withdrew from the Roman communion.

The Peasants' War and the Anabaptists.

Before this time, the Reform had passed through serious trials, coming from excesses in the very spirit out of which itself had risen and to which it gave encouragement. The long suffering, much oppressed peasantry of Germany, who had found bishops as pitiless extortioners as lords, caught eagerly at a hope of relief from the overthrow of the ancient Church. Several times within the preceding half-century they had risen in formidable revolts, with a peasants' clog, or *bundschuh* for their banner. In 1525 fresh risings occurred in Swabia, Franconia, Alsace, Lorraine, Bavaria, Thuringia and elsewhere, and a great

Peasants' War raged for months, with ferocity and brutality on both sides. The number who perished in the war is estimated at 100,000. The demands made by the peasants were for measures of the simplest justice—for the poorest rights and privileges in life. But their cause was taken up by half-crazed religious fanatics, who became in some parts their leaders, and such a character was given to it that reasonable reformers were justified, perhaps, in setting themselves sternly against it. The wildest prophet of the outbreak was one Thomas Münzer, a precursor of the frenzied sect of the Anabaptists. Münzer perished in the wreck of the peasants' revolt; but some of his disciples, who fled into Westphalia and the Netherlands, made converts so rapidly in the town of Münster that in 1535 they controlled the city, expelled every inhabitant who would not join their communion, elected and crowned a king, and exhibited a madness in their proceedings that is hardly equalled in history. The experience at Münster may reasonably be thought to have proved the soundness of Luther's judgment in refusing countenance to the cause of the oppressed peasants when they rebelled.

At all events, his opposition to them was hard and bitter. And it has been remarked that what may be called Luther's political position in Germany had become by this time quite changed. "Instead of the man of the people, Luther became the man of the princes; the mutual confidence between him and the masses, which had supported the first faltering steps of the movement, was broken; the democratic element was supplanted by the aristocratic; and the Reformation, which at first had promised to lead to a great national democracy, ended in establishing the territorial supremacy of the German princes. . . . The Reformation was gradually assuming a more secular character, and leading to great political combinations" (Dyer).

Progress of Lutheranism in Germany.

By the year 1530, the Emperor Charles was prepared to give more attention to affairs in Germany and to gratify his animosity towards the movement of Reformation. He had effectually beaten his rival, the King of France, had established his supremacy in Italy, had humbled the Pope, and was quite willing to be the zealous champion of a submissive Church. His brother Ferdinand, the Archduke of Austria, had secured, against much opposition, both the Hungarian and the Bohemian crowns, and so firmly that neither was ever again wrested from his family, though they continued for some time to be nominally elective. The dominions of Ferdinand had suffered a great Turkish invasion, in 1529, under the Sultan Solymán, who penetrated even to Vienna and besieged the city, but without success, losing heavily in his retreat.

In May, 1530, Charles re-entered Germany from Italy. The following month he opened the sitting of the Diet, which had been convened at Augsburg. His first act at Augsburg was to summon the protesting princes, of Saxony, Hesse, Brandenburg, and other states, before him and to signify to them his imperial command that the toleration of Lutheranism in their dominions must cease. He expected the mandate to suffice; when he found it ineffectual, he required an abstract of the new religious doctrines to be laid before him. This was prepared by Melancthon, and,

afterwards known as the Confession of Augsburg, became the Lutheran standard of faith. The Catholic theologians prepared a reply to it, and both were submitted to the Emperor. He made some attempt to bring about a compromise of the differences, but he demanded of the Protestants that they should submit themselves to the Pope, pending the final decisions of a proposed general Council of the Church. When this was refused, the Diet formally condemned their doctrines and required them to reunite themselves with the Catholic Church before the 15th of April following. The Emperor, in November, issued a decree accordingly, renewing the Edict of Worms and commanding its enforcement.

The Protestant princes, thus threatened, assembled in conference at Schmalkald at Christmas, 1530, and there organized their famous armed league. But fresh preparations for war by the Turk now compelled Charles to make terms with his Lutheran subjects. They refused to give any assistance to Austria or Hungary against the Sultan, while threatened by the Augsburg decree. The gravity of the danger forced a concession to them, and by the Peace of Nuremberg (1532) it was agreed that the Protestants should have freedom of worship until the next Diet should meet, or a General Council should be held. This peace was several times renewed, and there were ten years of quiet under it, in Germany, during which time the cause of Protestantism made rapid advances. By the year 1540, it had established an ascendancy in Würtemberg, among the states of the South, and in the imperial cities of Nuremberg, Augsburg, Ulm, Constance, and Strasburg. Its doctrines had been adopted by "the whole of central Germany, Thuringia, Saxony, Hesse, part of Brunswick, and the territory of the Guelphs; in the north by the bishoprics of Magdeburg, Halberstadt, and Naumburg . . . ; by East Friesland, the Hanse Towns, Holstein and Schleswig, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Anhalt, Silesia, the Saxon states, Brandenburg, and Prussia. Of the larger states that were closed against it there remained only Austria, Bavaria, the Palatinate and the Rhenish Electorates" (Hausser). In 1542, Duke Henry of Brunswick, the last of the North German princes who adhered to the Papal Church, was expelled from his duchy and Protestantism established. About the same time the Archbishop-Elector of Cologne announced his conviction of the truth of the Protestant doctrines.

The Schmalkaldic War.

Charles was still too much involved in foreign wars to venture upon a struggle with the Lutherans; but a few years more sufficed to free his hands. The Treaty of Crespy, in 1544, ended his last conflict with Francis I. In the same year, Pope Paul III. summoned the long promised General Council of the Church to meet at Trent the following spring—by which appointment a term was put to the toleration conceded in the Peace of Nuremberg. The Protestants, though greatly increased in numbers, were now less united than at the time of the formation of the Schmalkaldic League. There was much division among the leading princes. They yielded no longer to the influence of their wisest and ablest chief, Philip of Hesse. Luther, whose counsels had always been for peace, approached his end, and died in 1546. The circumstances were favorable to the Emperor, when he determined to put

a stop to the Reformation by force. He secured an important ally in the very heart of Protestant Germany, winning over to his side the selfish schemer, Duke Maurice of Saxony—now the head of the Albertine branch of the Saxon house. In 1546 he felt prepared and war began. The successes were all on the imperial side. There was no energy, no unity, no forethoughtfulness of plan, among the Lutherans. The Elector, John Frederick, of Saxony, and Philip of Hesse, both fell into the Emperor's hands and were barbarously imprisoned. The former was compelled to resign his Electorate, and it was conferred upon the renegade Duke Maurice. Philip was kept in vile places of confinement and inhumanly treated for years. The Protestants of Germany were entirely beaten down, for the time being, and the Emperor imposed upon them in 1548 a confession of faith called "the Interim," the chief missionaries of which were the Spanish soldiers whom he had brought into the country. But if the Lutherans had suffered themselves to be overcome, they were not ready to be trodden upon in so despotic a manner. Even Maurice, now Elector of Saxony, recoiled from the tyranny which Charles sought to establish, while he resented the inhuman treatment of Philip of Hesse, who was his father-in-law. He headed a new league, therefore, which was formed against the Emperor, and which entered into a secret alliance with Henry II. of France (Francis I. having died in 1547). Charles was taken by surprise when the revolt broke out, in 1552, and barely escaped capture. The operations of Maurice were vigorous and ably conducted, and in a few weeks the Protestants had recovered all the ground lost in 1546-7; while the French had improved the opportunity to seize the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul and Verdun. The ultimate result was the so-called "Religious Peace of Augsburg," concluded in 1555, which gave religious freedom to the ruling princes of Germany, but none whatever to the people. It put the two religions on the same footing, but it was simply a footing of equal intolerance. Each ruler had the right to choose his own creed, and to impose it arbitrarily upon his subjects if he saw fit to do so. As a practical consequence, the final division of Germany between Protestantism and Catholicism was substantially determined by the princes and not by the people.

The humiliating failure of Charles V. to crush the Reformation in Germany was no doubt prominent among the experiences which sickened him of the imperial office and determined him to abdicate the throne, which he did in the autumn of 1556.

Reformation in Switzerland.

A generation had now passed since the Lutheran movement of Reformation was begun in Germany, and, within that time, not only had the wave of influence from Wittenberg swept over all western Europe, but other reformers had risen independently and contemporaneously, or nearly so, in other countries, and had co-operated powerfully in making the movement general. The earliest of these was the Swiss reformer, Ulrich Zwingli, who began preaching against indulgences and other flagrant abuses in the Church, at Zurich, in 1519, the same year in which Luther opened his attack. The effect of his preaching was so great that Zurich, four years later, had practically separated itself from the Roman

Church. From that beginning the Reformation spread so rapidly that in half-a-dozen years it had mastered most of the Cantons of Switzerland outside of the five Forest Cantons, where Catholicism held its ground with stubbornness. The two religions were then represented by two parties, which absorbed in themselves all the political as well as the religious questions of the day, and which speedily came to blows. The Catholics allied themselves with Ferdinand of Austria, and the Protestants with several of the imperial cities of Germany. But such an union between the Swiss and the German Protestants as seemed plainly desirable was prevented, mainly, by the dictatorial obstinacy of Luther. Zwingli's reforming ideas were broader, and at the same time more radical, than Luther's, and the latter opposed them with irreconcilable hostility. He still held with the Catholics to the doctrine of transubstantiation, which the Swiss reformer rejected. Hence Zwingli was no less a heretic in Luther's eyes than in the eyes of the pope, and the anathemas launched against him from Wittenberg were hardly less thunderous than those from Rome. So the two contemporaneous reformation movements, German and Swiss, were held apart from one another, and went on side by side, with little help or sympathy from one another.

In 1531 the Forest Cantons attacked and defeated the men of Zurich, and Zwingli was slain in the battle. Peace was then concluded on terms which left each canton free to establish its own creed, and each congregation free to do the same in the common territories of the confederation.

Reformation in France.

In France, the freer ideas of Christianity—the ideas less servile to tradition and to Rome—that were in the upper air of European culture when the sixteenth century began, had found some expression even before Luther spoke. The influence of the new classical learning, and of the "humanists" who imbibed its spirit, tended to that liberation of the mind, and was felt in the greatest center of the learning of the time, the University of Paris. But not sufficiently to overcome the conservatism of the Sorbonne—the theological faculty of the University; for Luther's writings were solemnly condemned and burned by it in 1521, and a persecution of those inclined toward the new doctrines was early begun. Francis I., in whose careless and coarse nature there was some taste for letters and learning, as well as for art, and who patronized in an idle way the Renaissance movements of his reign, seemed disposed at the beginning to be friendly to the religious Reformers. But he was too shallow a creature, and too profoundly unprincipled and false, to stand firmly in any cause of righteousness, and face such a power as that of Rome. His nobler sister, Margaret of Angoulême, who embraced the reformed doctrines with conviction, exerted a strong influence upon the king in their favor while she was by his side; but after her marriage to Henry d'Albret, King of Navarre, and after Francis had suffered defeat and shame in his war with Charles V., he was ready to make himself the servant of the Papacy for whatever it willed against his Protestant subjects, in order to have its alliance and support. So the persecution grew steadily more fierce, more systematic, and more determined, as the spirit of the Reformation spread more widely through the kingdom.

Calvin at Geneva.

One of the consequences of the persecution was the flight from France, in 1534, of John Calvin, who subsequently became the founder and the exponent of a system of Protestant theology which obtained wider acceptance in Europe than that of Luther. All minor differences were practically merged in the great division between these two theologies—the Lutheran and the Calvinistic—which split the Reformation in twain. After two years of wandering, Calvin settled in the free city of Geneva, where his influence very soon rose to so extraordinary a height that he transformed the commonwealth and ruled it, unselfishly, and in perfect piety, but with iron-handed despotism, for a quarter of a century.

The French Court.

The reign of Francis I. has one other mark in history, besides that of his persecution of the Reformers, his careless patronage of arts and letters, and his unsuccessful wars with the Emperor. He gave to the French Court—at least more than his predecessors had done—the character which made it in later French history so evil and mischievous a center of dissoluteness, of base intrigue, of national demoralization. It was invested in his time with the fascinations which drew into it the nobles of France and its men of genius, to corrupt them and to destroy their independence. It was in his time that the Court began to seem to be, in its own eyes, a kind of self-centered society, containing all of the French nation which needed or deserved consideration, and holding its place in the order of things quite apart from the kingdom which it helped its royal master to rule. Not to be of the Court was to be non-existent in its view; and thus every ambition in France was invited to push at its fatal doors.

Catherine de' Medici and the Guises.

Francis I. died in 1547, and was followed on the throne by his son Henry II., whose marriage to Catherine de' Medici, of the renowned Florentine family, was the most important personal act of his life. It was important in the malign fruits which it bore; since Catherine, after his death, gave an evil Italian bend-sinister to French politics, which had no lack of crookedness before. Henry continued the war with Charles V., and was afterwards at war with Philip II., Charles' son, and with England, the latter country losing Calais in the contest,—its last French possession. Peace was made in 1559, and celebrated with splendid tournaments, at one of which the French king received a wound that caused his death.

He left three sons, all weaklings in body and character, who reigned successively. The elder, Francis II., died the year following his accession. Although aged but seventeen when he died, he had been married some two years to Mary Stuart, the young queen of Scots. This marriage had helped to raise to great power in the kingdom a family known as the Guises. They were a branch of the ducal House of Lorraine, whose duchy was at that time independent of France, and, although the father of the family, made Duke of Guise by Francis I., had become naturalized in France in 1505, his sons were looked upon as foreigners by the jealous Frenchmen whom they supplanted at Court. Of the six

sons, there were two of eminence, one (the second duke of Guise) a famous general in his day, the other a powerful cardinal. Five sisters completed the family in its second generation. The elder of these, Mary, had married James V. of Scotland (whose mother was the English princess, Margaret, sister of Henry VIII.), and Mary Stuart, queen of Scots, born of that marriage, was therefore a niece of the Guises. They had brought about her marriage to Francis II., while he was dauphin, and they mounted with her to supreme influence in the kingdom when she ascended the throne with her husband. The queen-mother, Catherine de' Medici, was as eager as the Guises to control the government, in what appeared to her eyes the interest of her children; but during the short reign of Francis II. she was quite thrust aside, and the queen's uncles ruled the state.

The death of Francis II. (1560) brought a change, and with the accession of Charles IX., a boy of ten years, there began a bitter contest for ascendancy between Catherine and the Guises; and this struggle became mixed and strangely complicated with a deadly conflict of religions, which the steady advance of the Reformation in France had brought at this time to a crisis.

The Huguenots.

Under the powerful leadership which Calvin assumed, at Geneva, the reformed religion in France had acquired an organized firmness and strength which not only resisted the most cruel persecution, but made rapid headway against it. "Protestantism had become a party which did not, like Lutheranism in Germany, spring up from the depths." "It numbered its chief adherents among the middle and upper grades of society, spread its roots rather among the nobles than the citizens, and among learned men and families of distinction rather than among the people." "Some of the highest aristocracy, who were discontented, and submitted unwillingly to the supremacy of the Guises, had joined the Calvinistic opposition—some undoubtedly from policy, others from conviction. The Turennes, the Rohans, and Soubises, pure nobles, who addressed the king as 'mon cousin,' especially the Bourbons, the agnates of the royal house, had adopted the new faith" (Hausser). One branch of the Bourbons had lately acquired the crown of Navarre. The Spanish part of the old Navarrese kingdom had been subjugated and absorbed by Ferdinand of Aragon; but its territory on the French side of the Pyrenees—Béarn and other counties—still maintained a half independent national existence, with the dignity of a regal government. When Margaret of Angoulême, sister of Francis I., married Henry d'Albret, King of Navarre, as mentioned before, she carried to that small court an earnest inclination towards the doctrines of the Reform. Under her protection Navarre became largely Protestant, and a place of refuge for the persecuted of France. Margaret's daughter, the famous Jeanne d'Albret, espoused the reformed faith fully, and her husband, Antoine de Bourbon, as well as Antoine's brother, Louis de Condé, found it politic to profess the same belief. For the Protestants (who were now acquiring, in some unknown way, the name of Huguenots) had become so numerous and so compactly organized as to form a party capable of being wielded with great

effect, in the strife of court factions which the rivalry of Catherine and the Guises produced. Hence politics and religion were inextricably confused in the civil wars which broke out shortly after the death of Francis II. (1560), and the accession of the boy king, Charles IX. These wars belong to a different movement in the general current of European events, and we will return to them after a glance at the religious Reformation, and at the political circumstances connected with it, in England and elsewhere.

England.

Henry Tudor, Earl of Richmond, made king of England by his victory at Bosworth, established himself so firmly in the seat of power that three successive rebellions failed to disturb him. In one of these (1487) a pretender, Lambert Simnel, was put forward, who claimed to be the Earl of Warwick. In another (1491-1497) a second pretender, Perkin Warbeck, personated one of the young princes whom Richard III. had caused to be murdered in the tower. Neither of the impostures had much success in the kingdom. Henry VII. was not a popular king, but he was able and strong, and he solidified all the bases of monarchical independence which circumstances had enabled Edward IV. to begin laying down.

It was in the reign of Henry that America was discovered, and he might have been the patron of Columbus, the beneficiary of the great voyage, and the proprietor and lord of the grand realm which Isabella and Ferdinand secured. But he lacked the funds or the faith—apparently both—and put aside his unequaled opportunity. When the field of westward exploration had been opened, however, he was early in entering it, and sent the Cabots upon those voyages which gave England her claim to the North American coasts.

During the reign of Henry VII. there were two quiet marriages in his family which strangely influenced subsequent history. One was the marriage, in 1501, of the king's eldest son, Arthur, to Catherine of Aragon, youngest daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella. The other, in 1503, united the king's daughter, Margaret, to James IV., King of Scotland. It was through this latter marriage that the inheritance of the English crown passed to the Scottish House of Stuart, exactly one hundred years later, upon the failure of the direct line of descent in the Tudor family. The first marriage, of Prince Arthur to Catherine of Aragon, was soon dissolved by the death of the prince, in 1502. Seven years afterwards the widowed Catherine married her late husband's brother, just after he became Henry VIII., King of England, upon the death of his father, in 1509. Whence followed notable consequences which will presently appear.

Henry VIII. and his breach with Rome.

It was the ambition of Henry VIII. to play a conspicuous part in European affairs; and as England was rich and strong, and as the king had obtained nearly the absoluteness of the crown in France, the parties to the great contests then going on were all eagerly courting his alliance. His ambitions ran parallel, too, with those of the able minister, Thomas Wolsey, who rose to high influence at his side soon after his reign began. Wolsey aspired to the Papal crown, with the cardinal's cap as a preparatory adornment, and he

drew England, as we have seen, into the stormy politics of the sixteenth century in Europe, with no gain, of glory or otherwise, to the nation, and not much result of any kind. When the Emperor Maximilian died, in 1519, Henry entered the lists against Maximilian's grandson, Charles of Spain, and Francis I. of France, as a candidate for the imperial crown. In the subsequent wars which broke out between his two rivals, he took the side of the successful Charles, now Emperor, and helped him to climb to supremacy in Europe over the prostrate French king. He had dreams of conquering France again, and casting the glories of Henry V. in the shade; but he carried his enterprise little beyond the dreaming. When it was too late to check the growth of Charles' overshadowing power, he changed his side and took Francis into alliance.

But Henry's motives were always selfish and personal—never political; and the personal motives had now taken on a most despicable character. He had tired of his wife, the Spanish Catherine, who was six years older than himself. He had two pretexts for discontent with his marriage: 1, that his queen had borne him only a daughter, whereas England needed a male heir to the throne; 2, that he was troubled with scruples as to the lawfulness of wedlock with his brother's widow. On this latter ground he began intrigues to win from the Pope, not a divorce in the ordinary sense of the term, but a declaration of the nullity of his marriage. This challenged the opposition of the Emperor, Catherine's nephew, and Henry's alliances were naturally changed.

The Pope, Clement VII., refused to annul the marriage, and Henry turned his unreasoning wrath upon Cardinal Wolsey, who had conducted negotiations with the Pope and failed in them. Wolsey was driven from the Court in disgrace and died soon afterwards. He was succeeded in the king's favor by a more unscrupulous man, Thomas Cromwell. Henry had not yet despaired of bringing the Pope to compliance with his wishes; and he began attacks upon the Church and upon the papal revenues which might shake, as he hoped, the firmness of the powers at Rome. With the help of a pliant minister and a subservient Parliament, he forced the clergy (1531-1532) in Convocation to acknowledge him to be the Supreme Head of the English Church, and to submit themselves entirely to his authority. At the same time he grasped the "annates," or first year's income of bishoprics, which had been the richest perquisite of the papal treasury.

In all these proceedings, the English king was acting on a line parallel to that of the continental rising against Rome; but it was not in friendliness toward it nor in sympathy with it that he did so. He had been among the bitterest enemies of the Reformation, and he never ceased to be so. He had won from the Pope the empty title of "Defender of the Faith," by a foolish book against Luther, and the faith which he defended in 1521 was the faith in which he died. But when he found that the influence of Charles V. at Rome was too great to be overcome, and that the Pope could be neither bribed, persuaded nor coerced to sanction the putting away of his wife, he resolved to make the English Church sufficient in authority to satisfy his demand, by establishing its ecclesiastical independence, with a pontiff of its own, in himself. He purposed

nothing more than this. He contemplated no change of doctrine, no cleansing of abuses. He permitted no one whose services he commanded in the undertaking to bring such changes into contemplation. So far as concerned Henry's initiative, there was absolutely nothing of religious Reformation in the movement which separated the Church of England from the Church of Rome. It accomplished its sole original end when it gave finality to the decree of an English ecclesiastical court, on the question of the king's marriage, and barred queen Catherine's appeal from it. It was the intention of Henry VIII. that the Church under his papacy should remain precisely what it had been under the Pope at Rome, and he spared neither stake nor gibbet in his persecuting zeal against impudent reformers.

But the spirit of Reformation which was in the atmosphere of that time lent itself, nevertheless, to King Henry's project, and made that practicable which could hardly have been so a generation before. The influence of Wyclif had never wholly died out; the new learning was making its way in England and broadening men's minds; the voice of Luther and his fellow workers on the continent had been heard, and not vainly. England was ripe for the religious revolution, and her king promoted it, without intention. But while his reign lasted, and his despotism was heavy on the land, there was nothing accomplished but the breaking of the old Church fetters, and the binding of the nation anew with green withes, which, presently, it would burst asunder.

The conspicuous events of Henry's reign are familiarly known. Most of them bear the stamp of his monstrous egotism and selfishness. He was the incomparable tyrant of English history. The monarch who repudiated two wives, sent two to the block, and shared his bed with yet two more; who made a whole national church the servant of his lusts, and who took the lives of the purest men of his kingdom when they would not bend their consciences to say that he did well—has a pedestal quite his own in the gallery of infamous kings.

Edward VI. and the Reformation.

Dying in 1547, Henry left three children: Mary, daughter of Catherine of Aragon, Elizabeth, daughter of Anne Boleyn, and Edward, son of Jane Seymour. The latter, in his tenth year, became King (Edward VI.), and his uncle, the Duke of Somerset, acquired the control of the government, with the title of Protector. Somerset headed a party which had begun before the death of the king to press for more changes in the character of the new Church of England and less adherence to the pattern of Rome. There seems to be little reason to suppose that the court leaders of this party were much moved in the matter by any interest of a religious kind; but the growth of thinking and feeling in England tended that way, and the side of Reformation had become the stronger. They simply gave way to it, and abandoned the repression which Henry had persisted in. At the same time, their new policy gave them more freedom to grasp the spoils of the old Church, which Henry VIII. had begun to lay hands on, by suppression of monasteries and confiscation of their estates. The wealth thus sequestered went largely into private hands.

It was in the short reign of Edward VI. that the Church of England really took on its organic form as one of the Churches of the Reformation, by the composition of its first prayer-books, and by the framing of a definite creed.

Lady Jane Grey.

In 1553, the young king died. Somerset had fallen from power the previous year and had suffered death. He had been supplanted by Dudley, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland, and that minister had persuaded Edward to bequeath his crown to Lady Jane Grey, granddaughter of the younger sister of Henry VIII. But Northumberland was hated by the people, and few could recognize the right of a boy on the throne to change the order of regal succession by his will. Parliament had formally legitimated both Catherine's daughter, Mary, and Anne Boleyn's daughter, Elizabeth, and had placed them in the line of inheritance. Mary's legal title to the crown was clear. She had adhered with her mother to the Roman Church, and her advent upon the throne would mean the subjection of the English Church to the Papacy anew; since the constitution of the Church armed the sovereign with supreme and indisputable power over it. The Protestants of the kingdom knew what to expect, and were in great fear; but they submitted. Lady Jane Grey was recommended to them by her Protestant belief, and by her beautiful character; but her title was too defective and her supporters too much distrusted. There were few to stand by the poor young girl when Northumberland proclaimed her queen, and she was easily dethroned by the partisans of Mary. A year later she was sent to the block.

Catholicism was now ascendant again, and England was brought to share in the great reaction against the Reformation which prevailed generally through Europe and which we shall presently consider. Before doing so, let us glance briefly at the religious state of some other countries not yet touched upon.

The Reformation in Scotland.

In Scotland, a deep undercurrent of feeling against the corruptions of the Church had been repressed by resolute persecutions, until after the middle of the sixteenth century. Wars with England, and the close connection of the Scottish Court with the Guises of France, had both tended to retard the progress of a reform sentiment, or to delay the manifestation of it. But when the pent-up feeling began to respond to the voice of the great Calvinistic evangelist and organizer, John Knox, it swept the nation like a storm. Knox's first preaching, after his captivity in France and exile to Geneva, was in 1555. In 1560, the authority of the Pope was renounced, the mass prohibited, and the Geneva confession of faith adopted, by the Scottish Estates. After that time the Reformed Church in Scotland — the Church of Presbyterianism — had only to resist the futile hostility of Mary Stuart for a few years, until it came to its great struggle against English Episcopacy, under Mary's son and grandson, James and Charles.

The Reformation in the North.

In the three Scandinavian nations the ideas of the Reformation, diffused from Germany, had won early favor, both from kings and people,

and had soon secured an enduring foothold. They owed their reception quite as much, perhaps, to the political situation as to the religious feeling of the northern peoples.

When the ferment of the Reformation movement began, the three crowns were worn by one king, as they had been since the "Union of Calmar," in 1397, and the King of Denmark was the sovereign of the Union. His actual power in Sweden and Norway was slight; his theoretical authority was sufficient to irritate both. In Sweden, especially, the nobles chafed under the yoke of the profitless federation. Christian II., the last Danish king of the three kingdoms, crushed their disaffection by a harsh conquest of the country (1520), and by savage executions, so perfidious and so numerous that they are known in Swedish history as the Massacre of Stockholm. But this brutal and faithless king became so hateful in his own proper kingdom that the Danish nobles rose against him in 1523 and he was driven from the land. The crown was given to his uncle, Frederick, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein. In that German Duchy, Lutheranism had already made its way, and Frederick was in accord with it. On coming to the throne of Denmark, where Catholicism still prevailed, he pledged himself to attempt no interference with it; but he felt no obligation, on the other hand, to protect it. He demanded and established a toleration for both doctrines, and gave to the reformers a freedom of opportunity which speedily undermined the old faith and overthrew it.

In the meantime, Sweden had undergone the important revolution of her history, which placed the national hero, Gustavus Vasa, on the throne. Gustavus was a young noble whose title to the crown was not derived from his lineage, but from his genius. After Christian II. had bloodily exterminated the elder leaders of the Swedish state, this young lord, then a hostage and prisoner in the tyrant's hands, made his escape and took upon himself the mission of setting his country free. For three years Gustavus lived a life like that of Alfred the Great in England, when he, too, struggled with the Danes. His heroic adventures were crowned with success, and Sweden, led to independence by its natural king, bestowed the regal title upon him (1523) and seated him upon its ancient throne. The new Danish king, Frederick, acknowledged the revolution, and the Union of Calmar was dissolved. Sweden under Gustavus Vasa recovered from the state of great disorder into which it had fallen, and grew to be a nation of important strength. As a measure of policy, he encouraged the introduction of Lutheranism and promoted the spread of it, in order to break the power of the Catholic clergy, and also, in order, without doubt, to obtain possession of the property of the Church, which secured to the Crown the substantial revenues it required.

Italy.

In Italy, the reformed doctrines obtained no popular footing at any time, though many among the cultivated people regarded them with favor, and would gladly have witnessed, not only a practical purging of the Church, but a revision of those Catholic dogmas most offensive to a rational mind. But such little movement as stirred in that direction was soon stopped by the

success of the Emperor, Charles V., in his Italian wars with Francis I., and by the Spanish domination in the peninsula which ensued thereon. The Spain of that age was like the bloodless octopus which paralyzes the victim in its clutch, and Italy, gripped in half of its many principalities by the deadly tentacles thrust out from Madrid, showed no consciousness for the next two centuries.

The Council of Trent.

The long demanded, long promised General Council, for considering the alleged abuses in the Church and the alleged falsities in its doctrine, and generally for discussion and action upon the questions raised by the Reformation, assembled at Trent in December, 1545. The Emperor seems to have desired with sincerity that the Council might be one which the Protestants would have confidence in, and in which they might be represented, for a full discussion of their differences with Rome. But this was made impossible from the beginning. The Protestants demanded that "final appeal on all debated points should be made to the sole authority of Holy Scripture," and this being refused by the Pope (Paul III.), there remained no ground on which the two parties could meet. The Italian prelates who composed the majority of the Council made haste, it would seem, to take action which closed the doors of conciliation against the Reformers. "First, they declared that divine revelation was continuous in the Church of which the Pope was the head; and that the chief written depository of this revelation—namely, the Scriptures—had no authority except in the version of the Vulgate. Secondly, they condemned the doctrine of justification by Faith. . . . Thirdly, they confirmed the efficacy and the binding authority of the Seven Sacraments." "The Council terminated in December [1563] with an act of submission, which placed all its decrees at the pleasure of the Papal sanction. Pius [Pius IV. became Pope in 1560] was wise enough to pass and ratify the decrees of the Tridentine fathers by a Bull dated on December 26, 1563, reserving to the Papal sovereign the sole right of interpreting them in doubtful or disputed cases. This he could well afford to do; for not an article had been penned without his concurrence, and not a stipulation had been made without a previous understanding with the Catholic powers. The very terms, moreover, by which his ratification was conveyed, secured his supremacy, and conferred upon his successors and himself the privileges of a court of ultimate appeal. At no previous period in the history of the Church had so wide, so undefined, and so unlimited an authority been accorded to the See of Rome" (Symonds).

Some practical reforms in the Church were wrought by the Council of Trent, but its disciplinary decrees were less important than the dogmatic. From beginning to end of its sessions, which, broken by many suspensions and adjournments, dragged through eighteen years, it addressed itself to the task of solidifying the Church of Rome, as left by the Protestant schism,—not of healing the schism itself or of removing the provocations to it. The work which the Council did in that direction was of vast importance, and profoundly affected the future of the Papacy and of its spiritual realm. It gave a firm dogmatic footing to the great reactionary

new forces which now came into play, with aggressive enthusiasm and zeal, to arrest the advance of the Reformation and roll it back.

The Catholic reaction.

The extraordinary revival of Catholicism and thrusting back of Protestantism which occurred in the later half of the sixteenth century had several causes behind it and within it.

1. The spiritual impulse from which the Reformation started had considerably spent itself, or had become debased by a gross admixture of political and mercenary aims. In Germany, the spoils derived from the suppressing of monastic establishments and the secularizing of ecclesiastical fiefs and estates, appeared very early among the potent inducements by which mercenary princes were drawn to the side of the Lutheran reform. Later, as the opposing leagues, Protestant and Catholic, settled into chronic opposition and hostility, the struggle between them took on more and more the character of a great political game, and lost more and more the spirit of a battle for free conscience and a free mind. In France, as we have noticed, the political entanglements of the Huguenot party were such, by this time, that it could not fail to be lowered by them in its religious tone. In England, every breath of spirituality in the movement had so far (to the death of Henry VIII.) been stifled, and it showed nothing but a brazen political front to the world. In the Netherlands, the struggle for religious freedom was about to merge itself in a fight of forty years for self-government, and the fortitude and valor of the citizen were more surely developed in that long war than the faith and fervor of the Christian. And so, generally throughout Europe, Protestantism, in its conflict with the powers of the ancient Church, had descended, ere the sixteenth century ran far into its second half, to a distinctly lower plane than it occupied at first. On that lower plane Rome fronted it more formidably, with stronger arms, than on the higher.

2. Broadly stating the fact, it may be said that Protestantism made all its great inroads upon the Church of Rome before partisanship came to the rescue of the latter, and closed the open mind with which Luther, and Zwingli, and Farel, and Calvin were listened to at first. It happens always, when new ideas, combative of old ones, whether religious or political, are first put forward in the world, they are listened to for a time with a certain disinterestedness of attention—a certain native candor in the mind—which gives them a fair hearing. If they seem reasonable, they obtain ready acceptance, and spread rapidly,—until the conservatism of the beliefs assailed takes serious alarm, and the radicalism of the innovating beliefs becomes ambitious and rampant; until the for and the against stiffen themselves in opposing ranks, and the voice of argument is drowned by the cries of party. That ends all shifting of masses from the old to the new ground. That ends conversion as an epidemic and dwindles it to the sporadic character.

3. Protestantism became bitterly divided within itself at an early stage of its career by doctrinal differences, first between Zwinglians and Lutherans, and then between Lutherans and Calvinists, while Catholicism, under attack, settled into more unity and solidity than before.

4. The tremendous power in Europe to which the Spanish monarchy, with its subject

dominions, and its dynastic relations, had now risen, passed, in 1556, to a dull-brained and soulless bigot, who saw but one use for it, namely, the extinction of all dissent from his own beliefs, and all opposition to his own will. Philip II. differed from his father, Charles V., not in the enormity of his bigoted egotism—they were equals, perhaps, in that—but in the exclusiveness of it. There was something else in Charles, something sometimes faintly admirable. He did have some interests in life that were not purely malignant. But his horrid vampire of a son, the most repulsive creature of his kind in all history, had nothing in him that was not as deadly to mankind as the venom secreted behind the fang of a cobra. It was a frightful day for the world when a despotism which shadowed Spain, Sicily, Italy and the Low Countries, and which had begun to drag unbounded treasure from America, fell to the possession of such a being as this. Nothing substantial was taken away from the potent malevolence of Philip by his failure of election in Germany to the Imperial throne. On the contrary, he was the stronger for it, because all his dominion was real and all his authority might assume to be absolute. His father had been more handicapped than helped by his German responsibilities and embarrassments, which Philip escaped. It is not strange that his concentration of the vast machinery under his hands to one limited aim, of exterminating what his dull and ignorant mind conceived to be irreligion and treason, had its large measure of success. The stranger thing is, that there was fortitude and courage to resist such power, in even one corner of his realm.

5. The Papacy was restored at this time to the purer and higher character of its best ages, by well-guided elections, which raised in succession to the throne a number of men, very different in ability, and quite different, too, in the spirit of their piety, but generally alike in dignity and decency of life, and in qualities which command respect. The fiery Neapolitan zealot, Caraffa, who became Pope in 1555 as Paul IV.; his cool-tempered diplomatic successor, Pius IV., who manipulated the closing labors of the Council of Trent; the austere inquisitor, Pius V.; the more commonplace Gregory XIII., and the powerful Sixtus V., were pontiffs who gave new strength to Catholicism, in their different ways, both by what they did and by what they were.

6. The revival of zeal in the Roman Church, naturally following the attacks upon it, gave rise to many new religious organizations within its elastic fold, some reformatory, some missionary and militant, but all bringing an effectual reinforcement to it, at the time when its assailants began to show faltering signs. Among these was one—Loyola's Society of Jesus—which marched promptly to the front of the battle, and which contributed more than any other single force in the field to the rallying of the Church, to the stopping of retreat, and to the facing of its stubborn columns forward for a fresh advance. The Jesuits took such a lead and accomplished such results by virtue of the military precision of discipline under which they had been placed and to which they were singularly trained by the rules of the founder; and also by effect of a certain subtle sophistry that runs through their ethical maxims and their counsels of piety. They fought for their faith with a

sublime courage, with a devotion almost unparalleled, with an earnestness of belief that cannot be questioned; but they used weapons and modes of warfare which the higher moral feeling of civilized mankind, whether Christian or Pagan, has always condemned. It is not Protestant enemies alone who say this. It is the accusation that has been brought against them again and again in their own Church, and which has expelled them from Catholic countries, again and again. In the first century or more of their career, this plastic conscience, moulded by a passionate zeal, and surrendered, with every gift of mind and body, to a service of obedience which tolerated no evasion on one side nor bending on the other, made the Jesuits the most invincible and dangerous body of men that was ever organized for defense and aggression in any cause.

The order was founded in 1540, by a bull of Pope Paul III. At the time of Loyola's death, in 1556, it numbered about one thousand members, and under Lainez, the second general of the order, who succeeded Loyola at the head, it advanced rapidly, in numbers, in efficiency of organization, and in wide-spread influence.

Briefly stated, these are the incidents and circumstances which help to explain—not fully, perhaps, but almost sufficiently—the check to Protestantism and the restored energy and aggressiveness of the Catholic Church, in the later half of the sixteenth century.

The Ruin of Spain.

In his kingdoms of Spain, Philip II. may be said to have finished the work of death which his father and his father's grand-parents committed to him. They began it, and appointed the lines on which it was to be done. The Spain of their day had the fairest opportunity of any nation in Europe for a great and noble career. The golden gates of her opportunity were unlocked and opened by good Queen Isabella; but the pure hands of the same pious queen threw over the neck of her country the noose of a strangler, and tightened it prayerfully. Her grandson, who was neither pious nor good, flung his vast weight of power upon it. But the strangling balter of the Spanish Inquisition did not extinguish signs of life in his kingdom fast enough to satisfy his royal impatience, and he tightened other cords upon the suffering body and all its limbs. Philip, when he came to take up the murderous task, found every equipment for it that he could desire. He had only to gather the strands of the infernal mesh into his hands, and bring the strain of his awful sovereignty to bear upon them; then sit and watch the palsy of death creep over his dominions.

Of political life, Charles really left nothing for his son to kill. Of positive religious life, there can have been no important survival, for he and his Inquisition had been keenly vigilant; but Philip made much of the little he could discover. As to the industrial life of Spain, father and son were alike active in the murdering of it, and alike ingenious. They paralyzed manufactures, in the first instance, by persecuting and expelling the thrifty and skilful Moriscoes; then they made their work complete by heavy duties on raw materials. To extinguish the agricultural industries of the kingdom, they had happy inspirations. They prohibited the exportation of one

commodity after another—corn, cattle, wool, cloth, leather, and the like—until they had brought Spain practically to the point of being dependent on other countries for many products of skill, and yet of having nothing to offer in exchange, except the treasure of precious metals which she drew from America. Hence it happened that the silver and gold of the Peruvian and Mexican mines ran like quicksand through her fingers, into the coffers of the merchants of the Low Countries and of England; and, probably, no other country in Europe saw so little of them, had so little of benefit from them, as the country they were supposed to enrich.

If the killing of Spain needed to be made complete by anything more, Philip supplied the need, in the deadliness of his taxation. Spending vast sums in his attempt to repeat upon the Netherlands the work of national murder he had accomplished in Spain; losing, by the same act, the rich revenues of the thrifty provinces; launching into new expenditures as he pursued, by clumsy warfare, his mission of death into fresh fields, aiming now at the life of France, and now at the life of England,—he squeezed the cost of his armies and armadas from a country in which he had strangled production already, and made poverty the common estate. It was the last draining of the life-blood of a nation which ought to have been strong and great, but which suffered murder most foul and unnatural.

We hardly exaggerate even in figure when we say that Spain was a dead nation when Philip quitted the scene of his arduous labors. It is true that his successors still found something for their hands to do, in the ways that were pleasant to their race, and burned and bled and crushed the unhappy kingdom with indefatigable persistence; but it was really the corpse of a nation which they practised on. The life of Spain, as a breathing, sentient state, came to an end under the hands of Philip II., first of the Thugs.

Philip II. and the Netherlands.

The hand of Charles V. had been heavy on the Netherlands; but resistance to such a power as that of Spain in his day was hardly dreamed of. It was not easy for Philip to outdo his father's despotism; less easy to drive the laborious Hollanders and Flemings to desperation and force them into rebellious war. But he accomplished it. He filled the country with Spanish troops. He reorganized and stimulated the Inquisition. He multiplied bishoprics in the Provinces, against the wish of even the Catholic population. He scorned the counsels of the great nobles, and gave foreign advisers to the Regent, his half-sister, Margaret of Parma, illegitimate daughter of Charles V., whom he placed at the head of the government. His oppressions were endured, with increasing signs of hidden passion, for ten years. Then, in 1566, the first movement of patriotic combination appeared. It was a league among certain of the nobles; its objects were peaceful, its plans were legal; but it was not countenanced by the wiser of the patriots, who saw that events were not ripe. The members of the league went in solemn procession to the Regent with a petition; whereupon one of her councillors denounced them as "a troop of beggars." They promptly seized the epithet and appropriated it. A beggar's wallet became their emblem; the idea was caught up and carried

through the country, and a visible party rose quickly into existence.

The religious feeling now gained boldness. Enormous field-meetings began to be held, under arms, in every part of the open country, defying edicts and Inquisition. There followed a little later some fanatical and riotous outbreaks in several cities, breaking images and desecrating churches. Upon these occurrences, Philip despatched to the Netherlands, in the summer of 1567, a fresh army of Spanish troops, commanded by a man who was after his own heart—as mean, as false, as merciless, as little in soul and mind, as himself,—the Duke of Alva. Alva brought with him authority which practically superseded that of the Regent, and secret instructions which doomed every man of worth in the Provinces.

At the head of the nobility of the country, by eminence of character, no less than by precedence in rank, stood William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, who derived his higher title from a petty and remote principality, but whose large family possessions were in Flanders, Brabant, Holland and Luxemburg. Associated closely with him, in friendship and in political action, were Count Egmont, and the Admiral Count Horn, the latter of a family related to the Montmorencies of France. These three conspicuous nobles Philip had marked with special malice for the headman, though their solitary crime had been the giving of advice against his tyrannies. William of Orange—"the Silent," as he came to be known—far-seeing in his wisdom, and well-advised by trusty agents in Spain, withdrew into Germany before Alva arrived. He warned his friends of their danger and implored them to save themselves; but they were blinded and would not listen. The perfidious Spaniard lured them with flatteries to Brussels and thrust them into prison. They were to be the first victims of the appalling sacrifice required to appease the dull rage of the king. Within three months they had eighteen hundred companions, condemned like themselves to the scaffold, by a council in which Alva presided and which the people called "the Council of Blood." In June, 1568, they were brought to the block.

Meantime Prince William and his brother, Louis of Nassau, had raised forces in Germany and attempted the rescue of the terrorized Provinces; but their troops were ill-paid and mutinous and they suffered defeat. For the time being, the Netherlands were crushed. As many of the people as could escape had fled; commerce was at a standstill; workshops were idle; the cities, once so wealthy, were impoverished; death, mourning, and terror, were everywhere. Alva had done very perfectly what he was sent to do.

The first break in the blackness of the clouds appeared in April, 1572, when a fleet, manned by refugee adventurers who called themselves Sea-Beggars, attacked and captured the town of Brill. From that day the revolt had its right footing, on the decks of the ships of the best sailors in the world. It faced Philip from that day as a maritime power, which would grow by the very feeding of its war with him, until it had consumed everything Spanish within its reach. The taking of Brill soon gave the patriots control of so many places in Holland and Zealand that a meeting of deputies was held at Dort, in July, 1572, which declared William of Orange to be "the King's legal Stadtholder in Holland, Zealand,

Friesland and Utrecht," and recommended to the other Provinces that he be appointed Protector of all the Netherlands during the King's absence.

Alva's reign of terror had failed so signally that even he was discouraged and asked to be recalled. It was his boast when he retired that he had put eighteen thousand and six hundred of the Netherlands to death since they were delivered into his hands, above and beyond the horrible massacres by which he had half depopulated every captured town. Under Alva's successor, Don Louis de Requesens, a man of more justice and humanity, the struggle went on, adversely, upon the whole, to the patriots, though they triumphed gloriously in the famous defense of Leyden. To win help from England, they offered the sovereignty of their country to Queen Elizabeth; but in vain. They made no headway in the southern provinces, where Catholicism prevailed, and where the religious difference drew people more to the Spanish side. But when Requesens died suddenly, in the spring of 1576, and the Spanish soldiery broke into a furious mutiny, sacking Antwerp and other cities, then the nobles of Flanders and Brabant applied to the northern provinces for help. The result was a treaty, called the Pacification of Ghent, which contemplated a general effort to drive the Spaniards from the whole land. But not much came of this confederacy; the Catholic provinces never co-operated with the Protestant provinces, and the latter went their own way to freedom and prosperity, while the former sank back, submissive, to their chains.

For a short time after the death of Requesens, Philip was represented in the Netherlands by his illegitimate half-brother, Don John of Austria; but Don John died in October, 1578, and then came the great general, Alexander Farnese, Prince of Parma, who was to try the patriots sorely by his military skill. In 1579, the Prince of Orange drew them more closely together, in the Union of Utrecht, which Holland, Zealand, Gelderland, Zutphen, Utrecht, Overijssel, and Groningen, subscribed, and which was practically the foundation of the Dutch republic, though allegiance to Philip was not yet renounced. This followed two years later, in July, 1581, when the States General, assembled at the Hague, passed a solemn Act of Abjuration, which deposed Philip from his sovereignty and transferred it to the Duke of Anjou, a prince of the royal family of France, who did nothing for the Provinces, and who died soon after. At the same time, the immediate sovereignty of Holland and Zealand was conferred on the Prince of Orange.

In March, 1582, Philip made his first deliberate attempt to procure the assassination of the Prince. He had entered into a contract for the purpose, and signed it with his own hand. The assassin employed failed only because the savage pistol wound he inflicted, in the neck and jaw of his victim, did not kill. The master-murderer, at Madrid, was not discouraged. He launched his assassins, one following the other, until six had made their trial in two years. The sixth, one Balthazar Gérard, accomplished that for which he was sent, and William the Silent, wise statesman and admirable patriot, fell under his hand (July 10, 1584). Philip was so immeasurably delighted at this success that he conferred three lordships on the parents of the murderer.

William's son, Maurice, though but eighteen years old, was immediately chosen Stadtholder of Holland, Zealand and Utrecht, and High Admiral of the Union. In the subsequent years of the war, he proved himself a general of great capacity. Of the details of the war it is impossible to speak. Its most notable event was the siege of Antwerp, whose citizens defended themselves against the Duke of Parma, with astonishing courage and obstinacy, for many months. They capitulated in the end on honorable terms; but the prosperity of their city had received a blow from which it never revived.

Once more the sovereignty of the Provinces was offered to Queen Elizabeth of England, and once more declined; but the queen sent her favorite, the Earl of Leicester, with a few thousand men, to help the struggling Hollanders (1585). This was done, not in sympathy with them or their cause, but purely as a self-defensive measure against Spain. The niggardliness and the vacillations of Elizabeth, combined with the incompetency of Leicester, caused troubles to the Provinces nearly equal to the benefit of the forces lent them. Philip of Spain was now involved in his undertakings with the Guises and the League in France, and in his plans against England, and was weakened in the Netherlands for some years. Parma died in 1592, and Count Mansfield took his place, succeeded in his turn by the Marquis Spinola. The latter, at last, made an honest report, that the subjugation of the United Provinces was impracticable, and, Philip II. being now dead, the Spanish government was induced in 1607 to agree to a suspension of arms. A truce for twelve years was arranged; practically it was the termination of the war of independence, and practically it placed the United Provinces among the nations, although the formal acknowledgment of their independence was not yielded by Spain until 1648.

England under Mary.

While the Netherlands had offered to Philip of Spain a special field for his malice, there were others thrown open to him which he did not neglect. He may be said, in fact, to have whetted his appetite for blood and for burned human flesh in England, whither he went, as a young prince, in 1554, to marry his elderly second cousin, Queen Mary. We may be sure that he did not check the ardor of his consort, when she hastened to re-establish the supremacy of the Pope, and to rekindle the fires of religious persecution. The two-hundred and seventy-seven heretics whom she is reckoned to have burned may have seemed to him, even then, an insignificant handful. He quickly tired of her, if not of her congenial work, and left her in 1558. In 1558 she died, and the Church of Rome fell once more, never to regain its old footing of authority.

England under Elizabeth.

Elizabeth, daughter of Anne Boleyn, who now came to the throne, was Protestant by the necessities of her position, whether doctrinally convinced or no. The Catholics denied her legitimacy of birth, and disputed, therefore, her right to the crown. She depended upon the Protestants for her support, and Protestantism, either active or passive, had become, without doubt, the dominant faith of the nation. But the mild schism which formerly took most of its direction

from Luther, had now been powerfully acted upon by the influence of Calvin. Geneva had been the refuge of many ministers and teachers who fled from Mary's fires, and they returned to spread and deepen in England the stern, strong, formidable piety which Calvin evoked. These Calvinistic Protestants now made themselves felt as a party in the state, and were known ere long by that name which the next century rendered famous in English and American history — the great name of the Puritans. They were not satisfied with the stately, decorous, ceremonious Church which Elizabeth reconstructed on the pattern of the Church of Edward VI. At the same time, no party could be counted on more surely for the support of the queen, since the hope of Protestantism in England depended upon her, even as she was dependent upon it.

The Catholics, denying legitimacy to Elizabeth, recognized Mary Queen of Scots as the lawful sovereign of England. And Mary was, in fact, the next in succession, tracing her lineage, as stated before, to the elder sister of Henry VIII. If Elizabeth had been willing to frankly acknowledge Mary's heirship, failing heirs of her own body, it seems probable that the partisans of the Scottish queen would have been quieted, to a great extent. But Mary had angered her by assuming, while in France, the arms and style of Queen of England. She distrusted and disliked her Stuart cousin, and, moreover, the whole idea of a settlement of the succession was repugnant to her mind. At the same time, she could not be brought to marry, as her Protestant subjects wished. She coquetted with the notion of marriage through half her reign, but never to any purpose.

Such were the elements of agitation and trouble in England under Elizabeth. The history of well-nigh half-a-century was shaped in almost all its events by the threatening attitude of Catholicism and its supporters, domestic and foreign, toward the English queen. She was supported by the majority of her subjects with staunch loyalty and fidelity, even though she treated them none too well, and troubled them in their very defense of her by her whims and caprices. They identified her cause with themselves, and took such pride in her courage that they shut their eyes to the many weaknesses that went with it. She never grasped the affairs she dealt with in a broadly capable way. She never acted on them with well considered judgment. Her ministers, it is clear, were never able to depend upon a reasonable action of her mind. Her vanity or her jealousy might put reason in eclipse at any moment, and a skilful flatterer could make the queen as foolish as a milkmaid. But she had a royal courage and a royal pride of country, and she did make the good and glory of England her aim. So she won the affection of all Englishmen whose hearts were not in the keeping of the Pope, and no monarch so arbitrary was ever more ardently admired.

Mary, Queen of Scots.

In 1567, Mary Stuart was deposed by her own subjects, or forced to abdicate in favor of her infant son, James. She had alienated the Scottish people, first by her religion, and then by her suspected personal crimes. Having married her second cousin, Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, she was accused of being false to him. Darnley revenged his supposed wrongs as a husband by

murdering her secretary, David Rizzio. In the next year (1567) Darnley was killed; the hand of the Earl of Bothwell appeared quite plainly in the crime, and the queen's complicity was believed. She confirmed the suspicions against herself by marrying Bothwell soon afterwards. Then her subjects rose against her, imprisoned her in Loch Leven Castle, and made the Earl of Murray regent of the Kingdom. In 1568 Mary escaped from her Scottish prison and entered England. From that time until her death, in 1587, she was a captive in the hands of her rival, Queen Elizabeth, and was treated with slender magnanimity. More than before, she became the focus of intrigues and conspiracies which threatened both the throne and the life of Elizabeth, and a growing feeling of hostility to the wretched woman was inevitable.

In 1570, Pope Pius V. issued against Elizabeth his formal bull of excommunication, absolving her subjects from their allegiance. This quickened, of course, the activity of the plotters against the queen and set treason astir. Priests from the English Catholic Seminary at Douai, afterwards at Rheims, began to make their appearance in the country; a few Jesuits came over; and both were active agents of the schemes on foot which contemplated the seating of Mary Stuart on the throne of Elizabeth Tudor. Some of these emissaries were executed, and they are counted among the martyrs of the Catholic Church, which is a serious mistake. The Protestantism of the sixteenth century was quite capable of religious persecution, even to death; but it has no responsibilities of that nature in these Elizabethan cases. As a matter of fact, the religion of the Jesuit sufferers in the reign of Elizabeth was a mere incident attaching itself to a high political crime, which no nation has ever forgiven.

The plotting went on for twenty years, keeping the nation in unrest; while beyond it there were thickening signs of a great project of invasion in the sinister mind of Philip II. At last, in 1586, the coolest councillors of Elizabeth persuaded her to bring Mary Stuart to trial for alleged complicity in a conspiracy of assassination which had lately come to light. Convicted, and condemned to death, Mary ended her sad life on the scaffold, at Fotheringay, on the 8th of February, 1587. Whether guilty or guiltless of any knowledge of what had been done in her name, against the peace of England and against the life of the English queen, it cannot be thought strange that Protestant England took her life.

The Spanish Armada.

A great burst of wrath in Catholic Europe was caused by the execution of Mary, and Philip of Spain hastened forward his vast preparations for the invasion and conquest of England. In 1588, the "invincible armada," as it was believed to be, sailed out of the harbors of Portugal and Spain, and wrecked itself with clumsy imbecility on the British and Irish coasts. It scarcely did more than give sport to the eager English sailors who scattered its helpless ships and hunted them down. Philip troubled England no more, and conspiracy ceased.

England at Sea.

But the undeclared, half-piratical warfare which private adventurers had been carrying on against Spanish commerce for many years now

acquired fresh energy. Drake, Hawkins, Fro-bisher, Grenvil, Raleigh, were the heroic spirits of this enterprising warfare; but they had many fellows. It was the school of the future navy of England, and the foundations of the British Empire were laid down by those who carried it on.

Otherwise, Elizabeth had little war upon her hands, except in Ireland, where the state of misery and disorder had already been long chronic. The first really complete conquest of the island was accomplished by Lord Mountjoy between 1600 and 1603.

Intellectual England.

But neither the political troubles nor the naval and military triumphs of England during the reign of Elizabeth are of much importance, after all, compared with the wonderful flowering of the genius of the nation which took place in that age. Shakespeare, Spenser, Bacon, Ben Jonson, Marlowe, Hooker, Raleigh, Sidney, are the great facts of Elizabeth's time, and it shines with the luster of their names, the period most glorious in English history.

The Religious Wars in France.

Wherever the stealthy arm of the influence of Philip II. of Spain could reach, there the Catholic reaction of his time took on a malignant form. In France, it is quite probable that the Catholics and the Huguenots, if left to themselves, would have come to blows; but it is certain that the meddling fingers of the Spanish king put fierceness and fury into the wars of religion, which raged from 1562 to 1596, and that they were prolonged by his encouragement and help.

Catherine de' Medici, to strengthen herself against the Guises, after the death of Francis II., offered attentions for a time to the Huguenot nobles, and encouraged them to expect a large and lasting measure of toleration. She went so far that the Huguenot influence at court, surrounding the young king, became very seriously alarming to Catholic onlookers, both at home and abroad. Among the many remonstrances addressed to the queen-regent, the one which appears to have been decisive in its effect came from Philip. He coldly sent her word that he intended to interfere in France and to establish the supremacy of the Catholic Church; that he should give his support for that purpose to any true friend of the Church who might request it. Whether Catherine had entertained an honest purpose or not, in her dealing with the Huguenots, this threat, with what lay behind it, put an end to the hope of justice for them. It is true that an assembly of notables, in January, 1562, did propose a law which the queen put forth, in what is known as the "Edict of January," whereby the Huguenots were given, for the first time, a legal recognition, ceasing to be outlaws, and were permitted to hold meetings, in the daytime, in open places, outside of walled cities; but their churches were taken away from them, they were forbidden to build more, and they could hold no meetings in walled towns. It was a measure of toleration very different from that which they had been led to expect; and even the little meted out by this Edict of January was soon shown to have no guarantee. Within three months, the Duke of Guise had found an opportunity for exhibiting his contempt of the new

law, by ordering his armed followers to attack a congregation at Vassy, killing fifty and wounding two hundred of the peaceful worshippers. This outrage drove the Huguenots to arms and the civil wars began.

The frivolous Anthony, King of Navarre, had been won back to the Catholic side. His staunch wife, Jeanne d'Albret, with her young son, the future Henry IV., and his brother, Louis, Prince of Condé, remained true to their faith. Condé was the chief of the party. Next to him in rank, and first in real worth and weight, was the noble Admiral Coligny. The first war was brief, though long enough to end the careers of Anthony of Navarre, killed in battle, and the Duke of Guise, assassinated. Peace was made in 1563 through a compromise, which conceded certain places to the Huguenots, wherein they might worship God in their own way. But it was a hollow peace, and the malicious finger of the great master of assassins at Madrid never ceased picking at it. In 1566, civil war broke out a second time, continuing until 1570. Its principal battles were that of Jarnac, in which Condé was taken prisoner and basely assassinated by his captors, and that of Moncontour. The Huguenots were defeated in both. After the death of Condé, young Henry of Navarre, who had reached his fifteenth year, was chosen to be the chief of the party, with Coligny for his instructor in war.

Again peace was made, on a basis of slight concessions. Henry of Navarre married the King's sister, Margaret of Valois; prior to which he and his mother took up their residence with the court, at Paris, where Jeanne d'Albret soon sickened and died. The Admiral Coligny acquired, apparently, a marked influence over the mind of the young king; and once more there seemed to be a smiling future for the Reformed. But damnable treacheries were hidden underneath this fair showing. The most hideous conspiracy of modern times was being planned, at the very moment of the ostentatious peace-marriage of the King of Navarre, and the chief parties to it were Catherine de' Medici and the Guises, whose evil inclinations in common had brought them together at last. On the 22d of August, 1572, Coligny was wounded by an assassin, employed by the widow and son of the late Duke of Guise, whose death they charged against him, notwithstanding his protestations of innocence. Two days later, the monstrous and almost incredible Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day was begun. Paris was full of Huguenots—the heads of the party—its men of weight and influence—who had been drawn to the capital by the King of Navarre's marriage and by the supposed new era of favor in which they stood. To cut these off was to decapitate Protestantism in France, and that was the purpose of the infernal scheme. The weak-minded young king was not an original party to the plot. When everything had been planned, he was easily excited by a tale of pretended Huguenot conspiracies, and his assent to summary measures of prevention was secured. A little after midnight, on the morning of Sunday, August 24, the signal was given, by Catherine's order, which let loose a waiting swarm of assassins, throughout Paris, on the victims who had been marked for them. The Huguenots had had no warning; they were taken everywhere by surprise, and they were easily murdered in their beds, or hunted down in their hopeless flight.

The noble Coligny, prostrated by the wound he had received two days before, was killed in his chamber, and his body flung out of the window. The young Duke of Guise stood waiting in the court below, to gloat on the corpse and to basely spurn it with his foot.

The massacre in Paris was carried on through two nights and two days; and, for more than a month following, the example of the capital was imitated in other cities of France, as the news of what were called "the Paris Matins" reached them. The total number of victims in the kingdom is estimated variously to have been between twenty thousand and one hundred thousand.

Henry of Navarre and the young Prince of Condé escaped the massacre, but they saved their lives by a hypocritical abjuration of their religion.

The strongest town in the possession of the Huguenots was La Rochelle, and great numbers of their ministers and people of mark who survived the massacre now took refuge in that city, with a considerable body of armed men. The royal forces laid siege to the city, but made no impression on its defences. Peace was conceded in the end on terms which again promised the Huguenots some liberty of worship. But there was no sincerity in it.

In 1574, Charles IX. died, and his brother, the Duke of Anjou, who had lately been elected King of Poland, ran away from his Polish capital with disgraceful haste and secrecy, to secure the French crown. He was the most worthless of the Valois-Medicean brood, and the French court in his reign attained its lowest depth of degradation. The contending religions were soon at war again, with the accustomed result, in 1576, of another short-lived peace. The Catholics were divided into two factions, one fanatical, following the Guises, the other composed of moderate men, calling themselves the Politiques, who hated the Spanish influence under which the Guises were always acting, and who were willing to make terms with the Huguenots. The Guises and the ultra-Catholics now organized throughout France a great oath-bound "Holy League", which became so formidable in power that the king took fright, put himself at the head of it, and reopened war with the Reformed.

More and more, the conflict of religions became confused with questions of politics and mixed with personal quarrels. At one time, the king's younger brother, the Duke of Alençon, had gone over to the Huguenot side; but stayed only long enough to extort from the court some appointments which he desired. The king, more despised by his subjects than any king of France before him had ever been, grew increasingly jealous and afraid of the popularity and strength of the Duke of Guise, who was proving to be a man quite superior to his father in capability. Guise, on his side, was made arrogant by his sense of power, and his ambition soared high. There were reasons for believing that he did not look upon the throne itself as beyond his reach.

After 1584, when the Duke of Alençon (Duke of Anjou under his later title) died, a new political question, vastly disturbing, was brought into affairs. That death left no heir to the crown in the Valois line, and the King of Navarre, of the House of Bourbon, was now nearer in birth to the throne than any other living person. Henry had, long ere this, retracted his abjuration of 1572, had rejoined the Huguenots and taken his

place as their chief. The head of the Huguenots was now the heir presumptive to the crown, and the wretched, incapable king was being impelled by his fear of Guise to look to his Huguenot heir for support. It was a strange situation. In 1588 it underwent a sinister change. Guise and his brother, the Cardinal, were both assassinated by the king's body-guard, acting under the king's orders, in the royal residence at the Castle of Blois. When the murder had been done, the cowardly king spurned his dead enemy with his foot, as Guise, sixteen years before, had spurned the murdered Coligny, and said "I am King at last." He was mistaken. His authority vanished with the vile deed by which he expected to reinvigorate it. Paris broke into open rebellion. The League renewed its activity throughout France. The king, abandoned and cursed on all sides, had now no course open to him but an alliance with Henry of Navarre and the Huguenots. The alliance was effected, and the two Henrys joined forces to subdue insurgent Paris. While the siege of the city was in progress (1589), Henry III. fell a victim, in his turn, to the murderous mania of his depraved age and court. He was assassinated by a fanatical monk.

Henry of Navarre.

Henry of Navarre now steps into the foreground of French history, as Henry IV., lawful King of France as well as of Navarre, and ready to prove his royal title by a more useful reign than the French nation had known since it buried St. Louis, his last ancestor on the throne. But his title was recognized at first by few outside the party of the Huguenots. The League went openly into alliance with Philip of Spain, who even half-stopped his war in the Netherlands to send money and troops into France. The energies of his insignificant soul were all concentrated on the desire to keep the heretical Béarnese from the throne of France. But happily his powers were no longer equal to his malice; he was still staggering under the blow which destroyed his great Armada.

Henry received some help in money from Queen Elizabeth, and 5,000 English and Scotch came over to join his army. He was an abler general than any among his opponents, and he made headway against them. His splendid victory at Ivry, on the 14th of March, 1590, inspired his followers and took heart from the League. He was driven from his subsequent siege of Paris by a Spanish army, under the Duke of Parma; but the very interference of the Spanish king helped to turn French feeling in Henry's favor. On the 25th of July, 1593, he practically extinguished the opposition to himself by his final submission to the Church of Rome. It was an easy thing for him to do. His religion sat lightly on him. He had accepted it from his mother; he had adhered to it—not faithfully—as the creed of a party. He could give it up, in exchange for the crown of France, and feel no trouble of conscience. But the Reformed religion in France was really benefited by his apostacy. Peace came to the kingdom, as the consequence,—a peace of many years,—and the Huguenots were sheltered in considerable religious freedom by the peace. Henry secured it to them in 1598 by the famous Edict of Nantes, which remained in force for nearly a hundred years.

The reign of Henry IV. was one of the satisfactory periods in the life of France, so far as concerns the material prosperity of the nation. He was a man of strong, keen intellect, with firmness of will and elasticity of temper, but weak on the moral side. He was of those who win admiration and friendship easily, and he remains traditionally the most popular of French kings. He had the genius for government which so rarely coincides with royal birth. A wise minister, the Duke of Sully, gave stability to his measures, and between them they succeeded in remarkably improving and promoting the agricultural and the manufacturing industries of France, effacing the destructive effects of the long civil wars, and bringing economy and order into the finances of the overburdened nation. His useful career was ended by an assassin in 1610.

Germany and the Thirty Years War.

The reactionary wars of religion in Germany came half-a-century later than in France. While the latter country was being torn by the long civil conflicts which Henry IV. brought to an end, the former was as nearly in the enjoyment of religious peace as the miserable contentions in the bosom of Protestantism, between Lutherans and Calvinists (the latter more commonly called "the Reformed"), would permit. On the abdication of Charles V., in 1556, he had fortunately failed to bring about the election of his son Philip to the imperial throne. His brother Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria and King of Bohemia and Hungary, was chosen Emperor, and that sovereign had too many troubles in his immediate dominions to be willing to invite a collision with the Protestant princes of Germany at large. The Turks had overrun Hungary and established themselves in possession of considerable parts of the country. Ferdinand obtained peace with the redoubtable Sultan Suleiman, but only by payments of money which bore a strong likeness to tribute. He succeeded, through his prudent and skilful policy, in making both the Hungarian and the Bohemian crowns practically hereditary in the House of Austria.

Dying in 1564, Ferdinand transmitted both those kingdoms, with the Austrian Archduchy and the imperial office, to his son, Maximilian II., the broadest and most liberal minded of his race. Though educated in Spain, and in companionship with his cousin, Philip II., Maximilian exhibited the most tolerant spirit that appears anywhere in his age. Perhaps it was the hatefulness of orthodox zeal as exemplified in Philip which drove the more generous nature of Maximilian to revolt. He adhered to the Roman communion; but he manifested so much respect for the doctrines of the Lutheran that his father felt called upon at one time to make apologies for him to the Pope. Throughout his reign he held himself aloof from religious disputes, setting an example of tolerance and spiritual intelligence to all his subjects, Lutherans, Calvinists and Catholics alike, which ought to have influenced them more for their good than it did. Under the shelter of the toleration which Maximilian gave it, Protestantism spread quickly over Austria, where it had had no opportunity before; revived the old Hussite reform in Bohemia; made great gains in Hungary, and advanced in all parts of his dominions except the Tyrol. The time permitted to it

for this progress was short, since Maximilian reigned but twelve years. He died in 1576, and his son Rudolph, who followed him, brought evil changes upon the country in all things. He, too, had been educated in Spain, but with a very different result. He came back a creature of the Jesuits; but so weakly wilful a creature that even they could do little with him. Authority of government went to pieces in his incompetent hands, and at last, in 1606, a family conclave of princes of the Austrian house began measures which aimed at dispossessing Rudolph of his various sovereignties, so far as possible, in favor of his brother Matthias. Rudolph resisted with some effect, and in the contests which ensued the Protestants of Austria and Bohemia improved their opportunity for securing an enlargement of their rights. Matthias made the concession of complete toleration in Austria, while Rudolph, in Bohemia, granted the celebrated charter, called the Letter of Majesty (1609), which gave entire religious liberty to all sects.

These concessions were offensive to two princes, the Archduke Ferdinand of Styria, and Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, who had already taken the lead in a vigorous movement of Catholic reaction. Some proceedings on the part of Maximilian, which the Emperor sanctioned, against the Protestant free city of Donauwörth, had caused certain Protestant princes and cities, in 1608, to form a defensive Union. But the Elector Palatine, who attached himself to the Reformed or Calvinist Church, was at the head of this Union, and the bigoted Lutherans, especially the Elector of Saxony, looked with coldness upon it. On the other hand, the Catholic states formed a counter-organization—a Holy League—which was more compact and effective. The two parties being thus set in array, there rose suddenly between them a political question of the most disturbing character. It related to the right of succession to an important duchy, that of Juliers, Cleves, and Berg. There were several powerful claimants, in both of the Saxon families, and including also the Elector of Brandenburg and the Palgrave of Neuberg, two members of the Union. As usual, the political question took possession of the religious issue and used it for its own purposes. The Protestant Union opened negotiations with Henry IV. of France, who saw an opportunity to weaken the House of Austria and to make some gains for France at the expense of Germany. A treaty was concluded, and Henry began active preparations for campaigns in both Germany and Italy, with serious intent to humble and diminish the Austrian power. The Dutch came into the alliance, likewise, and James I. of England promised his co-operation. The combination was formidable, and might have changed very extensively the course of events that awaited unhappy Germany, if the whole plan had not been frustrated by the assassination of Henry IV., in 1610. All the parties to the alliance drew back after that event, and both sides waited.

In 1611, Rudolph was deposed in Bohemia, and the following year he died. Matthias, already King of Hungary, succeeded Rudolph in Bohemia and in the Empire. But Matthias was scarcely stronger in mind or body than his brother, and the same family pressure which had pushed Rudolph aside now forced Matthias to accept a coadjutor, in the person of the vigorous

Ferdinand, Archduke of Styria. For the remainder of his reign Matthias was a cipher, and all power in the government was exercised by Ferdinand. His bitter opposition to the tolerant policy which had prevailed generally for half-a-century was well understood. Hence, his rise to supremacy in the Empire gave notice that the days of religious peace were ended. The outbreak of civil war was not long in coming.

Beginning of the war in Bohemia.

It began in Bohemia. A violation of the Protestant rights guaranteed by the Letter of Majesty provoked a rising under Count Thurn. Two of the king's councilors, with their secretary, were flung from a high window of the royal castle, and this act of violence was followed by more revolutionary measures. A provisional government of thirty Directors was set up and the king's authority set wholly aside. The Protestant Union gave prompt support to the Bohemian insurrection and sent Count Mansfield with three thousand soldiers to its aid. The Thirty Years War was begun (1618).

Early in these disturbances, Matthias died (1619). Ferdinand had already made his succession secure, in Austria, Bohemia and Hungary, and the imperial crown was presently conferred on him. But the Bohemians repudiated his kingship and offered their crown to Frederick, the Elector Palatine, lately married to the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of James I. of England. The Elector, persuaded, it is said, by his ambitious young wife, unwisely accepted the tempting bauble, and went to Prague to receive it. But he had neither prudence nor energy to justify his bold undertaking. Instead of strengthening himself for his contest with Ferdinand, he began immediately to enrage his new subjects by pressing Calvinistic forms and doctrines upon them, and by arrogantly interfering with their modes of worship. His reign was so brief that he is known in Bohemian annals as "the winter king." A single battle, won by Count Tilly, in the service of the Catholic League and of its chief, Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, ended his sovereignty. He lost his Electorate as well as his kingdom, and was a wandering fugitive for the remainder of his life. Bohemia was mercilessly dealt with by the victorious Ferdinand. Not only was Protestantism crushed, and Catholicism established as the exclusive religion, but the very life of the country, intellectually and materially, was extinguished; so that Bohemia never again stood related to the civilization of Europe as it had stood before, when Prague was an important center of learning and thought. To a less extent, Austria suffered the same repression, and its Protestantism was uprooted.

In this sketch it is unnecessary to follow the details of the frightful Thirty Years War, which began as here described. During the first years it was carried on mainly by the troops of the Catholic League, under Tilly, acting against Protestant forces which had very little coherence or unity, and which were led by Count Mansfield, Christian of Anhalt, and other nobles, in considerable independence of one another. In 1625 the first intervention from outside occurred. Christian IV. of Denmark took up the cause of threatened Protestantism. As Duke of Schleswig-Holstein, he was a prince of the Empire, and he joined with other Protestant princes in condemn-

ing the deposition of the Elector-Palatine, whose electorate had been conferred on Maximilian of Bavaria. King Christian entered into an alliance with England and Holland, which powers promised help for the reinstatement of the Elector. But the aid given was trifling, and slight successes which Christian and his German allies obtained against Tilly were soon changed to serious reverses.

Wallenstein.

For the first time during the war, the Emperor now brought into the field an army acting in his own name, and not in that of the League. It was done in a singular manner — by contract, so to speak, with a great soldier and wealthy nobleman, the famous Wallenstein. Wallenstein offered to the Emperor the services of an army of 50,000 men, which he would raise and equip at his own expense, and which should be maintained without public cost — that is, by plunder. His proposal was accepted, and the formidable body of trained and powerfully handled brigands was launched upon Germany, for the torture and destruction of every region in which it moved. It was the last appearance in European warfare of the "condottiere" of the Middle Ages. Wallenstein and Tilly swept all before them. The former failed only before the stubborn town of Stralsund, which defied his siege. Mansfield and Christian of Anhalt both died in 1627. Peace was forced upon the Danish king. The Protestant cause was prostrate, and the Emperor despised its weakness so far that he issued an "Edict of Restitution," commanding the surrender of certain bishoprics and ecclesiastical estates which had fallen into Protestant hands since the Treaty of Passau. At the same time, he yielded to the jealousy which Wallenstein's power had excited, by dismissing that commander from his service.

Gustavus Adolphus.

The time was an unfavorable one for such an experiment. A new and redoubtable champion of Protestantism had just appeared on the scene and was about to revive the war. This was Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, who had ambitions, grievances and religious sympathies, all urging him to rescue the Protestant states of Germany from the Austrian-Catholic despotism which seemed to be impending over them. His interference was jealously resented at first by the greater Protestant princes. The Elector of Brandenburg submitted to an alliance with him only under compulsion. The Elector of Saxony did not join the Swedish king until (1631) Tilly had ravaged his territories with ferocity, burning 200 villages. When Gustavus had made his footing in the country secure, he quickly proved himself the greatest soldier of his age. Tilly was overwhelmed in a battle fought on the Breitenfeld, at Leipsic. The following spring he was again beaten, on the Lech, in Bavaria, and died of wounds received in the battle. Meantime, the greater part of Germany was at the feet of the Swedish king; and a sincere co-operation between him and the German princes would probably have ended the war. But small confidence existed between these allies, and Richelieu, the shrewd Cardinal who was ruling France, had begun intrigues which made the Thirty Years War profitable in the end to France. The

victories of Gustavus seemed to bear little fruit. Wallenstein was summoned once more to save the Emperor's cause, and reappeared in the field with 40,000 men. The heroic Swede fought him at Lützen, on the 16th of November, 1632, and routed him, but fell in the battle among the slain.

With the death of Gustavus Adolphus, the possibility of a satisfactory conclusion of the war vanished. The Swedish army remained in Germany, under the military command of Duke Bernhard of Saxe Weimar and General Horn, but under the political direction of Axel Oxenstiern, the able Swedish Chancellor. On the Imperial side, Wallenstein again incurred distrust and suspicion. His power was so formidable that his enemies were afraid to let him live. They plotted his death by assassination, and he was murdered on the 25th of February, 1634. The Emperor's son Ferdinand now took the command of the Imperial forces, and, a few months later, having received reinforcements from Spain, he had the good fortune to defeat the Swedes at Nördlingen.

The French in the War.

The Elector of Saxony, and other Protestant princes, then made peace with the Emperor, and the war was only prolonged by the intrigues of Richelieu and for the aggrandizement of France. In this final stage of it, when the original elements of contention, and most of the original contestants, had disappeared, it lasted for yet fourteen years. Ferdinand II. died in 1637, and was succeeded by his son Ferdinand III. Duke Bernhard died in 1639. In the later years of the war, Piccolomini on the Imperial side, Baner, Torstenson and Wrangel at the head of the Swedes, and Turenne and Condé in command of the French, were the soldiers who made great names.

Destructiveness of the War.

In 1648, the long suffering of Germany was eased by the Peace of Westphalia. Years of quiet, and of order fairly restored, would be needed to heal the bleeding wounds of the country and revive its strength. From end to end, it had been trampled upon for a generation by armies which plundered and destroyed as they passed. There is nothing more sickening in the annals of war than the descriptions which eye-witnesses have left of the misery, the horror, the desolation of that frightful period in German history. "Especially in the south and west, Germany was a wilderness of ruins; places that were formerly the seats of prosperity were the haunts of wolves and robbers for many a long year. It is estimated that the population was diminished by twenty, by some even by fifty, per cent. The population of Augsburg was reduced from 80,000 to 18,000; of Frankenthal, from 18,000 to 324 inhabitants. In Würtemberg, in 1641, of 400,000 inhabitants, 48,000 remained; in the Palatinate, in 1636, there were 201 peasant farmers; and in 1648, but a fiftieth part of the population remained" (Häusser).

The Peace of Westphalia.

By the treaties of Westphalia, the religious question was settled with finality. Catholics, Lutherans, and the Reformed (Calvinists), were put on an equal footing of religious liberty. Politically, the effects of the Peace were radical

and lasting in their injury to the German people. The few bonds of Germanic unity which had survived the reign of feudalism were dissolved. The last vestige of authority in the Empire was destroyed. "From this time Germany long remained a mere lax confederation of petty despotisms and oligarchies with hardly any national feeling. Its boundaries too were cut short in various ways. The independence of the two free Confederations at the two ends of the Empire, those of Switzerland and the United Provinces, which had long been practically cut off from the Empire, was now formally acknowledged. And, what was far more important, the two foreign kingdoms which had had the chief share in the war, France and Sweden, obtained possessions within the Empire, and moreover, as guarantors or sureties of the peace, they obtained a general right of meddling in its affairs." "The right of France to the 'Three Lotharingian Bishoprics,' which had been seized nearly a hundred years before, was now formally acknowledged, and, besides this, the possessions and rights of the House of Austria in Elsass, the German land between the Rhine and the Vosges, called in France Alsace, were given to France. The free city of Strasburg and other places in Elsass still remained independent, but the whole of South Germany now lay open to France. This was the greatest advance that France had yet made at the expense of the Empire. Within Germany itself the Elector of Brandenburg also received a large increase of territory" (Freeman).

Among the treaties which made up the Peace of Westphalia was one signed by Spain, acknowledging the independence of the United Provinces, and renouncing all claims to them.

France under Richelieu.

The great gains of France from the Thirty Years War were part of the fruit of bold and cunning statesmanship which Richelieu had ripened and plucked for that now rising nation. For a time after the death of Henry IV., chaos had seemed likely to return again in France. His son, Louis XIII., was but nine years old. The mother, Marie de' Medici, who secured the regency, was a foolish woman, ruled by Italian favorites, who made themselves odious to the French people. As soon as the young king approached manhood, he put himself in opposition to his mother and her favorites, under the influence of a set of rivals no more worthy, and France was carried to the verge of civil war by their puerile hostilities. Happily there was something in the weak character of Louis XIII. which bent him under the influence of a really great mind when circumstances had brought him within its reach. Richelieu entered the King's council in 1624. The king was soon an instrument in his hands, and he ruled France, as though the scepter was his own, for eighteen years. He was as pitiless a despot as ever set heel on a nation's neck; but the power which he grasped with what seemed to be a miserly and commonplace greed, was all gathered for the aggrandizement of the monarchy that he served. He believed that the nation needed to have one master, sole and unquestioned in his sovereignty. That he enjoyed being that one master, in reality, while he lived, is hardly doubtful; but his whole ambition is not so explained. He wrought according to his belief for France, and the king,

in his eyes, was the embodiment of France. He erected the pedestal on which "the grand monarch" of the next generation posed with theatrical effect.

Three things Richelieu did: 1. He enforced the royal authority, with inexorable rigor, against the great families and personages, who had not learned, even under Henry IV., that they were subjects in the absolute sense. 2. He struck the Huguenots, not as a religious sect, but as a political party, and peremptorily stopped their growth of strength in that character, which had clearly become threatening to the state. 3. He organized hostility in Europe to the overbearing and dangerous Austro-Spanish power, put France at the head of it, and took for her the lion's share of the conquests by which the Hapsburgs were reduced.

Mazarin and the Fronde.

The great Cardinal died near the close of the year 1642; and Louis XIII. followed him to the grave in the succeeding May, leaving a son, Louis XIV., not yet five years of age, under the regency of his mother, Anne of Austria. The minister, Cardinal Mazarin, who enjoyed the confidence of the queen-regent, and who was supposed to enjoy her affections as well, had been Richelieu's disciple, and took the helm of government on Richelieu's recommendation. He was an adroit politician, with some statesmanlike sagacity, but he lacked the potent spirit by which his master had awed and ruled every circle into which he came, great or small. Mazarin had the Thirty Years War to bring to a close, and he managed the difficult business with success, wasting nothing of the effect of the brilliant victories of Condé and Turenne. But the war had been very costly. Mazarin was no better financier than Richelieu had been before him, and the burdens of taxation were greater than wise management would have made them. There was inevitable discontent, and Mazarin, as a foreigner, was inevitably unpopular. With public feeling in this state, the Court involved itself in a foolish conflict with the Parliament of Paris, and presently there was a Paris revolution and a civil war afoot (1649). It was a strange affair of froth and empty rages—this war of "The Fronde," as it was called—having no depth of earnestness in it and no honesty of purpose anywhere visible in its complications. The men and women who sprang to a lead in it—the women more actively and rancorously than the men—were mere actors of parts in a great play of court intrigue, for the performance of which unhappy France had lent its grand stage. There seems to have been never, in any other civil conflict which history describes, so extraordinary a mixture of treason and libertinism, of political and amorous intrigue, of heartlessness and frivolity, of hot passion and cool selfishness. The people who fought most and suffered most hardly appear as noticeable factors in the contest. The court performers amused themselves with the stratagems and bloody doings of the war as they might have done with the tricks of a masquerade.

It was in keeping with the character of the Frondeurs that they went into alliance, at last, with Spain, and that, even after peace within the nation had been restored, "the Great Condé" remained in the Spanish service and fought against his own countrymen. Mazarin regained control

of affairs, and managed them on the whole ably and well. He brought about an alliance with England, under Cromwell, and humbled Spain to the acceptance of a treaty which considerably raised the position of France among the European Powers. By this Treaty of the Pyrenees (1659), the northwestern frontier of the kingdom was both strengthened and advanced; Lorraine was shorn of some of its territory and prepared for the absorption which followed after no long time; there were gains made on the side of the Pyrenees; and, finally, Louis XIV. was wedded to the infanta of Spain, with solemn renunciations on her part, for herself and her descendants, of all claims upon the Spanish crown, or upon Flanders, or Burgundy, or Charolais. Not a claim was extinguished by these solemn renunciations, and the Treaty of the Pyrenees is made remarkable by the number of serious wars and important events to which it gave rise.

Cardinal Mazarin died in 1661 and the government was assumed personally by Louis XIV., then twenty-three years old.

England Under the Stuarts.

While Germany and France had, each in turn, been disordered by extremely unlike civil wars, one to the unmitigated devastation and prostration of the land, the other to the plain putting in proof of the nothingness of the nation at large, as against its monarchy and court, the domestic peace of England had been ruffled in a very different way, and with very different effects.

The death of Queen Elizabeth united the crown of England with that of Scotland, on the head of James, son of the unhappy Mary Stuart. In England he was James I., in Scotland James VI. His character combined shrewdness in some directions with the most foolish simplicity in others. He was not vicious, he was not in any particular a bad man; but he was exasperating in his opinionated self-conceit, and in his gaucheries of mind and body. The Englishmen of those days did not love the Scots; and, all things considered, we may wonder, perhaps, that James got on so well as he did with his English subjects. He had high notions of kingship, and a superlative opinion of his own king-craft, as he termed the art of government. He scarcely deviated from the arbitrary lines which Elizabeth had laid down, though he had nothing of Elizabeth's popularity. He offended the nation by truckling to its old enemy, the King of Spain, and pressing almost shamefully for a marriage of his elder son to the Spanish infanta. The favorites he enriched and lavished honors upon were insolent upstarts. His treatment of the growing Puritanism in English religious feeling was contemptuous. There was scarcely a point on which any considerable number of his subjects could feel in agreement with him, or entertain towards him a cordial sentiment of loyalty or respect. Yet his reign of twenty-two years was disturbed by nothing more serious than the fatuous "gun-powder plot" (1605) of a few discontented Catholics. But his son had to suffer the retarded consequences of a loyalty growing weak, on one side, while royalty strained its prerogatives on the other.

The reign of James I. witnessed the effective beginnings of English colonization in America,—the planting of a durable settlement in Virginia and the migration of the Pilgrim Fathers to New

England. The latter movement (1620) was one of voluntary exile, produced by the hard treatment inflicted on those "Separatists" or "Independents" who could not reconcile themselves to a state-established Church. Ten years later, the Pilgrim movement, of Independents, was followed by the greater migration of Puritans—quite different in class, in character and in spirit.

Charles I.

James died in 1625, and the troubled reign of his son, Charles I., began. Charles took over from his father a full measure of popular discontent, along with numerous active springs in operation for increasing it. The most productive of these was the favorite, Buckingham, who continued to be the sole counselor and minister of the young king, as he had been of the older one, and who was utterly hateful to England, for good reasons of incapacity and general worthlessness. In the king himself, though he had virtues, there was a coldness and a falsity of nature which were sure to widen the breach between him and his people.

Failing the Spanish marriage, Charles had wedded (1624) a French princess, Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII. The previous subserviency to Spain had then been followed by a war with that country, which came to Charles among his inheritances, and which Buckingham mismanaged, to the shame of England. In 1627 another war began, but this time with France, on account of the Huguenots besieged at La Rochelle. Again the meddlesome hand of Buckingham wrought disaster and national disgrace, and public indignation was greatly stirred. When Parliament endeavored to call the incapable minister to account, and to obtain some security for a better management of affairs, the king dissolved it. Twice was this done, and Charles and his favorite employed every arbitrary and questionable device that could be contrived for them, to raise money without need of the representatives of the people. At length, in 1628, they were driven to face a third Parliament, in order to obtain supplies. By this time the Commons of England were wrought up to a high and determined assertion of their rights, as against the Crown, and the Puritans had gained a majority in the popular representation. In the lower House of Parliament, therefore, the demands of the king for money were met by a counter-demand for guarantees to protect the people from royal encroachments on their liberties. The Commons were resolute, and Charles gave way to them, signing with much reluctance the famous instrument known as the "Petition of Right," which pledged the Crown to abstain in future from forced loans, from taxes imposed without Parliamentary grant, from arbitrary imprisonments, without cause shown, and from other despotic proceedings. In return for his signature to the Petition of Right, Charles received a grant of money; but the Commons refused to authorize his collection of certain customs duties, called Tonnage and Poundage, beyond a single year, and it began attacks on Buckingham,—whereupon the king prorogued it. Shortly afterwards Buckingham was assassinated; a second expedition to relieve Rochelle failed miserably; and early in 1629 Parliament was assembled again. This time the Puritan temper of the House began to show itself in

measures to put a stop to some revivals of ancient ceremony which had appeared in certain churches. At the same time officers of the king, who had seized goods belonging to a member of the House, for non-payment of Tonnage and Poundage, were summoned to the bar to answer for it. The king protected them, and a direct conflict of authority arose. On the 2d of March, the king sent an order to the Speaker of the House of Commons for adjournment; but the Speaker was forcibly held in his chair, and not permitted to announce the adjournment, until three resolutions had been read and adopted, denouncing as an enemy to the kingdom every person who brought in innovations in religion, or who advised the levying of Tonnage and Poundage without parliamentary grant, or who voluntarily paid such duties, so levied. This done, the members dispersed; the king dissolved Parliament immediately, and his resolution was taken to govern England thenceforth on his own authority, with no assembly of the representatives of the people to question or criticise him. He held to that determination for eleven years, during which long time no Parliament sat in England, and the Constitution was practically obliterated.

The leaders of the Commons in their recent proceedings were arrested and imprisoned. Sir John Eliot, the foremost of them, died in harsh confinement within the Tower, and others were held in long custody, refusing to recognize the jurisdiction of the king's judges over things done in Parliament.

Wentworth and Laud.

One man, of great ability, who had stood at the beginning with Sir John Eliot, and acted with the party which opposed the king, now went over to the side of the latter and rose high in royal favor, until he came in the end to be held chiefly responsible for the extreme absolutism to which the government of Charles was pushed. This was Sir Thomas Wentworth, made Earl of Strafford at a later day, in the tardy rewarding of his services. But William Laud, Bishop of London, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, was the evil counselor of the king, much more than Wentworth, in the earlier years of the decade of tyranny. It was Laud's part to organize the system of despotic monarchy on its ecclesiastical side; to uproot Puritanism and all dissent, and to cast religion for England and for Scotland in one mould, as rigid as that of Rome.

For some years, the English nation seemed terrorized or stupefied by the audacity of the complete overthrow of its Constitution. The king and his servants might easily imagine that the day of troublesome Parliaments and of inconvenient laws was passed. At least in those early years of their success, it can scarcely have occurred to their minds that a time of accounting for broken laws, and for the violated pledges of the Petition of Right, might come at the end. At all events they went their way with seeming satisfaction, and tested, year by year, the patient endurance of a people which has always been slow to move. Their courts of Star Chamber and of High Commission, finding a paramount law in the will and pleasure of the king, imprisoned, fined, pilloried, flogged and mutilated in quite the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition, though they did not burn. They collected Tonnage and

Poundage without parliamentary consent, and servile judges enforced the payment. They invented a claim for "ship-money" (in commutation of an ancient demand for ships to serve in the King's navy) from inland towns and counties, as well as from the commercial ports; and when John Hampden, a squire in Buckinghamshire, refused payment of the unlawful tax, their obedient judges gave judgment against him. And still the people endured; but they were laying up in memory many things, and gathering a store of reasons for the action that would by and by begin.

Rebellion in Scotland.

At last, it was Scotland, not England, that moved to rebel. Laud and the king had determined to break down Presbyterianism in the northern kingdom and to force a Prayer Book on the Scottish Church. There was a consequent riot at St. Giles, in Edinburgh (1637); Jenny Geddes threw her stool at the bishop, and Scotland presently was in revolt, signing a National Covenant and defying the king. Charles, attempting to frighten the resolute Scots with an army which he could not pay, was soon driven to a treaty with them (1639) which he had not honesty enough to keep. Wentworth, who had been Lord Deputy of Ireland since 1632, and who had framed a model of absolutism in that island, for the admiration of his colleagues in England, now returned to the king's side and became his chief adviser. He counselled the calling of a Parliament, as the only means by which English help could be got for the restoring of royal authority in Scotland. The Parliament was summoned and met in April, 1640. At once, it showed a temper which alarmed the king and he dissolved it in three weeks. Again Charles made the attempt to put down his Scottish subjects without help from an English Parliament, and again the attempt failed.

The Long Parliament.

Then the desperate king summoned another Parliament, which concentrated in itself, when it came together, the suppressed rebellion that had been in the heart of England for ten years, and which broke his flimsy fabric of absolutism, almost at a single blow. It was the famous Long Parliament of English history, which met in November, 1640, and which ruled England for a dozen years, until it gave way to the Cromwellian dictatorship. It sent Laud and Strafford to the Tower, impeached the latter and brought him to the block, within six months from the beginning of its session; and the king gave up his minister to the vengeance of the angry Commons with hardly one honest attempt to protect him. Laud waited in prison five years before he suffered the same fate. The Parliament declared itself to be indissoluble by any royal command; and the king assented. It abolished the Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission; and the king approved. It swept ship-money, and forest claims, and all of Charles' lawless money-getting devices into the limbo; and he put his signature to its bills. But all the time he was intriguing with the Scots for armed help to overthrow his masterful English Parliament, and he was listening to Irish emissaries who offered an army for the same purpose, on condition that Ireland should be surrendered to the Catholics.

Civil War.

Charles had arranged nothing on either of these treacherous plans, nor had he gained anything yet from the division between radicals and moderates that was beginning to show itself in the popular party, when he suddenly brought the strained situation to a crisis, in January, 1642, by his most foolish and arrogant act. He invaded the House of Commons in person, with a large body of armed men, for the purpose of arresting five members—Pym, Hampden, Holles, Hazlerigg and Strode—whom he accused of having negotiated treasonably with the Scots in 1640. The five members escaped; the House appealed to the citizens of London for protection; king and Parliament began immediately to raise troops; the nation divided and arrayed itself on the two sides,—most of the gentry, the Cavaliers, supporting the king, and most of the Puritan middle-class, wearing close-cut hair and receiving the name Roundheads, being ranged in the party of Parliament. They came to blows in October, when the first battle was fought, at Edgehill.

In the early period of the war, the parliamentary forces were commanded by the Earl of Essex; and Sir Thomas Fairfax was their general at a later stage; but the true leader on that side, for war and for politics alike, was soon found in Oliver Cromwell, a member of Parliament, whose extraordinary capacity was first shown in the military organization of the Eastern Counties, from which he came. After 1645, when the army was remodeled, with Cromwell as second in rank, his real chieftainship was scarcely disguised. The decisive battle of the war was fought that year at Naseby, where the king's cause suffered an irrecoverable defeat.

The Presbyterians of Scotland had now allied themselves with the English Roundheads, on condition that the Church of England should be remodeled in the Presbyterian form. The Puritan majority in Parliament being favorable to that form, a Solemn League and Covenant between the two nations had been entered into, in 1643, and an Assembly of Divines was convened at Westminster to frame the contemplated system of the Church. But the Independents, who disliked Presbyterianism, and who were more tolerantly inclined in their views, had greatly increased in numbers, and some of the stronger men on the Parliament side, including Cromwell, the strongest of all, were among them. This difference brought about a sharp struggle within the popular party for the control of the fruits of the triumph now beginning to seem secure. Under Cromwell, the Army became a powerful organization of religious Independency, while Parliament sustained Presbyterianism, and the two stood against each other as rival powers in the state.

At the beginning of the year 1646 the fortunes of Charles had fallen very low. His partisan, Montrose, in Scotland, had been beaten; his intrigues in Ireland, for the raising of a Catholic army, had only alarmed and disgusted his English friends; he was at the end of his resources, and he gave himself up to the Scots. The latter, in conjunction with the Presbyterian majority in Parliament, were willing to make terms with him, and restore him to his throne, on conditions which included the signing of the Covenant and the establishing of Presbyterianism in the

Churches of both kingdoms. He refused the proposal, being deluded by a belief that the quarrel of Independents and Presbyterians would open his way to the recovery of power without any concessions at all. The Scots then surrendered him to the English, and he was held in confinement by the latter for the next two years, scheming and pursuing intrigues in many directions, and convincing all who dealt with him that his purposes were never straightforward—that he was faithless and false to the core.

Ill-will and suspicion, meanwhile, were widening the breach between Parliament and the Army. Political and religious agitators were gaining influence in the latter and republican ideas were spreading fast. At length (December, 1648), the Army took matters into its own hands; expelled from Parliament those members who favored a reconciliation with the king, on the basis of a Presbyterian establishment of the Church, and England passed under military rule. The "purged" Parliament (or rather the purged House of Commons, which now set the House of Lords aside, declaring itself to be the sole and supreme power in the state) brought King Charles to trial in the following month, before a High Court of Justice created for the occasion. He was convicted of treason, in making war upon his subjects, and was beheaded on the 30th of January, 1649.

The Commonwealth and the Protectorate.

The king being thus disposed of, the House of Commons proclaimed England a Commonwealth, "without a King or House of Lords," took to itself the name of Parliament, and appointed an executive Council of State, forty-one in number. The new government, in its first year, had a rebellion in Ireland to deal with, and sent Cromwell to the scene. He crushed it with a merciless hand. The next year Scotland was in arms, for the late king's son, now called Charles II., who had entered the country, accepted Presbyterianism, and signed the Covenant. Again Cromwell was the man for the occasion, and in a campaign of two months he ended the Scottish war, with such decision that he had no more fighting to do on English or Scottish soil while he lived. There was war with the Dutch in 1652, 1653 and 1654, over questions of trade, and the long roll of English naval victories was opened by the great soldier-seaman, Robert Blake.

But the power which upheld and carried forward all things at this time was the power of Oliver Cromwell, master of the Army, and, therefore, master of the Commonwealth. The surviving fragment of the Long Parliament was an anomaly, a fiction; men called it "the Rump." In April, 1653, Cromwell drove the members of it from their chamber and formally took to himself the reins of government which in fact he had been holding before. A few months later he received from his immediate supporters the title of Lord Protector, and an Instrument of Government was framed, which served as a constitution during the next three years. Cromwell was as unwilling as Charles had been to share the government with a freely elected and representative Parliament. The first House which he called together was dissolved at the end of five months (1655), because it persisted in discussing a revision of the constitution. His second Parliament,

which he summoned the following year, required to be purged by the arbitrary exclusion of about a hundred members before it could be brought to due submission. This tractable body then made certain important changes in the constitution, by an enactment called the "Humble Petition and Advice." It created a second house, to take the place of the House of Lords, and gave to the Lord Protector the naming of persons to be life-members of such upper house. It also gave to the Protector the right of appointing his own successor, a right which Cromwell exercised on his death-bed, in 1658, by designating his son Richard.

The responsible rule of Cromwell, from the expulsion of the Rump and his assumption of the dignity of Lord Protector, covered only the period of five years. But in that brief time he made the world respect the power of England as it had never been respected before. His government at home was as absolute and arbitrary as the government of the Stuarts, but it was infinitely wiser and more just. Cromwell was a statesman of the higher order; a man of vast power, in intellect and will. That he did not belong to the yet higher order of commanding men, whose statesmanship is pure in patriotism and uncolored by selfish aims, is proved by his failure to even plan a more promising settlement of the government of England than that which left it, an anomalous Protectorate, to a man without governing qualities, who happened to be his son.

Restoration of the Stuarts.

Richard Cromwell was brushed aside after eight months of an absurd attempt to play the part of Lord Protector. The officers of the Army and the resuscitated Rump Parliament, between them, managed affairs, in a fashion, for almost a year, and then they too were pushed out of the way by the army which had been stationed in Scotland, under General George Monk. By the action of Monk, with the consent, and with more than the consent, of England at large, the Stuart monarchy was restored. Charles II. was invited to return, and in May, 1660, he took his seat on the re-erected throne.

The nation, speaking generally, was tired of a military despotism; tired of Puritan austerity; tired of revolution and political uncertainty;—so tired that it threw itself down at the feet of the most worthless member of the most worthless royal family in its history, and gave itself up to him without a condition or a guarantee. For twenty-five years it endured both oppression and disgrace at his hands. It suffered him to make a brothel of his Court; to empty the national purse into the pockets of his shameless mistresses and debauched companions; to revive the ecclesiastical tyranny of Laud; to make a crime of the religious creeds and the worship of more than half his subjects; to sell himself and sell the honor of England to the king of France for a secret pension, and to be in every possible way as ignoble and despicable as his father had been arrogant and false. When he died, in 1685, the prospects of the English nation were not improved by the accession of his brother, the Duke of York, who became James II. James had more honesty than his brother or his father; but the narrowness and meanness of the Stuart race were in his blood. He had made himself intolerable

to his subjects, both English and Scotch, by entering the Catholic Church, openly, while Charles was believed to have done the same in secret. His religion was necessarily bigotry, because of the smallness of his nature, and he opposed it to the Protestantism of the kingdom with a kind of brutal aggressiveness. In the first year of his reign there was a rebellion undertaken, in the interest of a bastard son of Charles II., called Duke of Monmouth; but it was savagely put down, first by force of arms, at Sedgemoor, and afterwards by the "bloody assizes" of the ruthless Judge Jeffreys. Encouraged by this success against his enemies James began to ignore the "Test Act," which excluded Catholics from office, and to surround himself by men of his own religion. The Test Act was an unrighteous law, and the "Declaration of Indulgence" which James issued, for the toleration of Catholics and Dissenters, was just in principle, according to the ideas of later times; but the action of the king with respect to both was, nevertheless, a gross and threatening violation of law. England had submitted to worse conduct from Charles II., but its Protestant temper was now roused, and the loyalty of the subject was consumed by the fierceness of the Churchman's wrath. James' daughter, Mary, and her husband, William, Prince of Orange, were invited from Holland to come over and displace the obnoxious father from his throne. They accepted the invitation, November, 1688; the nation rose to welcome them; James fled,—and the great Revolution, which ended arbitrary monarchy in England forever, and established constitutional government on clearly defined and lasting bases, was accomplished without the shedding of a drop of blood.

The House of Orange and the Dutch Republic.

William of Orange, who thus acquired a place in the line of English kings, held, at the same time, the nearly regal office of Stadtholder of Holland; but the office had not remained continuously in his family since William the Silent, whose great-grandson he was. Maurice, the son of the murdered William the Silent, had been chosen to the stadtholdership after his father's death, and had carried forward his father's work with success, so far as concerned the liberation of the United Provinces from the Spanish yoke. He was an abler soldier than William, but not his equal as a statesman, nor as a man. The greater statesman of the period was John of Barneveldt, between whom and the Stadtholder an opposition grew up which produced jealousy and hostility, more especially on the part of the latter. A shameful religious conflict had arisen at this time between the Calvinists, who numbered most of the clergy in their ranks, and a dissenting body led by Jacob Hermann, or Arminius, which protested against the doctrine of predestination. Barneveldt favored the Arminians. The Stadtholder, Maurice, without any apparent theological conviction in the matter, threw his whole weight of influence on the side of the Calvinists; and was able, with the help of the Calvinist preachers, to carry the greater part of the common people into that faction. The Arminians were everywhere put down as heretics, barred from preaching or teaching, and otherwise silenced and ill-treated. It is a singular fact that, at the very time of this outburst of Calvinistic fury, the Dutch were exhibiting other-

wise a far more tolerant temper in religion than any other people in Europe, and had thrown open their country as a place of shelter for the persecuted of other lands,—both Christian sectaries and Jews. We infer, necessarily, that the bitterness of the Calvinists against the Arminians was more political than religious in its source, and that the source is really traceable to the fierce ambition of Prince Maurice, and the passion of the party which supported his suspicious political aims.

Barneveldt lost influence as the consequence of the Calvinistic triumph, and was exposed helplessly to the vindictive hatred of Prince Maurice, who did not scruple to cause his arrest, his trial and execution (1619), on charges which none believed. Maurice, whose memory is blackened by this great crime, died in 1625, and was succeeded by his half-brother, Frederic Henry. The war with Spain had been renewed in 1621, at the end of the twelve years truce, and more than willingly renewed; for the merchant class, and the maritime interest in the cities which felt secure, preferred war to peace. Under a hostile flag they pushed their commerce into Spanish and Portuguese seas from which a treaty of peace would undoubtedly exclude them; and, so long as Spanish American silver fleets were afloat, the spoils of ocean war were vastly enriching. It was during these years of war that the Dutch got their footing on the farther sides of the world, and nearly won the mastery of the sea which their slower but stronger English rivals wrested from them in the end. Not until the general Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, was a final settlement of issues between Spain and the United Provinces brought about. The freedom and independence of the Provinces, as sovereign states, was then acknowledged by the humbled Spaniard, and favorable arrangements of trade were conceded to them. The southern, Catholic Provinces, which Spain had held, were retained in their subjection to her.

Frederic Henry, the third Stadtholder, was succeeded in 1647 by his son, William II. The latter wasted his short career of less than four years in foolish plotting to revolutionize the government and transform the stadtholdership into a monarchy, supported by France, for the help of which country he seemed willing to pay any base and treasonable price. Dying suddenly in the midst of his scheming, he left an unborn son—the future William III. of England—who came into the world a week after his father had left it. Under these circumstances the stadtholdership was suspended, with strong feelings against the revival of it, resulting from the conduct of William II. The lesser provinces then fell under the domination of Holland—so much so that the name of Holland began soon to be applied to the confederation at large, and is very commonly used with that meaning for a long subsequent time. The chief minister of the Estates of Holland, known as the Grand Pensionary, became the practical head of the federal government. After 1653 the office of Grand Pensionary was filled by a statesman of high ability, John de Witt, the chief end of whose policy appears to have been the prevention of the return of the House of Orange to power. The government thus administered, and controlled by the commercial class, was successful in promoting the general prosperity of the provinces, and in

advancing their maritime importance and power. It conducted two wars with England—one with the Commonwealth and one with the restored monarchy—and could claim at least an equal share of the naval glory won in each. But it neglected the land defense of the country, and was found shamefully unprepared in 1672, when the Provinces were attacked by a villainous combination, formed between Louis XIV. of France and his servile pensioner, Charles II. of England. The republic, humbled and distressed by the rushing conquests of the French, fixed its hopes upon the young Prince of Orange, heir to the prestige of a great historic name, and turned its wrath against the party of De Witt. The Prince was made Stadtholder, despite the opposition of John de Witt, and the latter, with his brother Cornelius, was murdered by a mob at Amsterdam. William of Orange proved both wise and heroic as a leader, and the people were roused to a new energy of resistance by his appeals and his example. They cut their dykes and flooded the land, subjecting themselves to unmeasured loss and distress, but peremptorily stopping the French advance, until time was gained for awakening public feeling in Europe against the aggressions of the unscrupulous French king. Then William of Orange began that which was to be his great and important mission in life,—the organizing of resistance to Louis XIV. Without the foresight and penetration of French designs which he evinced,—without his unflinching exertions for the next thirty years,—without his diplomatic tact, his skill of management, his patience in war, his obstinate perseverance,—it seems to be a certainty that the ambitious “grand monarch,” concentrating the whole power of France in himself, would have been able to break the surrounding nations one by one, and they would not have combined their strength for an effective self-protection. The revolution of 1688-9 in England, which gave the crown of that kingdom to William, and his wife Mary, contributed greatly to his success, and was an event nearly as important in European politics at large as it was in the constitutional history of Great Britain.

Germany after the Thirty Years War.

In a natural order of things, Germany should have supplied the main resistance to Louis XIV. and held his unscrupulous ambition in check. But Germany had fallen to its lowest state of political demoralization and disorder. The very idea of nationality had disappeared. The Empire, even collapsed to the Germanic sense, and even reduced to a frame and a form, had almost vanished from practical affairs. The numerous petty states which divided the German people stood apart from one another, in substantial independence, and were sundered by small jealousies and distrusts. Little absolute principalities they were, each having its little court, which aped, in a little way, the grand court of the great monarch of France—central object of the admiration and the envy of all small souls in its time. Half of them were ready to bow down to the splendid being at Versailles, and to be his creatures, if he condescended to bestow a nod of patronage and attention upon them. The French king had more influence among them than their nominal Emperor. More and more distinctly the latter drew apart in his immediate dominions as an Austrian sovereign; and more and more com-

pletely Austrian interests and Austrian policy became removed and estranged from the interests of the Germanic people. The ambitions and the cares of the House of Hapsburg were increasingly in directions most opposite to the German side of its relations, tending towards Italy and the southeast; while, at the same time, the narrow church influence which depressed the Austrian states widened a hopeless intellectual difference between them and the northern German people.

Brandenburg.—Prussia.

The most notable movements in dull German affairs after the Peace of Westphalia were those which connected themselves with the settling and centering in Brandenburg of a nucleus of growing power, around which the nationalizing of Germany has been a crystalizing process ever since. The Mark of Brandenburg was one of the earliest conquests (tenth century) of the Germans from the Wends. Prussia, afterwards united with Brandenburg, was a later conquest (thirteenth century) from Wendish or Slavonic and other pagan inhabitants, and its subjugation was a missionary enterprise, accomplished by the crusading Order of Teutonic Knights, under the authority and direction of the Pope. The Order, which held the country for more than two centuries, and ruled it badly, became degenerate, and about the middle of the fifteenth century it was overcome in war by Casimir IV. of Poland, who took away from it the western part of its territory, and forced it to do homage to him for the eastern part, as a fief of the Polish crown. Sixty years later, the Reformation movement in Germany brought about the extinguishment of the Teutonic Order as a political power. The Grand Master of the Order at that time was Albert, a Hohenzollern prince, belonging to a younger branch of the Brandenburg family. He became a Lutheran, and succeeded in persuading the Polish king, Sigismund I., to transfer the sovereignty of the East Prussian fief to him personally, as a duchy. He transmitted it to his descendants, who held it for a few generations; but the line became extinct in 1618, and the Duchy of Prussia then passed to the elder branch of the family and was united with Brandenburg. The Mark of Brandenburg had been raised to the rank of an Electorate in 1356 and had been acquired by the Hohenzollern family in 1417. The superior weight of the Brandenburg electors in northern Germany may be dated from their acquisition of the important Duchy of Prussia; but they made no mark on affairs until the time of Frederick William I., called the Great Elector, who succeeded to the Electorate in 1640, near the close of the Thirty Years War. In the arrangements of the Peace of Westphalia he secured East Pomerania and other considerable additions of territory. In 1657 he made his Duchy of Prussia independent of Poland, by treaty with the Polish king. In 1672 and 1674 he had the courage and the independence to join the allies against Louis XIV., and when the Swedes, in alliance with Louis, invaded his dominions, he defeated and humbled them at Fehrbellin, and took from them the greater part of their Pomeranian territory. When the Great Elector died, in 1688, Brandenburg was the commanding North-German power, and the Hohenzollern family had fully entered on the great career it has since pursued.

Frederick William's son Frederick, with none of his father's talent, had a pushing but shallow ambition. He aspired to be a king, and circumstances made his friendship so important to the Emperor Leopold I. that the latter, exercising the theoretical super-sovereignty of the Cæsars, endowed him with the regal title. He was made King of Prussia, not of Brandenburg, because Brandenburg stood in vassalage to the Empire, while Prussia was an independent state.

Poland and Russia.

When Brandenburg and Prussia united began to rise to importance, the neighboring kingdom of Poland had already passed the climax of its career. Under the Jagellon dynasty, sprung from the Duke Jagellon of Lithuania, who married Hedwig, Queen of Poland, in 1386, and united the two states, Poland was a great power for two centuries, and seemed more likely than Russia to dominate the Slavonic peoples of Europe. The Russians at that time were under the feet of the Mongols or Tartars, whose terrific sweep westwards, from the steppes of Asia, had overwhelmed them completely and seemed to bring their independent history to an end. Slowly a Russian duchy had emerged, having its seat of doubtful sovereignty at Moscow, and being subject quite humbly to the Mongol Khan. About 1477 the Muscovite duke of that time, Ivan Vasilovitch, broke the Tartar yoke and acquired independence. But his dominion was limited. The Poles and Lithuanians, now united, had taken possession of large and important territories formerly Russian, and the Muscovite state was entirely cut off from the Baltic. It began, however, in the next century, under Ivan the Terrible, first of the Czars, to make conquests southward and south-eastward, from the Tartars, until it had reached the Caspian Sea. The dominion of the Czar stretched northward, at the same time, to the White Sea, at the single port of which trade was opened with the Russian country by English merchant adventurers in the reign of Elizabeth. Late in the sixteenth century the old line of rulers, descended from the Scandinavian Ruric, came to an end, and after a few years Michael Romanoff established the dynasty which has reigned since his time.

As between the two principal Slavonic nations, Russia was now gaining stability and weight, while Poland had begun to lose both. It was a fatal day for the Poles when, in 1573, on the death of the last of the Jagellons, they made their monarchy purely elective, abolishing the restriction to one family which had previously prevailed. The election was by the suffrage of the nobles, not the people at large (who were generally serfs), and the government became an oligarchy of the most unregulated kind known in history. The crown was stripped of power, and the unwillingness of the nobility to submit to any national authority, even that of its own assembly, reached a point, about the middle of the seventeenth century, at which anarchy was virtually agreed upon as the desirable political state. The extraordinary "liberum veto," then made part of the Polish constitution, gave to each single member of the assemblies of the nobles, or of the deputies representing them, a right to forbid any enactment, or to arrest the whole proceedings of the body, by his unsupported negative. This amazing prerogative appears to

have been exercised very rarely in its fullness; but its theoretical existence effectually extinguished public spirit and paralyzed all rational legislation. Linked with the singular feebleness of the monarchy, it leaves small room for surprise at the ultimate shipwreck of the Polish state.

The royal elections at Warsaw came to be prize contests at which all Europe assisted. Every Court set up its candidate for the paltry titular place; every candidate emptied his purse into the Polish capital, and bribed, intrigued, corrupted, to the best of his ability. Once, at least (1674), when the game was on, a sudden breeze of patriotic feeling swept the traffickers out of the diet, and inspired the election of a national hero, John Sobieski, to whom Europe owes much; for it was he who drove back the Turks, in 1683, when their last bold push into central Europe was made, and when they were storming at the gates of Vienna. But when Sobieski died, in 1696, the old scandalous vendue of a crown was re-opened, and the Elector of Saxony was the buyer. During most of the last two centuries of its history, Poland sold its throne to one alien after another, and allowed foreign states to mix and meddle with its affairs. Of real nationality there was not much left to extinguish when the time of extinction came. There were patriots, and very noble patriots, among the Poles, at all periods of their history; but it seems to have been the very hopelessness of the state into which their country had drifted which intensified their patriotic feeling.

Russia had acquired magnitude and strength as a barbaric power, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but it was not until the reign of Peter the Great, which opened in 1682, that the great Slavonic empire began to take on a European character, with European interests and influences, and to assimilate the civilization of the West. Peter may be said to have knotted Russia to Europe at both extremities, by pushing his dominions to the Baltic on the north and to the Black Sea on the south, and by putting his own ships afloat in both. From his day, Russia has been steadily gathering weight in each of the two continents over which her vast bulk of empire is stretched, and moving to a mysterious great destiny in time to come.

The Turks.

The Turks, natural enemies of all the Christian races of eastern and southeastern Europe, came practically to the end of their threatening career of conquest about the middle of the sixteenth century, when Suleiman the Magnificent died (1566). He had occupied a great part of Hungary; seated a pasha in Buda; laid siege to Vienna; taken Rhodes from the Knights of St. John; attacked them in Malta; made an alliance with the King of France; brought a Turkish fleet into the western Mediterranean, and held Europe in positive terror of an Ottoman domination for half a century. His son Selim added Cyprus to the Turkish conquests; but was humbled in the Mediterranean by the great Christian victory of Lepanto, won by the combined fleets of Spain, Venice and the Pope, under Don John of Austria. After that time Europe had no great fear of the Turk; though he still fought hard with the Venetians, the Poles, the Russians, the Hungarians, and, once more, carried his arms

even to Vienna. But, on the whole, it was a losing fight; the crescent was on the wane.

Last glories of Venice.

In the whole struggle with the Ottomans, through the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, the republic of Venice bore a noble part. She contested with them foot by foot the Greek islands, Peloponnesus, and the eastern shores of the Adriatic. Even after her commerce began to slip from her control, and the strength which came from it sank rapidly, she gave up her eastern possessions but slowly, one by one, and after stout resistance. Crete cost the Turks a war of twenty-four years (1645-1669). Fifteen years afterwards the Venetians gathered their energies afresh, assumed the aggressive, and conquered the whole Peloponnesus, which they held for a quarter of a century. Then it was lost again, and the Ionian Islands alone remained Venetian territory in the East.

Rise of the House of Savoy.

Of Italy at large, in the seventeenth century, lying prostrate under the heavy hand of Spain, there is no history to claim attention in so brief a sketch as this. One sovereign family in the northwest, long balanced on the Alps, in uncertainty between a cis-Alpine and a trans-Alpine destiny, but now clearly committed to Italian fortunes, had begun to win its footing among the noticeable smaller powers of the day by sheer dexterity of trimming and shifting sides in the conflicts of the time. This was the House of Savoy, whose first possessions were gathered in the crumbling of the old kingdom of Burgundy, and lay on both slopes of the Alps, commanding several important passes. On the western and northern side, the counts, afterwards dukes, of Savoy had to contend, as time went on, with the expanding kingdom of France and with the stout-hearted communities which ultimately formed the Swiss Confederacy. They fell back before both. At one period, in the fifteenth century, their dominion had stretched to the Saone, and to the lake of Neufchâtel, on both sides of it, surrounding the free city of Geneva, which they were never able to overcome, and the lake of Geneva entire. After that time, the Savoyards gradually lost territory on the Gallic side and won compensations on the Italian side, in Piedmont, and at the expense of Genoa and the duchy of Milan. The Duke Victor Amadeus II. was the most successful winner for his house, and he made his gains by remarkable manœuvring on both sides of the wars of Louis XIV. One of his acquisitions (1713) was the island kingdom of Sicily, which gave him a royal title. A few years later he exchanged it with Austria for the island kingdom of Sardinia—a realm more desirable to him for geographical reasons only. The dukes of Savoy and princes of Piedmont thus became kings of Sardinia, and the name of the kingdom was often applied to their whole dominion, down to the recent time when the House of Savoy attained the grander kingship of united Italy.

First wars of Louis XIV.

The wars of Louis XIV. gave little opportunity for western and central Europe to make any other history than that of struggle and battle, invasion and devastation, intrigue and faithless

diplomacy, shifting of political landmarks and traffic in border populations, as though they were pastured cattle, for fifty years, in the last part of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth (1665-1715). It will be remembered that when this King of France married the Infanta of Spain, he joined in a solemn renunciation of all rights on her part and on that of her children to such dominions as she might otherwise inherit. But such a renunciation, with no sentiment of honor behind it, was worthless, of course, and Louis XIV., in his own esteem, stood on a height quite above the moral considerations that have force with common men. When Philip IV. of Spain died, in 1665, Louis promptly began to put forward the claims which he had pledged himself not to make. He demanded part of the Netherlands, and Franche Comté—the old county (not the duchy) of Burgundy—as belonging to his queen. It was his good fortune to be served by some of the greatest generals, military engineers and administrators of the day—by Turenne, Condé, Vauban, Louvois, and others—and when he sent his armies of invasion into Flanders and Franche Comté they carried all before them. Holland took alarm at these aggressions which came so near to her, and formed an alliance with England and Sweden to assist Spain. But the unprincipled English king, Charles II., was easily bribed to betray his ally; Sweden was bought over; Spain submitted to a treaty which gave the Burgundian county back to her, and surrendered an important part of the Spanish Netherlands to France. Louis' first exploit of national brigandage had thus been a glorious success, as glory is defined in the vocabulary of sovereigns of his class. He had stolen several valuable towns, killed some thousands of people, carried misery into the lives of some thousands more, and provoked the Dutch to a challenge of war that seemed promising of more glory of like kind.

In 1672 he prepared himself to chastise the Dutch, and his English pensioner, Charles II., with several German princes, joined him in the war. It was this war, as related already, which brought about the fall and the death of John de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland; which raised William of Orange to the restored stadtholdership, and which gave him a certain leadership of influence in Europe, as against the French king. It was this war, likewise, which gave the Hohenzollerns their first great battle-triumph, in the defeat of the Swedes, allies of the French, at Fehrbellin. For Frederick William, the Great Elector, had joined the Emperor Leopold and the King of Spain in another league with Holland to resist the aggressions of France; while Sweden now took sides with Louis. England was soon withdrawn from the contest, by the determined action of Parliament, which forced its king to make peace. Otherwise the war became general in western Europe and was frightful in the death and misery it cost. Generally the French had the most success. Turenne was killed in 1675 and Condé retired the same year; but able commanders were found in Luxembourg and Crequi to succeed them. In opposition to William of Orange, the Dutch made peace at Nimegueu, in 1678, and Spain was forced to give up Franche Comté, with another fraction of her Netherland territories; but Holland lost nothing. Again Louis XIV. had beaten and robbed his neighbors

with success, and was at the pinnacle of his glory. France, it is true, was oppressed and exhausted, but her king was a "grand monarch," and she must needs be content.

For a few years the grand monarch contented himself with small filchings of territory, which kept his conscience supple and gave practice to his sleight-of-hand. On one pretext and another he seized town after town in Alsace, and, at last, 1681, surprised and captured the imperial free city of Strasburg, in a time of entire peace. He bombarded Genoa, took Avignon from the Pope, bullied and abused feeble Spain, made large claims on the Palatinate in the name of his sister-in-law, but against her will, and did nearly what he was pleased to do, without any effective resistance, until after William of Orange had been called to the English throne. That completed a great change in the European situation.

Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

The change had already been more than half brought about by a foul and foolish measure which Louis had adopted in his domestic administration. Cursed by a tyrant's impatience at the idea of free thought and free opinion among his subjects, he had been persuaded by Catholic zealots near his person to revoke the Edict of Nantes and revive persecution of the Huguenots. This was done in 1685. The fatal effects within France resembled those which followed the persecution of the Moriscos of Spain. The Huguenots formed a large proportion of the best middle class of the kingdom,—its manufacturers, its merchants, its skilled and thrifty artisans. Infamous efforts were made to detain them in the country and there force them to apostasy or hold them under punishment if they withstood. But there was not power enough in the monarchy, with all its absolutism, to enclose France in such a wall. Vast numbers escaped—half a million it is thought—carrying their skill, their knowledge, their industry and their energy into Holland, England, Switzerland, all parts of Protestant Germany, and across the ocean to America. France was half ruined by the loss.

The League of Augsburg.

At the same time, the Protestant allies in Germany and the North, whom Louis had held in subservency to himself so long, were angered and alarmed by his act. They joined a new defensive league against him, formed at Augsburg, in 1686, which embraced the Emperor, Spain, Holland, and Sweden, at first, and afterwards took in Savoy and other Italian states, along with Germany almost entire. But the League was miserably unprepared for war, and hardly hindered the march of Louis' armies when he suddenly moved them into the Rhenish electorates in 1688. For the second time in his reign, and under his orders, the Palatinate was fearfully devastated with fire and sword. But this attack on Germany, occupying the arms of France, gave William of Orange his opportunity to enter England unopposed and take the English crown. That accomplished, he speedily brought England into the League, enlarging it to a "grand alliance" of all western Europe against the dangerous monarch of France, and inspiring it with some measure of his own energy and courage.

France had now to deal with enemies on every side. They swarmed on all her frontiers, and

the strength and valor with which she met them were amazing. For three years the French more than held their own, not only in land-fighting, but on the sea, where they seemed likely, for a time, to dispute the supremacy of the English and the Dutch with success. But the frightful draft made on the resources of the nation, and the strain on its spirit, were more than could be kept up. The obstinacy of the king, and his indifference to the sufferings of his people, prolonged the war until 1697, but with steady loss to the French of the advantages with which they began. Two years before the end, Louis had bought over the Duke of Savoy, by giving back to him all that France had taken from his Italian territories since Richelieu's time. When the final peace was settled, at Ryswick, like surrenderers had to be made in the Netherlands, Lorraine, and beyond the Rhine; but Alsace, with Strasburg, was kept, to be a German graft on France, until the sharp Prussian pruning knife, in our own time, cut it away.

War of the Spanish Succession.

There were three years of peace after the treaty of Ryswick, and then a new war—longer, more bitter, and more destructive than those before it—arose out of questions connected with the succession to the crown of Spain. Charles II., last of the Austro-Spanish or Spanish-Hapsburg kings, died in 1700, leaving no heir. The nearest of his relatives to the throne were the descendants of his two sisters, one of whom had married Louis XIV. and the other the Emperor Leopold, of the Austrian House. Louis XIV., as we know, had renounced all the Spanish rights of his queen and her issue; but that renunciation had been shown already to be wasted paper. Leopold had renounced nothing; but he had required a renunciation of her Spanish claims from the one daughter, Maria, of his Spanish wife, and he put forward claims to the Spanish succession, on his own behalf, because his mother had been a princess of that nation, as well as his wife. He was willing, however, to transfer his own rights to a younger son, fruit of a second marriage, the Archduke Charles.

The question of the Spanish succession was one of European interest and importance, and attempts had been made to settle it two years before the death of the Spanish king, in 1698, by a treaty, or agreement, between France, England, and Holland. By that treaty these outside powers (consulting Spain not at all) undertook a partition of the Spanish monarchy, in what they assumed to be the interest of the European balance of power. They awarded Naples, Sicily, and some lesser Italian possessions to a grandson of Louis XIV., the Milanese territory to the Archduke Charles, and the rest of the Spanish dominions to an infant son of Maria, the Emperor's daughter, who was married to the elector of Bavaria. But the infant so selected to wear the crown of Spain died soon afterwards, and a second treaty of partition was framed. This gave the Milanese to the Duke of Lorraine, in exchange for his own duchy, which he promised to cede to France, and the whole remainder of the Spanish inheritance was conceded to the Austrian archduke, Charles. In Spain, these arrangements were naturally resented, by both people and king, and the latter was persuaded to set against them a will,

bequeathing all that he ruled to the younger grandson of Louis XIV., Philip of Anjou, on condition that the latter renounce for himself and for his heirs all claims to the crown of France. The inducement to this bequest was the power which the King of France possessed to enforce it, and so to preserve the unity of the Spanish realm. That the argument and the persuasion came from Louis' own agents, while other agents amused England, Holland and Austria with treaties of partition, is tolerably clear.

Near the end of the year 1700, the King of Spain died; his will was disclosed; the treaties were as coolly ignored as the prior renunciation had been, and the young French prince was sent pompously into Spain to accept the proffered crown. For a time, there was indignation in Europe, but no more. William of Orange could persuade neither England nor Holland to war, and Austria could not venture hostilities without their help. But that submissiveness only drew from the grand monarch fresh displays of his dishonesty and his insolence. Philip of Anjou's renunciation of a possible succession to the French throne, while occupying that of Spain, was practically annulled. The government of Spain was guided from Paris like that of a dependency of France. Dutch and English commerce was injured by hostile measures. Movements alarming to Holland were made on the frontiers of the Spanish Netherlands. Finally, when the fugitive ex-king of England, James II., died at St. Germain, in September, 1701, Louis acknowledged James' son, the Pretender, as King of England. This insult roused the war spirit in England which King William had striven so hard to evoke. He had already arranged the terms of a new defensive Grand Alliance with Holland, Austria, and most of the German states. There was no difficulty now in making it an offensive combination.

But William, always weak in health, and worn by many cares and harassing troubles, died in March, 1702, before the war which he desired broke out. His death made no pause in the movement of events. Able statesmen, under Queen Anne, his successor, carried forward his policy and a great soldier was found, in the person of John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, to command the armies of England and the Dutch. Another commander, of remarkable genius, Prince Eugene of Savoy, took service with the Emperor, and these two, acting cordially together, humbled the overweening pride of Louis XIV. in the later years of his reign. He had worn out France by his long exactions. His strong ministers, Colbert, Louvois and others, were dead, and he did not find successors for them. He had able generals, but none equal to Turenne, Condé or Luxemburg,—none to cope with Marlborough and Prince Eugene. The war was widespread, on a stupendous scale, and it lasted for twelve years. Its campaigns were fought in the Low Countries, in Germany, in Italy and in Spain. It glorified the reign of Anne, in English history, by the shining victories of Blenheim, Ramilies, Oudenarde and Malplaquet, and by the capture of Gibraltar, the padlock of the Mediterranean. The misery to which France was reduced in the later years of the war was probably the greatest that the much suffering nation ever knew.

The Peace of Utrecht.

Louis sought peace, and was willing to go far in surrenders to obtain it. But the allies pressed him too hard in their demands. They would have him not only abandon the Bourbon dynasty that he had set up in Spain, but join them in overthrowing it. He refused to negotiate on such terms, and Fortune approved his resolution, by giving decisive victories to his arms in Spain, while dealing out disaster and defeat in every other field. England grew weary of the war when it came to appear endless, and Marlborough and the Whigs, who had carried it on, were ousted from power. The Tories, under Harley and Bolingbroke, came into office and negotiated the famous Peace of Utrecht (1713), to which all the belligerents in the war, save the Emperor, consented. The Emperor yielded to a supplementary treaty, signed at Rastadt the next year. These treaties left the Bourbon King of Spain, Philip V., on his throne, but bound him, by fresh renunciations, not to be likewise King of France. They gave to England Gibraltar and Minorca, at the expense of Spain, and Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Hudson's Bay at the expense of France. They took much more from Spain. They took Sicily, which they gave to the Duke of Savoy, with the title of King; they took Naples, Milan, Mantua and Sardinia, which they gave to Austria, or, more strictly speaking, to the Emperor; and they took the Spanish Netherlands, which they gave to Austria in the main, with some barrier towns to the Dutch. They took from France her conquests on the right bank of the Rhine; but they left her in possession of Alsace, with Strasburg and Landau. The great victim of the war was Spain.

France at the death of Louis XIV.

Louis XIV. was near the end of his reign when this last of the fearful wars which he caused was brought to a close. He died in September, 1715, leaving a kingdom which had reasons to curse his memory in every particular of its state. He had foiled the exertions of as wise a minister, Jean Colbert, as ever strove to do good to France. He had dried the sources of national life as with a searching and monstrous sponge. He had repressed everything which he could not absorb in his flaunting court, in his destroying armies, and in himself. He had dealt with France as with a dumb beast that had been given him to bestride; to display himself upon, before the gaze of an envious world; to be bridled, and spurred at his pleasure, and whipped; to toil for him and bear burdens as he willed; to tread upon his enemies and trample his neighbors' fields. It was he, more than all others before or after, who made France that dumb creature which suffered and was still for a little longer time, and then began thinking and went mad.

Charles XII. of Sweden.

While the Powers of western Europe were wrestling in the great war of the Spanish Succession, the nations of the North and East were tearing each other, at the same time, with equal stubbornness and ferocity. The beginning of their conflict was a wanton attack from Russia, Poland and Denmark, on the possessions of Sweden. Sweden, in the past century, had made extensive conquests, and her territories, outside

of the Scandinavian peninsula, were thrust provocingly into the sides of all these three neighbors. There had been three Charleses on the Swedish throne in succession, following Christina, the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus. Queen Christina, an eccentric character, had abdicated in 1654, in order to join the Catholic Church, and had been succeeded by her cousin, Charles X. The six years reign of this Charles was one of constant war with the Danes and the Poles, and almost uniformly he was the aggressor. His son and successor, Charles XI., suffered the great defeat at Fehrbellin which gave prestige to Brandenburg; but he was shielded by the puissant arm of Louis XIV., his ally, and lost no territory. More successful in his domestic policy than in his wars, he, both practically and formally, established absolutism in the monarchy. Inheriting from his father that absolute power, while inheriting at the same time the ruthless ambition of his grandfather, Charles XII. came to the throne in 1697.

In the first two years of his reign, this extraordinary young autocrat showed so little of his character that his royal neighbors thought him a weakling, and Peter the Great, of Russia, conspired with Augustus of Poland and Frederick IV. of Denmark to strip him of those parts of his dominion which they severally coveted. The result was like the rousing of a lion by hunters who went forth to pursue a hare. The young Swede, dropping, instantly and forever, all frivolities, sprang at his assailants before they dreamed of finding him awake, and the game was suddenly reversed. The hunters became the hunted, and they had no rest for nine years from the implacable pursuit of them which Charles kept up. He defeated the Danes and the Russians in the first year of the war (1700). In 1702 he invaded Poland and occupied Warsaw; in 1704 he forced the deposition of the Saxon King of Poland, Augustus, and the election of Stanislaus Leczinski. Not yet satisfied, he followed Augustus into his electorate of Saxony, and compelled him there to renounce the Polish crown and the Russian alliance. In 1708 he invaded Russia, marching on Moscow, but turning aside to meet an expected ally, Mazeppa the Cossack. It was the mistake which Napoleon repeated a century later. The Swedes exhausted themselves in the march, and the Russians bided their time. Peter the Czar had devoted eight years, since Charles defeated him at Narva, to making soldiers, well-trained, out of the mob which that fight scattered. When Charles had worn his army down to a slender and disheartened force, Peter struck and destroyed it at Pultowa. Charles escaped from the wreck and took refuge, with a few hundreds of his guards, in the Turkish province of Bessarabia, at Bender. In that shelter, which the Ottomans hospitably accorded to him, he remained for five years, intriguing to bring the Porte into war with his Muscovite enemy, while all the fruits of his nine years of conquest in the North were stripped from him by the old league revived. Augustus returned to Poland and recovered his crown. Peter took possession of Livonia, Ingria, and a great part of Finland. Frederick IV., of Denmark, attacked Sweden itself. The kingless kingdom made a valiant defense against the crowd of eager enemies; but Charles had used the best of its energies and its resources, and it was not strong.

Near the end of 1710, Charles succeeded in pushing the Sultan into war with the Czar, and the latter, advancing into Moldavia, rashly placed himself in a position of great peril, where the Turks had him really at their mercy. But Catherine, the Czarina, who was present, found means to bribe the Turkish vizier in command, and Peter escaped with no loss more serious than the surrender of Azov. That ended the war, and the hopes of the Swedish king. But still the stubborn Charles wearied the Porte with his importunities, until he was commanded to quit the country. Even then he refused to depart,—resisted when force was used to expel him, and did not take his leave until late in November, 1714, when he received intelligence that his subjects were preparing to appoint his sister regent of the kingdom and to make peace with the Czar. That news hurried him homeward; but only for continued war. He was about to make terms with Russia, and to secure her alliance against Denmark, Poland and Hanover, when he was killed during an invasion of Norway, in the siege of Friedrickshall (December, 1718). The crown of Sweden was then conferred upon his sister, but shorn of absolute powers, and practically dependent upon the nobles. All the wars in which Charles XII. had involved his kingdom were brought to an end by great sacrifices, and Russia rose to the place of Sweden as the chief power in the North. The Swedes paid heavily for the career of their "Northern Alexander."

Alliance against Spain.

Before the belligerents in the North had quieted themselves, those of the West were again in arms. Spain had fallen under the influence of two eager and restless ambitions, that of the queen, Elizabeth of Parma, and an Italian minister, Cardinal Alberoni; and the schemes into which these two drew the Bourbon king, Philip V., soon ruptured the close relations with France which Louis XIV. had ruined his kingdom to bring about. To check them, a triple alliance was formed (1717) between France, England and Holland,—enlarged the next year to a quadruple alliance by the adhesion of Austria. At the outset of the war, Spain made a conquest of Sardinia, and almost accomplished the same in Sicily; but the English crushed her navy and her rising commerce, while the French crossed the Pyrenees with an army which the Spaniards could not resist. A vast combination which Alberoni was weaving, and which took in Charles XII., Peter the Great, the Stuart pretender, the English Jacobites, and the opponents of the regency in France, fell to pieces when the Swedish king fell. Alberoni was driven from Spain and all his plans were given up. The Spanish king withdrew from Sicily and surrendered Sardinia. The Emperor and the Duke of Savoy exchanged islands, as stated before, and the former (holding Naples already) revived the old Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, while the latter became King of Sardinia.

War of the Polish Succession.

These disturbances ended, there were a few years of rest in Europe, and then another war, of the character peculiar to the eighteenth century, broke out. It had its cause in the Polish election of a king to succeed Augustus II. As usual, the neighboring nations formed a betting ring of onlookers, so to speak, and "backed"

their several candidates heavily. The deposed and exiled king, Stanislaus Leczinski, who received his crown from Charles XII. and lost it after Pultowa, was the French candidate; for he had married his daughter to Louis XV. Frederick Augustus of Saxony, son of the late King Augustus, was the Russian and Austrian candidate. The contest resulted in a double election (1733), and out of that came war. Spain and Sardinia joined France, and the Emperor had no allies. Hence the House of Austria suffered greatly in the war, losing the Two Sicilies, which went to Spain, and were conferred on a younger son of the king, creating a third Bourbon monarchy. Part of the duchy of Milan was also yielded by Austria to the King of Sardinia; and the Duke of Lorraine, husband of the Emperor's daughter, Maria Theresa, gave up his duchy to Stanislaus, who renounced therefor his claim on the crown of Poland. The Duke of Lorraine received as compensation a right of succession to the grand duchy of Tuscany, where the Medicean House was about to expire. These were the principal consequences, humiliating to Austria, of what is known as the First Family Compact of the French and Spanish Bourbons.

War of Jenkins' Ear.

This alliance between the two courts gave encouragement to hostile demonstrations in the Spanish colonies against English traders, who were accused of extensive smuggling, and the outcome was a petty war (1739), called "the War of Jenkins' Ear."

War of the Austrian Succession.

Before these hostilities were ended, another "war of succession," more serious than any before it, was wickedly brought upon Europe. The Emperor, Charles VI., died in 1740, leaving no son, but transmitting his hereditary dominions to his eldest daughter, the celebrated Maria Theresa, married to the ex-Duke of Lorraine. Years before his death he had sought to provide against any possible disputing of the succession, by an instrument known as the Pragmatic Sanction, to which he obtained, first, the assent of the estates of all the provinces and kingdoms of the Austrian realm, and, secondly, the guaranty by solemn treaty of almost every European Power. He died in the belief that he had established his daughter securely, and left her to the enjoyment of a peaceful reign. It was a pitiful illusion. He was scarcely in his grave before half the guarantors of the Pragmatic Sanction were putting forward claims to this part and that part of the Austrian territories. The Elector of Bavaria, the Elector of Saxony (in his wife's name) and the King of Spain, claimed the whole succession; the two first mentioned on grounds of collateral lineage, the latter (a Bourbon cuckoo in the Spanish-Hapsburg nest) as being the heir of the Hapsburgs of Spain.

While these larger pretensions were still jostling each other in the diplomatic stage, a minor claimant, who said little but acted powerfully, sent his demands to the Court of Vienna with an army following close at their heels. This was Frederick II. of Prussia, presently known as Frederick the Great, who resuscitated an obsolete claim on Silesia and took possession of the province (1740-41) without waiting for debate. If, anywhere, there had been virtuous hesitations

before, his bold stroke ended them. France could not see her old Austrian rival dismembered without hastening to grasp a share. She contracted with the Spanish king and the Elector of Bavaria to enforce the latter's claims, and to take the Austrian Netherlands in prospect for compensation, while Spain should find indemnity in the Austro-Italian states. Frederick of Prussia, having Silesia in hand, offered to join Maria Theresa in the defense of her remaining dominions; but his proposals were refused, and he entered the league against her. Saxony did the same. England and Sardinia were alone in befriending Austria, and England was only strong at sea. Maria Theresa found her heartiest support in Hungary, where she made a personal appeal to her subjects, and enlarged their constitutional privileges. In 1742 the Elector of Bavaria was elected Emperor, as Charles VII. In the same year, Maria Theresa, acting under pressure from England, gave up the greater part of Silesia to Frederick, by treaty, as a price paid, not for the help he had offered at first, but barely for his neutrality. He abandoned his allies and withdrew from the war. His retirement produced an immense difference in the conditions of the contest. Saxony made peace at the same time, and became an active ally on the Austrian side. So rapidly did the latter then recover their ground and the French slip back that Frederick, after two years of neutrality, became alarmed, and found a pretext to take up arms again. The scale was now tipped to the side on which he threw himself, but not immediately; and when, in 1745, the Emperor, Charles VII., died suddenly, Maria Theresa was able to secure the election of her husband, Francis of Lorraine (or Tuscany), which founded the Hapsburg-Lorraine dynasty on the imperial throne. This was in September. In the following December Frederick was in Dresden, and Saxony—the one effective ally left to the Austrians, since England had withdrawn from the war in the previous August—was at his feet. Maria Theresa, having the Spaniards and the French still to fight in Italy and the Netherlands, could do nothing but make terms with the terrible Prussian king. The treaty, signed at Dresden on Christmas Day, 1745, repeated the cession of Silesia to Frederick, with Glatz, and restored Saxony to the humbled Elector.

Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.

France and Spain, deserted the second time by their faithless Prussian ally, continued the war until 1748, when the influence of England and Holland brought about a treaty of peace signed at Aix-la-Chapelle. France gained nothing from the war, but had suffered a loss of prestige, distinctly. Austria, besides giving up Silesia to Frederick of Prussia, was required to surrender a bit of Lombardy to the King of Sardinia, and to make over Parma, Piacenza and Guastalla to Don Philip of Spain, for a hereditary principality. Under the circumstances, the result to Maria Theresa was a notable triumph, and she shared with her enemy, Frederick, the fruitage of fame harvested in the war. But antagonism between these two, and between the interests and ambitions which they respectively represented—dynastic on one side and national on the other—was henceforth settled and irreconcilable, and could leave in Germany no durable peace.

Colonial conflicts of France and England.

The peace was broken, not for Germany alone, but for Europe and for almost the world at large, in six years after the signing of the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. The rupture occurred first very far from Europe—on the other sides of the globe, in America and Hindostan, where England and France were eager rivals in colonial conquest. In America, they had quarreled since the Treaty of Utrecht over the boundaries of Acadia, or Nova Scotia, which that treaty transferred to England. Latterly, they had come to a more serious collision in the interior of the continent. The English, rooting their possession of the Atlantic seaboard by strong and stable settlements, had been tardy explorers and slow in passing the Alleghenies to the region inland. On the other hand, the French, nimble and enterprising in exploration, and in military occupation, but superficial and artificial in colonizing, had pushed their way by a long circuit from Canada, through the great lakes to the head waters of the Ohio, and were fortifying a line in the rear of the British colonies, from the valley of the St. Lawrence to the valley of the Mississippi, before the English were well aware of their intent. Then the colonists, Virginians and Pennsylvanians, took arms, and the career of George Washington was begun as leader of an expedition in 1754 to drive the French from the Ohio. It was not successful, and a strong force of regular troops was sent over next year by the British government, under Braddock, to repeat the attempt. A frightful catastrophe, worse than failure, came of this second undertaking, and open war between France and England, which had not yet been declared, followed soon. This colonial conflict of England and France fired the train, so to speak, which caused a great explosion of suppressed hostilities in Europe.

The House of Hanover in England.


If the English crown had not been worn by a German king, having a German principality to defend, the French and English might have fought out their quarrel on the ocean, and in the wilderness of America, or on the plains of the Carnatic, without disturbing their continental neighbors. But England was now under a new, foreign-bred line of sovereigns, descended from that daughter of James I., the princess Elizabeth, who married the unfortunate Elector Palatine and was queen of Bohemia for a brief winter term. After William of Orange died, his wife, Queen Mary, having preceded him to the grave, and no children having been born to them, Anne, the sister of Mary, had been called to the throne. It was in her reign that the brilliant victories of Marlborough were won, and in her reign that the Union of Scotland with England, under one parliament as well as one sovereign, was brought about. On Anne's death (1714), her brother, the son of James II., called "the Pretender," was still excluded from the throne, because of his religion, and the next heir was sought and summoned, in the person of the Elector George, of Hanover, whose remote ancestress was Elizabeth Stuart. George I. had reigned thirteen years, and his son, George II., had been twenty-seven years on the throne, when these quarrels with France arose. Throughout the two reigns, until 1742, the English nation had been kept mostly at peace, by the potent influence of a great min-

ister, Sir Robert Walpole, and had made a splendid advance in material prosperity and strength; while the system of ministerial government, responsible to Parliament and independent of the Crown, which has been in later times the peculiar feature of the British constitution, was taking shape. In 1742, Walpole fell from power, and the era of peace for England was ended. But her new dynasty had been firmly settled, and politically, industrially, and commercially, the nation was so sound in its condition as to be well prepared for the series of wars into which it plunged. In the War of the Austrian Succession England had taken a limited part, and with small results to herself. She was now about to enter, under the lead of the high-spirited and ambitious Pitt, afterwards Earl of Chatham, the greatest career of conquest in her history.

The Seven Years War.

As before said, it was the anxiety of George II. for his electorate of Hanover which caused an explosion of hostilities in Europe to occur, as consequence of the remote fighting of French and English colonists in America. For the strengthening of Hanover against attacks from France, he sought an alliance with Frederick of Prussia. This broke the long-standing anti-French alliance of England with Austria, and Austria joined fortunes with her ancient Bourbon enemy, in order to be helped to the revenge which Maria Theresa now promised herself the pleasure of executing upon the Prussian king. As the combination finally shaped itself on the French side, it embraced France, Austria, Russia, Sweden, Poland, Saxony, and the Palatinate, and its inspiring purpose was to break Prussia down and partition her territories, rather than to support France against England. The agreements to this end were made in secret; but Frederick obtained knowledge of them, and learned that papers proving the conspiracy against him were in the archives of the Saxony government, at Dresden. His action was decided with that promptitude which so often disconcerted his enemies. He did not wait to be attacked by the tremendous league formed against him, nor waste time in efforts to dissolve it, but defiantly struck the first blow. He poured his army into Saxony (August, 1756), seized Dresden by surprise, captured the documents he desired, and published them to the world in vindication of his summary precipitation of war. Then, blockading the Saxon army in Pirna, he pressed rapidly into Bohemia, defeated the Austrians at Lowositz, and returned as rapidly, to receive the surrender of the Saxons and to enlist most of them in his own ranks. This was the European opening of the Seven Years War, which raged, first and last, in all quarters of the globe.


In the second year of the war, Frederick gained an important victory at Prague and suffered a serious reverse at Kolin, which threw most of Silesia into the hands of the Austrians. Close following that defeat came crushing news from Hanover, where the incompetent Duke of Cumberland, commanding for his father, the English King George, had allowed the French to force him to an agreement which disbanded his army, and left Prussia alone in the terrific fight. Frederick's position seemed desperate; but his energy retrieved it. He fought and defeated the French at Rossbach, near Lützen, on the 5th of



EUROPE 1768 A.D

- PAPAL
- VENETIAN
- HOUSE OF SAVOY
- AUSTRIAN
- HABSBURG
- HOHENZOLLERN
- ENGLISH
- SWEDISH

THE HEAVY RED LINE SHOWS THE BOUNDARY OF THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE





November, and the Austrians, at Leuthen, near Breslau, exactly one month later. In the campaigns of 1758, he encountered the Russians at Zorndorf, winning a bloody triumph, and he sustained a defeat at Hochkirk, in battle with the Austrians. But England had repudiated Cumberland's convention and recalled him; English and Hanoverian forces were again put into the field, under the capable command of Prince Frederick of Brunswick, who turned the tide in that quarter against the French, and the results of the year were generally favorable to Frederick. In 1759, the Hanoverian army, under Prince Ferdinand, improved the situation on that side; but the prospects of the King of Prussia were clouded by heavy disasters. Attempting to push a victory over the Russians too far, at Kunersdorf, he was terribly beaten. He lost Dresden, and a great part of Saxony. In the next year he recovered all but Dresden, which he wantonly and inhumanly bombarded. The war was now being carried on with great difficulty by all the combatants. Prussia, France and Austria were suffering almost equally from exhaustion; the misery among their people was too great to be ignored; the armies of each had dwindled. The opponents of Pitt's war policy in England overcame him, in October, 1761, whereupon he resigned, and the English subsidy to Frederick was withdrawn. But that was soon made up to him by the withdrawal of Russia from the war, at the beginning of 1762, when Peter of Holstein, who admired Frederick, became Czar. Sweden made peace a little later. The remainder of the worn and wearied fighters went on striking at each other until near the end of the year.

Meantime, on the colonial and East Indian side of it, this prodigious Seven Years War, as a great struggle for world-empire between England and France, had been adding conquest to conquest and triumph to triumph for the former. In 1759, Wolfe had taken Quebec and died on the Heights of Abraham in the moment of victory. Another twelve months saw the whole of Canada clear of Frenchmen in arms. In the East, to use the language of Macaulay, "conquests equalling in rapidity and far surpassing in magnitude those of Cortes and Pizarro, had been achieved." "In the space of three years the English had founded a mighty empire. The French had been defeated in every part of India. Chandernagore had yielded to Clive, Pondicherry to Coote. Throughout Bengal, Bahar, Orissa, and the Carnatic, the authority of the East India Company was more absolute than that of Acbar or Aurungzebe had ever been."

Treaties of Paris and Hubertsburg.

In February, 1763, two treaties of peace were concluded, one at Paris, on the 10th, between England, France and Spain (the latter Power having joined France in the war as late as January, 1762); the other at Hubertsburg, on the 15th, between Prussia and Austria. France gave up to England all her possessions in North America, except Louisiana (which passed to Spain), and yielded Minorca, but recovered the Philippines. She surrendered, moreover, considerable interests in the West Indies and in Africa. The colonial aspirations of the French were cast down by a blow that was lasting in its effect. As between Prussia and Austria, the triumphs of the peace and the glories of the war were won

entirely by the former. Frederick came out of it, "Frederick the Great," the most famous man of his century, as warrior and as statesman, both. He had defended his little kingdom for seven years against three great Powers, and yielded not one acre of its territory. He had raised Prussia to the place in Germany from which her subsequent advance became easy and almost inevitable. But the great fame he earned is spotted with many falsities and much cynical indifference to the commonest ethics of civilization. His greatness is of that character which requires to be looked at from selected standpoints.

Russia.

Another character, somewhat resembling that of Frederick, was now drawing attention on the eastern side of Europe. Since the death of Peter the Great, the interval in Russian history had been covered by six reigns, with a seventh just opening, and the four sovereigns who really exercised power were women. Peter's widow, Catherine I., had succeeded him (1725) for two years. His son, Alexis, he had put to death; but Alexis left a son, Peter, to whom Catherine bequeathed the crown. Peter II. died after a brief reign, in 1730; and the nearest heirs were two daughters of Peter the Great, Anne and Elizabeth. But they were set aside in favor of another Anne — Anne of Courland — daughter of Peter the Great's brother. Anne's reign of ten years was under the influence of German favorites and ministers, and nearly half of it was occupied with a Turkish War, in coöperation with Austria. For Austria the war had most humiliating results, costing her Belgrade, all of Servia, part of Bosnia and part of Wallachia. Russia won back Asov, with fortifications forbidden, and that was all. Anne willed her crown to an infant nephew, who appears in the Russian annals as Ivan VI.; but two regencies were overthrown by palace revolutions within little more than a year, and the second one carried to the throne that Princess Elizabeth, younger daughter of Peter the Great, who had been put aside eleven years before. Elizabeth, a woman openly licentious and intemperate, reigned for twenty-one years, during the whole important period of the War of the Austrian Succession, and almost to the end of the Seven Years War. She was bitterly hostile to Frederick the Great, whose sharp tongue had offended her, and she joined Maria Theresa with eagerness in the great effort of revenge, which failed. In the early part of her reign, war with Sweden had been more successful and had added South Finland to the Russian territories. It is claimed for her domestic government that the general prosperity of the country was advanced.

Catherine II.

On the death of Elizabeth, near the end of the year 1761, the crown passed to her nephew, Peter of Holstein, son of her eldest sister, Anne, who had married the Duke of Holstein. This prince had been the recognized heir, living at the Russian court, during the whole of Elizabeth's reign. He was an ignorant boor, and he had become a besotted drunkard. Since 1744 he had been married to a young German princess, of the Anhalt Zerbst family, who took the baptismal name of Catherine when she entered the Greek Church. Catherine possessed a superior

intellect and a strong character; but the vile court into which she came as a young girl, bound to a disgusting husband, had debauched her in morals and lowered her to its own vileness. She gained so great an ascendancy that the court was subservient to her, from the time that her incapable husband, Peter III., succeeded to the throne. He reigned by sufferance for a year and a half, and then (July, 1762) he was easily deposed and put to death. In the deposition, Catherine was the leading actor. Of the subsequent murder, some historians are disposed to acquit her. She did not scruple, at least, to accept the benefit of both deeds, which raised her, alone, to the throne of the Czars.

Partition of Poland.

Peter III., in his short reign, had made one important change in Russian policy, by withdrawing from the league against Frederick of Prussia, whom he greatly admired. Catherine found reasons, quite aside from those of personal admiration, for cultivating the friendship of the King of Prussia, and a close understanding with that astute monarch was one of the earliest objects of her endeavor. She had determined to put an end to the independence of Poland. As she first entertained the design, there was probably no thought of the partitioning afterwards contrived. But her purpose was to keep the Polish kingdom in disorder and weakness, and to make Russian influence supreme in it, with views, no doubt, that looked ultimately to something more. On the death of the Saxon king of Poland, Augustus III., in 1763, Catherine put forward a native candidate for the vacant throne, in the person of Stanislaus Poniatowsky, a Russianized Pole and a former lover of her own. The King of Prussia supported her candidate, and Poniatowsky was duly elected, with 10,000 Russian troops in Warsaw to see that it was properly done. The Poles were submissive to the invasion of their political independence; but when Catherine, who sought to create a Russian party in Poland by protecting the members of the Greek Church and the Protestants, against the intolerance of the Polish Catholics, forced a concession of civil equality to the former (1768), there was a wide-spread Catholic revolt. In the fierce war which followed, a band of Poles was pursued across the Turkish border, and a Turkish town was burned by the Russian pursuers. The Sultan, who professed sympathy with the Poles, then declared war against Russia. The Russo-Turkish war, in turn, excited Austria, which feared Russian conquests from the Turks, and another wide disturbance of the peace of Europe seemed threatening. In the midst of the excitement there came a whispered suggestion, to the ear of the courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg, that they severally satisfy their territorial cravings and mutually assuage each other's jealousy, at the expense of the crumbling kingdom of Poland. The whisper may have come from Frederick II. of Prussia, or it may not. There are two opinions on the point. From whatever source it came, it found favorable consideration at Vienna and St. Petersburg, and between February and August, 1772, the details of the partition were worked out.

Poland was not yet extinguished. The kingdom was only shorn of some 160,000 square miles of territory, more than half of which went to Russia, a third to Austria, and the remainder, less than

10,000 square miles, to Prussia. This last mentioned annexation was the old district of West Prussia which the Polish king, Casimir IV., had wrested from the Teutonic Knights in 1466, before Brandenburg had aught to do with Prussian lands or name. After three centuries, Frederick reclaimed it.

The diminished kingdom of Poland showed more signs of a true national life, of an earnest national feeling, of a sobered and rational patriotism, than had appeared in its former history. The fatal powers monopolized by the nobles, the deadly "liberum veto," the corrupting elective kingship, were looked at in their true light, and in May, 1791, a new constitution was adopted which reformed those evils. But a few nobles opposed the reformation and appealed to Russia, supplying a pretext to Catherine on which she filled Poland with her troops. It was in vain that the patriot Kosciusko led the best of his countrymen in a brave struggle with the invader. They were overborne (1793-1794); the unhappy nation was put in fetters, while Catherine and a new King of Prussia, Frederick William II., arranged the terms of a second partition. This gave to Prussia an additional thousand square miles, including the important towns of Danzig and Thorn, while Russia took four times as much. A year later, the small remainder of Polish territory was dismembered and divided between Russia, Prussia and Austria, and thus Poland disappeared from the map of Europe as a state.

Russia as left by Catherine II.

Meantime, in her conflicts with the Turks, Catherine was extending her vast empire to the Dneister and the Caucasus, and opening a passage for her fleets from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. By treaty in 1774 she placed the Tartars of the Crimea in independence of the Turks, and so isolated them for easy conquest. In 1783 the conquest was made complete. By the same treaty she secured a right of remonstrance on behalf of the Christian subjects of the Sultan, in the Danubian principalities and in the Greek Church at Constantinople, which opened many pretexts for future interference and for war at Russian convenience. The aggressions of the strong-willed and powerful Czarina, and their dazzling success, filled her subjects with pride, and effaced all remembrance of her foreign origin and her want of right to the seat which she filled. She was ambitious to improve the empire, as well as to expand it; for her liberal mind took in the large ideas of that speculative age and was much moved by them. She attempted many reforms; but most things that she tried to do for the bettering of civilization and the lifting of the people were done imperiously, and spoiled by the autocratic method of the doing. In her later years, her inclination towards liberal ideas was checked, and the French Revolution put an end to it.

State of France in the Eighteenth Century.

In tracing the destruction of Poland and the aggrandizement of Russia, we have passed the date of that great catastrophe in France which ended the old modern order of things, and introduced a new one, not for France only, but for Europe at large. It was a catastrophe toward which the abused French people had been slowly slipping for generations, pushed unrelentingly to it by blind rulers and a besotted aristocracy. By

nature a people ardent and lively in temper, hopeful and brave in spirit, full of intelligence, they had been held down in dumb repression: silenced in voice, even for the uttering of their complaints; the national meeting of their representative States suppressed for nearly two centuries; taxes wrung from them on no measure save the will of a wanton-minded and ignorant king; their beliefs prescribed, their laws ordained, their courts of justice commanded, their industries directed, their trade hedged round, their rights and permissions in all particulars meted out to them by the same blundering and irresponsible autocracy. How long would they bear it? and would their deliverance come by the easing of their yoke, or by the breaking of it?—were the only questions.

Their state was probably at its worst in the later years of Louis XIV. That seems to be the conclusion which the deepest study has now reached, and the picture formerly drawn by historians, of a society continually sinking into lower miseries, is mostly put aside. The worst state, seemingly, was passed, or nearly so, when Louis XIV. died. It began to mend under his despicable successor, Louis XV. (1715–1774),—perhaps even during the regency of the profligate Orleans (1715–1723). Why it mended, no historian has clearly explained. The cause was not in better government; for the government grew worse. It did not come from any rise in character of the privileged classes; for the privileged classes abused their privileges with increasing selfishness. But general influences were at work in the world at large, stimulating activities of all kinds,—industry, trade, speculation, combination, invention, experiment, science, philosophy,—and whatever improvement occurred in the material condition and social state of the common people of France may find its explanation in these. There was an augmentation of life in the air of the eighteenth century, and France took some invigoration from it, despite the many maladies in its social system and the oppressions of government under which it bent.

But the difference between the France of Louis XIV. and the France of Louis XVI. was more in the people than in their state. If their misery was a little less, their patience was less, and by not a little. The stimulations of the age, which may have given more effectiveness to labor and more energy to trade, had likewise set thinking astir, on the same practical lines. Men whose minds in former centuries would have labored on riddles dialectical, metaphysical and theological, were now bent on the pressing problems of daily life. The mysteries of economic science began to challenge them. Every aspect of surrounding society thrust questions upon them, concerning its origin, its history, its inequalities, its laws and their principles, its government and the source of authority in it. The so-called “philosophers” of the age, Rousseau, Voltaire and the encyclopædists—were not the only questioners of the social world, nor did the questioning all come from what they taught. It was the intellectual epidemic of the time, carried into all countries, penetrating all classes, and nowhere with more diffusion than in France.

After the successful revolt of the English colonies in America, and the conspicuous blazoning of the doctrines of political equality and popular self-government in their declaration of inde-

pendence and their republican constitution, the ferment of social free-thinking in France was naturally increased. The French had helped the colonists, fought side by side with them, watched their struggle with intense interest, and all the issues involved in the American revolution were discussed among them, with partiality to the republican side. Franklin, most republican representative of the young republic, came among them and captivated every class. He recommended to them the ideas for which he stood, perhaps more than we suspect.

Louis XVI. and his reign.

And thus, by many influences, the French people of all classes except the privileged nobility, and even in that class to some small extent, were made increasingly impatient of their misgovernment and of the wrongs and miseries going with it. Louis XVI., who came to the throne in 1774, was the best in character of the Bourbon kings. He had no noxious vices and no baleful ambitions. If he had found right conditions prevailing in his kingdom he would have made the best of them. But he had no capacity for reforming the evils that he inherited, and no strength of will to sustain those who had. He accepted an earnest reforming minister with more than willingness, and approved the wise measures of economy, of equitable taxation, and of emancipation for manufactures and trade, which Turgot proposed. But when protected interests, and the privileged order which fattened on existing abuses, raised a storm of opposition, he weakly gave way to it, and dismissed the man (1776) who might possibly have made the inevitable revolution a peaceful one. Another minister, the Genevan banker, Necker, who aimed at less reform, but demanded economy, suffered the same overthrow (1781). The waste, the profligate expenditure, the jobbery, the leeching of the treasury by high-born pensioners and sinecure office-holders, went on, scarcely checked, until the beginnings of actual bankruptcy had appeared.

The States-General.

Then a cry, not much heeded before, for the convocation of the States-general of the kingdom—the ancient great legislature of France, extinct since the year 1614—became loud and general. The king yielded (1788). The States-general was called to meet on the 1st of May, 1789, and the royal summons decreed that the deputies chosen to it from the third estate—the common people—should be equal in number to the deputies of the nobility and the clergy together. So the dumb lips of France as a nation were opened. Its tongue unloosed, its common public opinion, and public feeling made articulate, for the first time in one hundred and seventy-five years. And the word that it spoke was the mandate of Revolution.

The States-general assembled at Versailles on the 5th of May, and a conflict between the third estate and the nobles occurred at once on the question between three assemblies and one. Should the three orders deliberate and vote together as one body, or sit and act separately and apart. The commons demanded the single assembly. The nobles and most of the clergy refused the union, in which their votes would be overpowered.

The National Assembly.

After some weeks of dead-lock on this fundamental issue, the third estate brought it to a summary decision, by boldly asserting its own supremacy, as representative of the mass of the nation, and organizing itself in the character of the "National Assembly" of France. Under that name and character it was joined by a considerable part of the humbler clergy, and by some of the nobles,—additional to a few, like Mirabeau, who sat from the beginning with the third estate, as elected representatives of the people. The king made a weak attempt to annul this assumption of legislative sufficiency on the part of the third estate, and only hurried the exposure of his own powerlessness. Persuaded by his worst advisers to attempt a stronger demonstration of the royal authority, he filled Paris with troops, and inflamed the excitement, which had risen already to a passionate heat.

Outbreak of the Revolution.

Necker, who had been recalled to the ministry when the meeting of the States-general was decided upon, now received his second dismissal (July 11), and the news of it acted on Paris like a signal of insurrection. The city next day was in tumult. On the 14th the Bastille was attacked and taken. The king's government vanished utterly. His troops fraternized with the riotous people. Citizens of Paris organized themselves as a National Guard, on which every hope of order depended, and Lafayette took command. The frightened nobility began flight, first from Paris, and then from the provinces, as mob violence spread over the kingdom from the capital. In October there were rumors that the king had planned to follow the "émigrés" and take refuge in Metz. Then occurred the famous rising of the women; their procession to Versailles; the crowd of men which followed, accompanied but not controlled by Lafayette and his National Guards; the conveyance of the king and royal family to Paris, where they remained during the subsequent year, practically in captivity, and at the mercy of the Parisian mob.

Meanwhile, the National Assembly, negligent of the dangers of the moment, while actual anarchy prevailed, busied itself with debates on constitutional theory, with enactments for the abolition of titles and privileges, and with the creating of an inconvertible paper money, based on confiscated church lands, to supply the needs of the national treasury. Meantime, too, the members of the Assembly and their supporters outside of it were breaking into parties and factions, divided by their different purposes, principles and aims, and forming clubs,—centers of agitation and discussion,—clubs of the Jacobins, the Cordeliers, the Feuillants and the like,—where fear, distrust and jealousy were soon engendering ferocious conflicts among the revolutionists themselves. And outside of France, on the border where the fugitive nobles lurked, intrigue was always active, striving to enlist foreign help for King Louis against his subjects.

The First Constitution.

In April, 1791, Mirabeau, whose influence had been a powerful restraint upon the Revolution, died. In June, the king made an attempt to escape from his durance in Paris, but was captured at Varennes and brought back. Angry de-

mands for his deposition were now made, and a tumultuous republican demonstration occurred, on the Champ de Mars, which Lafayette and the mayor of Paris, Bailly, dispersed, with bloodshed. But republicanism had not yet got its footing. In the constitution, which the Assembly completed at this time, the throne was left undisturbed. The king accepted the instrument, and a constitutional monarchy appeared to have quietly taken the place of the absolute monarchy of the past.

The Girondists.

It was an appearance not long delusive. The Constituent National Assembly being dissolved, gave way to a Legislative Assembly (October, 1791) elected under the new constitution. In the Legislative Assembly the republicans appeared with a strength which soon gave them control of it. They were divided into various groups; but the most eloquent and energetic of these, coming from Bordeaux and the department of the Gironde, fixed the name of Girondists upon the party to which they belonged. The king, as a constitutional sovereign, was forced presently to choose ministers from the ranks of the Girondists, and they controlled the government for several months in the spring of 1792. The earliest use they made of their control was to hurry the country into war with the German powers, which were accused of giving encouragement to the hostile plans of the émigrés on the border. It is now a well-determined fact that the Emperor Leopold was strongly opposed to war with France, and used all his influence for the preservation of peace. It was revolutionary France which opened the conflict, and it was the Girondists who led and shaped the policy of war.

Overthrow of the Monarchy.

In the first encounters of the war, the undisciplined French troops were beaten, and Paris was in panic. Measures were adopted which the king refused to sanction, and he dismissed his Girondist ministers. Lafayette, who was commanding one division of the army in the field, approved the king's course, and wrote an unwise letter to the Assembly, intimating that the army would not submit to a violation of the constitution. The republicans were enraged. Everything seemed proof to them of a treasonable connivance with the enemies of France, to bring about the subjugation of the country, and a forcible restoration of the old régime, absolutism, aristocratic privilege and all. On the 20th of June there was another rising of the Paris mob, unchecked by those who could, as yet, have controlled it. The rioters broke into the Tuileries and humiliated the king and queen with insults, but did no violence. Lafayette came to Paris and attempted to reorganize his old National Guard, for the defense of the constitution and the preservation of order, but failed. The extremists then resolved to throw down the toppling monarchy at once, by a sudden blow. In the early morning of August 10, they expelled the Council-General of the Municipality of Paris from the Hotel de Ville, and placed the government of the city under the control of a provisional Commune, with Danton at its head. At the same hour, the mob which these conspirators held in readiness, and which they directed, attacked the Tuileries and massacred the Swiss guard, while the king and the

royal family escaped for refuge to the Chamber of the Legislative Assembly, near at hand. There, in the king's presence, on a formal demand made by the new self-constituted Municipality or Commune of Paris, the Assembly declared his suspension from executive functions, and invited the people to elect without delay a National Convention for the revising of the Constitution. Commissioners, hastily sent out to the provinces and the armies in the field, were received everywhere with submission to the change of government, except by Lafayette and his army, in and around Sedan. The Marquis placed them under arrest and took from his soldiers a new oath of fidelity to the constitution and the king. But he found himself unsupported, and, yielding to the sweep of events, he obeyed a dismissal by the new government from his command, and left France, to wait in exile for a time when he might serve his country with a conscience more assured.

The Paris Commune.

Pending the meeting of the Convention, the Paris Commune, increased in number to two hundred and eighty-eight, and dominated by Danton and Robespierre, became the governing power in France. The Legislative Assembly was subservient to it; the kingless Ministry, which had Danton in association with the restored Girondists, was no less so. It was the fierce vigor of the Commune which caused the king and the royal family to be imprisoned in the Temple; which instituted a special tribunal for the summary trial of political prisoners; which searched Paris for "suspects," on the night of August 29-30, gathered three thousand men and women into the prisons and convents of the city, planned and ordered the "September Massacres" of the following week, and thus thinned the whole number of these "suspects" by a half.

Fall of the Girondists.

On the 22d of September the National Convention assembled. The Jacobins who controlled the Commune were found to have carried Paris overwhelmingly and all France largely with them, in the election of representatives. A furious, fanatical democracy, a bloodthirsty anarchism, was in the ascendant. The republican Girondists were now the conservative party in the Convention. They struggled to hold their ground, and very soon they were struggling for their lives. The Jacobin fury was tolerant of no opposition. What stood in its path, with no deadlier weapon than an argument or an appeal, must be, not merely overcome, but destroyed. The Girondists would have saved the king from the guillotine, but they dared not adopt his defense, and their own fate was sealed when they gave votes, under fear, which sent him in January to his death. Five months longer they contended irresolutely, as a failing faction, with their terrible adversaries, and then, in June, 1793, they were proscribed and their arrest decreed. Some escaped and raised futile insurrections in the provinces. Some stayed and faced the death which awaited them in the fast approaching "reign of terror."

"The Mountain" and "the Terror."

The fall of the Girondists left the Jacobin "Mountain" (so-called from the elevation of the seats on which its deputies sat in the Conven-

tion) unopposed. Their power was not only absolute in fact, but unquestioned, and they inevitably ran to riot in the exercise of it. The same madness overcame them in the mass which overcame Nero, Caligula, Caracalla, as individuals; for it is no more strange that the unnatural and awful feeling of unlimited dominion over one's fellows should turn the brain of a suddenly triumphant faction, than that it should madden a single shallow-minded man. The men of "the Mountain" were not only masters of France—except in La Vendée and the neighboring region south of the Loire, where an obstinate insurrection had broken out—but the armies which obeyed them had driven back the invading Germans, had occupied the Austrian Netherlands and taken possession of Savoy and Nice. Intoxicated by these successes, the Convention had proclaimed a crusade against all monarchical government, offering the help of France to every people which would rise against existing authorities, and declaring enmity to those who refused alliance with the Revolution. Holland was attacked and England forced to war. The spring of 1793 found a great European coalition formed against revolutionary France, and justified by the aggressions of the Jacobinical government.

For effective exercise of the power of the Jacobins, the Convention as a whole proved too large a body, even when it had been purged of Girondist opposition. Its authority was now gathered into the hands of the famous Committee of Public Safety, which became, in fact, the Revolutionary Government, controlling the national armies, and the whole administration of domestic and foreign affairs. Its reign was the Reign of Terror, and the fearful Revolutionary Tribunal, which began its bloody work with the guillotine in October, 1793, was the chief instrument of its power. Robespierre, Barère, St. Just, Couthon, Billaud-Varennes, Collot d'Herbois and Carnot—the latter devoted to the business of the war—were the controlling members of the Committee. Danton withdrew from it, refusing to serve.

In September, the policy of terrorism was avowedly adopted, and, in the language of the Paris Commune, "the Reign of Terror" became "the order of the day." The arraignment of "suspects" before the Revolutionary Tribunal began. On the 14th of October Marie Antoinette was put on trial; on the 16th she met her death. On the 31st the twenty-one imprisoned Girondist deputies were sent to the guillotine; followed on the 10th of November by the remarkable woman, Madame Roland, who was looked upon as the real leader of their party. From that time until the mid-summer following, the blood-madness raged; not in Paris alone, but throughout France, at Lyons, Marseilles, Toulon, Bordeaux, Nantes, and wherever a show of insurrection and resistance had challenged the ferocity of the Commissioners of the Revolutionary Government, who had been sent into the provinces with unlimited death-dealing powers.

But when Jacobinism had destroyed all exterior opposition, it began very soon to break into factions within itself. There was a pitch in its excesses at which even Danton and Robespierre became conservatives, as against Hébert and the atheists of his faction. A brief struggle ensued, and the Hébertists, in March, 1794, passed

under the knife of the guillotine. A month later Danton's enemies had rallied and he, with his followers, went down before their attack, and the sharp knife in the *Place de la Révolution* silenced his bold tongue. Robespierre remained dominant for a few weeks longer in the still reigning Committee of Public Safety; but his domination was already undermined by many fears, distrusts and jealousies among his colleagues and throughout his party. His downfall came suddenly on the 27th of July. On the morning of that day he was the dictator of the Convention and of its ruling committee; at night he was a headless corpse, and Paris was shouting with joy.

On the death of Robespierre the Reign of Terror came quickly to an end. The reaction was sudden and swift. The Committee of Public Safety was changed; of the old members only Carnot, indispensable organizer of war, remained. The Revolutionary Tribunal was remodeled. The Jacobin Club was broken up. The surviving Girondist deputies came back to the Convention. Prosecution of the Terrorists for their crimes began. A new struggle opened, between the lower elements in Parisian and French society, the sansculotte elements, which had controlled the Revolution thus far, and the middle class, the bourgeoisie, long cowed and suppressed, but now rallying to recover its share of power. Bourgeoisie triumphed in the contest. The Sansculottes made their last effort in a rising on the 1st Prairial (May 20, 1795) and were put down. A new constitution was framed which organized the government of the Republic under a legislature in two chambers,—a Council of Five Hundred and a Council of Ancients,—with an executive Directory of Five. But only one third of the legislature first assembled was to be freely elected by the people. The remaining two thirds were to be taken from the membership of the existing Convention. Paris rejected this last mentioned feature of the constitution, while France at large ratified it. The National Guard of Paris rose in insurrection on the 13th Vendémiaire (October 5), and it was on this occasion that the young Corsican officer, Napoleon Bonaparte, got his foot on the first round of the ladder by which he climbed afterwards to so great a height. Put in command of the regular troops in Paris, which numbered only 5,000, against 30,000 of the National Guards, he crushed the latter in an action of an hour. That hour was the opening hour of his career.

The government of the Directory was instituted on the 27th of October following. Of its five members, Carnot and Barras were the only men of note, then or afterwards.

The war with the Coalition.

While France was cowering under "the Terror," its armies, under Jourdan, Hoche, and Pichegru, had withstood the great European combination with astonishing success. The allies were weakened by ill feeling between Prussia and Austria over the second partition of Poland, and generally by a want of concert and capable leadership in their action. On the other side, the democratic military system of the Republic, under Carnot's keen eyes, was continually bringing forward fresh soldierly talent to the front. The fall of the Jacobins made no change in that vital department of the administration, and the suc-

cesses of the French were continued. In the summer of 1794 they carried the war into Germany, and expelled the allies from the Austrian Netherlands. Thence they invaded Holland, and before the end of January, 1795, they were masters of the country; the Stadtholder had fled to England, and a Batavian Republic had been organized. Spain had suffered losses in battle with them along the Pyrenees, and the King of Sardinia had yielded to them the passes of the Maritime Alps. In April the King of Prussia made peace with France. Before the close of the year 1795 the revolt in La Vendée was at an end; Spain had made peace; Pichegru had attempted a great betrayal of the armies on the Rhine, and had failed.

Napoleon in Italy.

This in brief was the situation at the opening of the year 1796, when the "little Corsican officer," who won the confidence of the new government of the Directory by saving its constitution on the 13th Vendémiaire, planned the campaign of the year, and received the command of the army sent to Italy. He attacked the Sardinians in April, and a single month sufficed to break the courage of their king and force him to a treaty of peace. On the 10th of May he defeated the Austrians at Lodi; on the 15th he was in Milan. Lombardy was abandoned to him; all central Italy was at his mercy, and he began to act the sovereign conqueror in the peninsula, with a contempt for the government at Paris which he hardly concealed. Two ephemeral republics were created under his direction, the Cisalpine, in Lombardy, and the Cispadane, embracing Modena, Ferrara and Bologna. The Papacy was shorn of part of its territories.

Every attempt made by the Austrians to shake the hold which Bonaparte had fastened on the peninsula only fixed it more firmly. In the spring he began movements beyond the Alps, in concert with Hoche on the Rhine, which threatened Vienna itself and frightened Austria into proposals of peace. Preliminaries, signed in April, foreshadowed the hard terms of the treaty concluded at Campo Formio in the following October. Austria gave up her Netherland provinces to France, and part of her Italian territories to the Cisalpine Republic; but received, in partial compensation, the city of Venice and a portion of the dominions of the Venetian state; for, between the armistice and the treaty, Bonaparte had attacked and overthrown the venerable republic, and now divided it with his humbled enemy.

France under the Directory.

The masterful Corsican, who handled these great matters with the airs of a sovereign, may have known himself already to be the coming master of France. For the inevitable submission again of the many to one was growing plain to discerning eyes. The frightful school-teaching of the Revolution had not impressed practical lessons in politics on the mind of the untrained democracy, so much as suspicions, distrusts, and alarms. All the sobriety of temper, the confidence of feeling, the constraining habit of public order, without which the self-government of a people is impracticable, were yet to be acquired. French democracy was not more prepared for republican institutions in 1797 than it had been

in 1789. There was no more temperance in its factions, no more balance between parties, no more of a steadying potency in public opinion. But it had been brought to a state of feeling that would prefer the sinking of all factions under some vigorous autocracy, rather than another appeal of their quarrels to the guillotine. And events were moving fast to a point at which that choice would require to be made. The summer of 1797 found the members of the Directory in hopeless conflict with one another and with the legislative councils. On the 4th of September a "coup d'état," to which Bonaparte contributed some help, purged both the Directory and the Councils of men obnoxious to the violent faction, and exiled them to Guiana. Perhaps the moment was favorable then for a soldier, with the great prestige that Bonaparte had won, to mount to the seat of power; but he did not so judge.

The Expedition to Egypt.

He planned, instead, an expedition to Egypt, directed against the British power in the East, —an expedition that failed in every object it could have, except the absence in which it kept him from increasing political disorders at home. He was able to maintain some appearance of success, by his subjugation of Egypt and his invasion of Syria; but of harm done to England, or of gain to France in the Mediterranean, there was none; since Nelson, at the battle of the Nile, destroyed the French fleet, and Turkey was added to the Anglo-Austrian coalition. The blunder of the expedition, as proved by its whole results, was not seen by the French people so plainly, however, as they saw the growing hopelessness of their own political state, and the alarming reverses which their armies in Italy and on the Rhine had sustained since Bonaparte went away.

French Aggressions.—The new Coalition.

Continued aggressions on the part of the French had provoked a new European coalition, formed in 1798. In Switzerland they had overthrown the ancient constitution of the confederacy, organizing a new Helvetic Republic on the Gallic model, but taking Geneva to themselves. In Italy they had set up a third republic, the Roman, removing the Pope forcibly from his sovereignty and from Rome. Every state within reach had then taken fresh alarm, and even Russia, undisturbed in the distance, was now enlisted against the troublesome democracy of France.

The unwise King of Naples, entering rashly into the war before his allies could support him, and hastening to restore the Pope, had been driven (December, 1798) from his kingdom, which underwent transformation into a fourth Italian republic, the Parthenopean. But this only stimulated the efforts of the Coalition, and in the course of the following year the French were expelled from all Italy, saving Genoa alone, and the ephemeral republics they had set up were extinguished. On the Rhine they had lost ground; but they had held their own in Switzerland, after a fierce struggle with the Russian forces of Suwarrow.

Napoleon in power.

When news of these disasters, and of the ripeness of the situation at Paris for a new coup

d'état, reached Bonaparte, in Egypt, he deserted his army there, leaving it, under Kléber, in a helpless situation, and made his way back to France. He landed at Fréjus on the 9th of October. Precisely a month later, by a combination with Sieyès, a veteran revolutionist and maker of constitutions, he accomplished the overthrow of the Directory. Before the year closed, a fresh constitution was in force, which vested substantially monarchical powers in an executive called the First Consul, and the chosen First Consul was Napoleon Bonaparte. Two associate Consuls, who sat with him, had no purpose but to conceal for a short time the real absoluteness of his rule.

From that time, for fifteen years, the history of France—it is almost possible to say the history of Europe—is the story of the career of the extraordinary Corsican adventurer who took possession of the French nation, with unparalleled audacity, and who used it, with all that pertained to it—lives, fortunes, talents, resources—in the most prodigious and the most ruthless undertakings of personal ambition that the modern world has ever seen. He was selfishness incarnate; and he was the incarnation of genius in all those modes of intellectual power which bear upon the mastery of momentary circumstances and the mastery of men. But of the higher genius that might have worthily employed such vast powers,—that might have enlightened and inspired a really great ambition in the man, to make himself an enduring builder of civilization in the world, he had no spark. The soul behind his genius was ignoble, the spirit was mean. And even on the intellectual side, his genius had its narrowness. His projects of selfishness were extraordinary, but never sagacious, never far-sighted, thoughtfully studied, wisely planned. There is no appearance in any part of his career of a pondered policy, guiding him to a well-determined end in what he did. The circumstances of any moment, whether on the battle-field or in the political arena, he could handle with a swift apprehension, a mastery and a power that may never have been surpassed. But much commoner men have apprehended and have commanded in a larger and more successful way the general sweep of circumstances in their lives. It is that fact which belittles Napoleon in the comparison often made between him and Cæsar. He was probably Cæsar's equal in war. But who can imagine Cæsar in Napoleon's place committing the blunders of blind arrogance which ruined the latter in Germany and Spain, or making his fatuous attempt to shut England, the great naval power, out of continental Europe?

His domestic administration was beneficial to France in many ways. He restored order, and maintained it, with a powerful hand. He suppressed faction effectually, and eradicated for the time all the political insanities of the Revolution. He exploited the resources of the country with admirable success; for his discernment in such matters was keen and his practical judgment was generally sound. But he consumed the nation faster than he gave it growth. His wars—the wars in which Europe was almost unceasingly kept by the aggression of his insolence and his greed—were the most murderous, the most devouring, that any warrior among the civilized races of mankind has ever been chargeable with.

His blood-guiltiness in these wars is the one glaring fact which ought to be foremost in every thought of them. But it is not. There is a pitiable readiness in mankind to be dazzled and cheated by red battle-lights, when it looks into history for heroes; and few figures have been glorified more illusively in the world's eye than the marvelous warrior, the vulgar-minded adventurer, the prodigy of self-exalting genius, Napoleon Bonaparte.

In the first year of his Consulate, Bonaparte recovered Italy, by the extraordinary Marengo campaign, while Moreau won the victory of Hohenlinden, and the Treaty of Lunéville was brought about. Austria obtained peace again by renewing the concessions of Campo Formio, and by taking part in a reconstruction of Germany, under Bonaparte's dictation, which secularized the ecclesiastical states, extinguished the freedom of most of the imperial cities, and aggrandized Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden and Saxony, as protégés and dependencies of France. England was left alone in the war, with much hostile feeling raised against her in Europe and America by the arrogant use she had made of her mastery of the sea. The neutral powers had all been embittered by her maritime pretensions, and Bonaparte now brought about the organization among them of a Northern League of armed neutrality. England broke it with a single blow, by Nelson's bombardment of Copenhagen. Napoleon, however, had conceived the plan of starving English industries and ruining British trade by a "continental system" of blockade against them, which involved the compulsory exclusion of British ships and British goods from all European countries. This impossible project committed him to a desperate struggle for the subjugation of Europe. It was the fundamental cause of his ruin.

The First Empire.

In 1802 the First Consul advanced his restoration of absolutism in France a second step, by securing the Consulate for life. A short interval of peace with England was arranged, but war broke out anew the following year, and the English for a time had no allies. The French occupied Hanover, and the Germans were quiescent. But in 1804, Bonaparte shocked Europe by the abduction and execution of the Bourbon prince, Duc d'Enghien, and began to challenge again the interference of the surrounding powers by a new series of aggressive measures. His ambition had thrown off all disguises; he had transformed the Republic of France into an Empire, so called, and himself, by title, into an Emperor, with an imposing crown. The Cisalpine or Italian Republic received soon afterwards the constitution of a kingdom, and he took the crown to himself as King of Italy. Genoa and surrounding territory (the Ligurian Republic) were annexed, at nearly the same time, to France; several duchies were declared to be dependencies, and an Italian principality was given to Napoleon's elder sister. The effect produced in Europe by such arbitrary and admonitory proceedings as these enabled Pitt, the younger, now at the head of the English government, to form an alliance (1805), first with Russia, afterwards with Austria, Sweden and Naples, and finally with Prussia, to break the yoke which the French Emperor had put upon

Italy, Holland, Switzerland and Hanover, and to resist his further aggressions.

Austerlitz and Trafalgar.

The amazing energy and military genius of Napoleon never had more astonishing proof than in the swift campaign which broke this coalition at Ulm and Austerlitz. Austria was forced to another humiliating treaty, which surrendered Venice and Venetia to the conqueror's new Kingdom of Italy; gave up Tyrol to Bavaria; yielded other territory to Würtemberg, and raised both electors to the rank of kings, while making Baden a grand duchy, territorially enlarged. Prussia was dragged by force into alliance with France, and took Hanover as pay. But England triumphed at the same time on her own element, and Napoleon's dream of carrying his legions across the Channel, as Cæsar did, was forever dispelled by Nelson's dying victory at Trafalgar. That battle, which destroyed the combined navies of France and Spain, ended hope of contending successfully with the relentless Britons at sea.

End of the Holy Roman Empire.

France was never permitted to learn the seriousness of Trafalgar, and it put no check on the vaulting ambition in Napoleon which now began to o'erleap itself. He gave free rein to his arrogance in all directions. The King of Naples was expelled from his kingdom and the crown conferred on Joseph Bonaparte. Louis Bonaparte was made King of Holland. Southern Germany was suddenly reconstructed again. The little kingdoms of Napoleon's creation and the small states surrounding them were declared to be separated from the ancient Empire, and were formed into a Confederation of the Rhine, under the protection of France. Warned by this rude announcement of the precarious tenure of his imperial title as the head of the Holy Roman Empire, Francis II. resigned it, and took to himself, instead, a title as meaningless as that which Napoleon had assumed,—the title of Emperor of Austria. The venerable fiction of the Holy Roman Empire disappeared from history on the 6th of August, 1806.

Subjugation of Prussia.

But while Austria had become submissive to the offensive measures of Napoleon, Prussia became now fired with unexpected, sudden wrath, and declared war in October, 1806. It was a rash explosion of national resentment, and the rashness was dearly paid for. At Jena and Auerstadt, Prussia sank under the feet of the merciless conqueror, as helplessly subjugated as a nation could be. Russia, attempting her rescue, was overcome at Eylau and Friedland; and both the vanquished powers came to terms with the victor at Tilsit (July, 1807). The King of Prussia gave up all his kingdom west of the Elbe, and all that it had acquired in the second and third partitions of Poland. A new German kingdom, of Westphalia, was constructed for Napoleon's youngest brother, Jerome. A free state of Danzig, dependent on France, and a Grand Duchy of Warsaw, were created. The Russian Czar, bribed by some pieces of Polish Prussia, and by prospective acquisitions from Turkey and Sweden, became an ally of Napoleon and an accomplice in his plans for the subjection of Europe. He enlisted his empire in the "continental

system" against England, and agreed to the enforcement of the decree which Napoleon issued from Berlin, declaring the British islands in a state of blockade, and prohibiting trade with them. The British government retorted by its "orders in council," which blockaded in the like paper-fashion all ports of France and of the allies and dependencies of France. And so England and Napoleon fought one another for years in the peaceful arena of commerce, to the exasperation of neutral nations and the destruction of the legitimate trade of the world.

The crime against Spain.

And now, having prostrated Germany, and captivated the Czar, Napoleon turned toward another field, which had scarcely felt, as yet, his intrusive hand. Spain had been in servile alliance with France for ten years, while Portugal adhered steadily to her friendship with Great Britain, and now refused to be obedient to the Berlin Decree. Napoleon took prompt measures for the punishment of so bold a defiance. A delusive treaty with the Spanish court, for the partition of the small kingdom of the Braganzas, won permission for an army under Junot to enter Portugal, through Spain. No resistance to it was made. The royal family of Portugal quitted Lisbon, setting sail for Brazil, and Junot took possession of the kingdom. But this accomplished only half of Napoleon's design. He meant to have Spain, as well; and he found, in the miserable state of the country, his opportunity to work out an ingenious, unscrupulous scheme for its acquisition. His agents set on foot a revolutionary movement, in favor of the worthless crown prince, Ferdinand, against his equally worthless father, Charles IV., and pretexts were obtained for an interference by French troops. Charles was first coerced into an abdication; then Ferdinand was lured to an interview with Napoleon, at Bayonne, was made prisoner there, and compelled in his turn to relinquish the crown. A vacancy on the Spanish throne having been thus created, the Emperor gathered at Bayonne a small assembly of Spanish notables, who offered the seat to Joseph Bonaparte, already King of Naples. Joseph, obedient to his imperial brother's wish, resigned the Neapolitan crown to Murat, his sister's husband, accepted the crown of Spain, and was established at Madrid with a French army at his back.

This was one of the two most ruinous of the political blunders of Napoleon's life. He had cheated and insulted the whole Spanish nation, in a way too contemptuous to be endured even by a people long cast down. There was a revolt which did not spring from any momentary passion, but which had an obstinacy of deep feeling behind that made effective suppression of it impossible. French armies could beat Spanish armies, and disperse them, but they could not keep them dispersed; and they could not break up the organization of a rebellion which organized itself in every province, and which went on, when necessary, without any organization at all. England sent forces to the peninsula, under Wellington, for the support of the insurgent Spaniards and Portuguese; and thenceforward, to the end of his career, the most inextricable difficulties of Napoleon were those in which he had entangled himself on the southern side of the Pyrenees.

The chastening of Germany.

The other cardinal blunder in Napoleon's conduct, which proved more destructive to him than the crime in Spain, was his exasperating treatment of Germany. There was neither magnanimity on the moral side of him nor real wisdom on the intellectual side, to restrain him from using his victory with immoderate insolence. He put as much shame as he could invent into the humiliations of the German people. He had Prussia under his heel, and he ground the heel upon her neck with the whole weight of his power. The consequence was a pain and a passion which wrought changes like a miracle in the temper and character of the abused nation. There were springs of feeling opened and currents of national life set in motion that might never have been otherwise discovered. Enlightened men and strong men from all parts of Germany found themselves called to Prussia and to the front of its affairs, and their way made easy for them in labors of restoration and reform. Stein and Hardenburg remodeled the administration of the kingdom, uprooted the remains of serfdom in it, and gave new freedom to its energies. Scharnhorst organized the military system on which rose in time the greatest of military powers. Humboldt planned the school system which educated Prussia beyond all her neighbors, in the succeeding generations. Even the philosophers came out of their closets and took part, as Fichte did, in the stirring and uplifting of the spirit of their countrymen. So it was that the outrages of Napoleon in Germany revenged themselves, by summoning into existence an unsuspected energy that would be turned against him to destroy him, in the end.

But the time of destruction was not yet come. He had a few years of triumph still before him, — of triumph everywhere except in Portugal and Spain. Austria, resisting him once more (1809), was once more crushed at Wagram, and to such submissiveness that it gave a daughter of the imperial house in marriage to the parvenu sovereign of France, next year, when he divorced his wife Josephine. He was at the summit of his renown that year, but already declining from the greatest height of his power. In 1811 there was little to change the situation.

The fall of Napoleon.

In 1812 the downfall of Napoleon was begun by his fatal expedition to Russia. The next year Prussia, half regenerated within the brief time since Jena and Tilsit, went into alliance with Russia, and the War of Liberation was begun. Austria soon joined the alliance; and at Leipzig (Oct. 18, 1813) the three nations shattered at last the yoke of oppression that had bound Europe so long. At the same time, the French armies in Spain were expelled, and Wellington entered France through the Pyrenees, to meet the allies who pursued Napoleon across the Rhine. Forced to abdicate and retire to the little island of Elba (the sovereignty of which was ceded to him), he remained there in quiet from May, 1814, until March, 1815, when he escaped and reappeared in France. Army and people welcomed him. The Bourbon monarchy, which had been restored by the allies, fell at his approach. The king, Louis XVIII., fled. Napoleon recovered his throne and occupied it for a few weeks. But the

alliance which had expelled him from it refused to permit his recovery of power. The question was settled finally at Waterloo, on the 18th of June, when a British army under Wellington and a Prussian army under Blücher won a victory which left no hope to the beaten Emperor. He surrendered himself to the commander of a British vessel of war, and was sent to confinement for the remainder of his life on the remote island of St. Helena.

The Congress of Vienna.

But Europe, delivered from one tyrannical master, was now given over to several of them, in a combination which oppressed it for a generation. The sovereigns who had united to dethrone Napoleon, with the two emperors, of Austria and Russia, at their head, and with the Austrian minister, Metternich, for their most trusted counselor, assumed first, in the Congress of Vienna, a general work of political rearrangement, to repair the Revolutionary and Napoleonic disturbances, and then, subsequently, an authoritative supervision of European politics which proved as meddlesome as Napoleon's had been. Their first act, as before stated, was to restore the Bourbon monarchy in France, indifferent to the wishes of the people. In Spain, Ferdinand had already taken the throne, when Joseph fled. In Italy, the King of Sardinia was restored and Genoa transferred to him; Lombardy and Venetia were given back to Austria; Tuscany, Modena and some minor duchies received Hapsburg princes; the Pope recovered his States, and the Bourbons returned to Naples and Sicily. In Germany, the Prussian kingdom was enlarged again by several absorptions, including part of Saxony, but some of its Polish territory was given to the Czar; Hanover became a kingdom; Austria resumed the provinces which Napoleon had conveyed to his Rhenish protégés; and, finally, a Germanic Confederation was formed, to take the place of the extinct Empire, and with no more efficiency in its constitution. In the Netherlands, a new kingdom was formed, to bear the Netherland name, and to embrace Holland and Belgium in union, with the House of Orange on the throne.

The Holy Alliance.

Between the Czar, the Emperor of Austria, and the King of Prussia, there was a personal agreement that went with these arrangements of the Congress of Vienna, and which was prolonged for a number of years. In the public understanding, this was associated, perhaps wrongly, with a written declaration, known as the Holy Alliance, in which the three sovereigns set forth their intention to regulate their foreign and domestic policy by the precepts of Christianity, and invited all princes to join their alliance for the maintenance of peace and the promotion of brotherly love. Whether identical as a fact with this Holy Alliance or secreted behind it, there was, and long continued to be, an undoubted league between these sovereigns and others, which had aims very different from the promotion of brotherly love. It was wholly reactionary, hostile to all political liberalism, and repressive of all movements in the interest of the people. Metternich was its skilful minister, and the deadly, soulless system of bureaucratic absolutism

which he organized in Austria was the model of government that it strove to introduce.

In Italy, the governments generally were reduced to the Austrian model, and the political state of the peninsula, for forty years, was scarcely better, if at all, than it had been under the Spanish rule in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Germany, as divided as ever, under a federal constitution which federated nothing else so much as the big and little courts and their reactionary ideas, was profoundly depressed in political spirit, while prospering materially and showing notable signs of intellectual life.

France was not slow in finding that the restored Bourbons and the restored émigrés had forgotten nothing and learned nothing, in the twenty-five years of their exile. They put all their strength into the turning back of the clock, trying to make it strike again the hours in which the Revolution and Napoleon had been so busy. It was futile work; but it sickened and angered the nation none the less. After all the stress and struggle it had gone through, there was a strong nation yet to resist the Bourbonism brought back to power. It recovered from the exhaustion of its wars with a marvellous quickness. The millions of peasant land-owners, who were the greatest creation of the Revolution, dug wealth from its soil with untiring free arms, and soon made it the most prosperous land in Europe. Through country and city, the ideas of the Revolution were in the brains of the common people, while its energies were in their brawn, and Bourbonism needed more wisdom than it ever possessed to reconcile them to its restoration.

Revolutions of 1820-1821.

It was not in France, however, but in Spain, that the first rising against the restored order of things occurred. Ferdinand VII., when released from his French imprisonment in 1814, was warmly received in Spain, and took the crown with quite general consent. He accepted the constitution under which the country had been governed since 1812, and made large lying promises of a liberal rule. But when seated on the throne, he suppressed the constitution, restored the Inquisition, revived the monasteries, called back the expelled Jesuits, and opened a deadly persecution of the liberals in Spanish politics. No effective resistance to him was organized until 1820, when a revolutionary movement took form which forced the king, in March, to re-establish the constitution and call different men to his council. Portugal, at the same time, adopted a similar constitution, and the exiled king, John VI., returning now from Brazil, accepted it.

The revolution in Spain set fire to the discontent that had smouldered in Italy. The latter broke forth, in the summer of 1820, at Naples, where the Bourbon king made no resistance to a sudden revolt of soldiers and citizens, but yielded the constitution they demanded at once. Sardinia followed, in the next spring, with a rising of the Piedmontese, requiring constitutional government. The king, Victor Emmanuel I., who was very old, resigned the crown to his brother, Charles Felix. The latter refused the demands of the constitutionalists and called upon Austria for help.

These outbreaks of the revolutionary spirit were alarming to the sovereigns of the Holy

Alliance and excited them to a vigorous activity. They convened a Congress, first at Troppau, in October, 1820, afterwards at Laybach, and finally at Verona, to plan concerted action for the suppressing of the popular movements of the time. As the result of these conferences, the congenial duty of restoring absolutism in the Two Sicilies, and of helping the King of Sardinia against his subjects, was imposed upon Austria and willingly performed; while the Bourbon court of France was solicited to put an end to the bad example of constitutional government in Spain. Both commissions were executed with fidelity and zeal. Italy was flung down and fettered again; French troops occupied Spain from 1823 until 1827. England, alone, protested against this flagrant policing of Europe by the Holy Alliance. Canning, its spirited minister, "called in the New World," as he described his policy, "to redress the balance of the old," by recognizing the independence of the Spanish colonies in America, which, Cuba excepted, were now separated forever from the crown of Spain. Brazil in like manner was cut loose from the Portuguese crown, and assumed the constitution of an empire, under Dom Pedro, the eldest son of John VI.

Greek War of Independence.

These stifled revolutions in western Europe failed to discourage a more obstinate insurrection which began in the East, among the Christian subjects of the Turks, in 1821. The Ottoman government had been growing weaker and more vicious for many years. The corrupted and turbulent Janissaries were the masters of the empire, and a sultan who attempted, as Selim III. (1789-1807) had done, to introduce reforms, was put to death. Russia, under Alexander I., had been continuing to gain ground at the expense of the Turks, and assuming more and more of a patronage of the Christian subjects of the Porte. There seems to be little doubt that the rising begun in 1821, which had its start in Moldavia, and its first leader in a Greek, Ypsilanti, who had been an officer in the Russian service, received encouragement from the Czar. But Alexander turned his back on it when the Greeks sprang to arms and seriously appealed to Europe for help in a war of national independence. The Congress of Verona condemned the Greek rising, in common with that of Spain. Again, England alone showed sympathy, but did nothing as a government, and left the struggling Greeks to such help as they might win from individual friends. Lord Byron, with others, went to Greece, carrying money and arms; and, generally, these volunteers lost much of their ardor in the Greek cause when they came into close contact with its native supporters. But the Greeks, however lacking in high qualities, made an obstinate fight, and held their ground against the Turks, until the feeling of sympathy with them had grown too strong in England and in France for the governments of those countries to be heedless of it. Moreover, in Russia, Alexander I. had been succeeded (1825) by the aggressive Nicholas, who had not patience to wait for the slow crumbling of the Ottoman power, but was determined to break it as summarily as he could. He joined France and England, therefore, in an alliance and in a naval demonstration against the Turks (1827), which had its result in the battle of Navarino. The

allies of Nicholas went no farther; but he pursued the undertaking, in a war which lasted until the autumn of 1829. Turkey at the end of it conceded the independence of Greece, and practically that of Wallachia and Moldavia. In 1830, a conference at London established the Greek kingdom, and in 1833 a Bavarian prince, Otho I., was settled on the throne.

Revolutions of 1830.

Before this result was reached, revolution in western Europe, arrested in 1821-23, had broken out afresh. Bourbonism had become unendurable to France. Charles X., who succeeded his brother Louis XVIII. in 1824, showed not only a more arbitrary temper, but a disposition more deferential to the Church than his predecessor. He was fond of the Jesuits, whom his subjects very commonly distrusted and disliked. He attempted to put shackles on the press, and when elections to the chamber of deputies went repeatedly against the government, he undertook practically to alter the suffrage by ordinances of his own. A revolution seemed then to be the only remedy that was open to the nation, and it was adopted in July, 1830, the veteran Lafayette taking the lead. Charles X. was driven to abdication, and left France for England. The crown was transferred to Louis Philippe, of the Orleans branch of the Bourbon family,—son of the Philip Égalité who joined the Jacobins in the Revolution.

The July Revolution in France proved a signal for more outbreaks in other parts of Europe than had followed the Spanish rising of ten years before.

Belgium broke away from the union with Holland, which had never satisfied its people, and, after some struggle, won recognized independence, as a new kingdom, with Leopold of Saxe Coburg raised to the throne.

Russian Poland, bearing the name of a constitutional kingdom since 1815, but having the Czar for its king and the Czar's brother for viceroy, found no lighter oppression than before, and made a hopeless, brave attempt to escape from its bonds. The revolt was put down with unmerciful severity, and thousands of the hapless patriots went to exile in Siberia.

In Germany, there were numerous demonstrations in the smaller states, which succeeded more or less in extorting constitutional concessions; but there was no revolutionary movement on a larger scale.

Italy remained quiet in both the north and the south, where disturbances had arisen before; but commotions occurred in the Papal states, and in Modena and Parma, which required the arms of Austria to suppress.

In England, the agitations of the continent hastened forward a revolution which went far beyond all other popular movements of the time in the lasting importance of its effects, and which exhibited in their first great triumph the peaceful forces of the Platform and the Press.

England under the last two Georges.

But we have given little attention to affairs in Great Britain during the past half century or more, and need to glance backward.

Under the third of the Georges, there was distinctly a check given to the political progress which England had been making since the

Revolution of 1688. The wilfulness of the king fairly broke down, for a considerable period, the system of responsible cabinet government which had been taking shape and root under the two earlier Hanoverians, and ministers became again, for a time, mere mouthpieces of the royal will. The rupture with the American colonies, and the unsuccessful war which ended in their independence, brought in another influence, adverse, for the time being, to popular claims in government. For it was not King George, alone, nor Lord North, nor any small Tory faction, that prosecuted and upheld the attempt to make the colonists in America submissive to "taxation without representation." The English nation at large approved the war; English national sentiment was hostile to the Americans in their independent attitude, and the Whigs—the liberals then in English politics—were a discredited and weakened party for many years because of their leaning to the American side of the questions in dispute. Following close upon the American war, came the French Revolution, which frightened into Toryism great numbers of people who did not by nature belong there. In England, as everywhere else, the reaction lasted long, and government was more arbitrary and repressive than it could possibly have continued to be under different circumstances.

Meantime extraordinary social changes had taken place, which tended to mark more strongly the petrifying of things in the political world. The great age of mechanical invention had been fully opened. Machines had begun to do the work of human hands in every industry, and steam had begun to move the machines. The organization of labor, too, had assumed a new phase. The factory system had arisen; and with it had appeared a new growth of cities and towns. Production was accelerated; wealth was accumulating more rapidly, and the distribution of wealth was following different lines. The English middle class was rising fast as a money-power and was gathering the increased energies of the kingdom into its hands.

Parliamentary Reform in England.

But while the tendency of social changes had been to increase vastly the importance of this powerful middle class, the political conditions had actually diminished its weight in public affairs. In Parliament, it had no adequate representation. The old boroughs, which sent members to the House of Commons as they had sent them for generations before, no longer contained a respectable fraction of the "commons of England," supposed to be represented in the House, and those who voted in the boroughs were not at all the better class of the new England of the nineteenth century. Great numbers of the boroughs were mere private estates, and the few votes polled in them were cast by tenants who elected their landlords' nominees. On the other hand, the large cities and the numerous towns of recent growth had either no representation in Parliament, or they had equal representation with the "rotten boroughs" which cast two or three or half-a-dozen votes.

That the commons of England, with all the gain of substantial strength they had been making in the last half of the eighteenth century and the first quarter of the nineteenth, endured this travesty of popular representation so long

as until 1832, is proof of the potency of the conservatism which the French Revolution induced.

The subject of parliamentary reform had been now and then discussed since Chatham's time; but Toryism had always been able to thrust it aside and bring the discussion to naught. At last there came the day when the question would no longer be put down. The agitations of 1830, combined with a very serious depression of industry and trade, produced a state of feeling which could not be defied. King and Parliament yielded to the public demand, and the First Reform Bill was passed. It widened the suffrage and amended very considerably the inequities of the parliamentary representation; but both reforms have been carried much farther since, by two later bills.

Repeal of the English Corn Laws.

The reform of Parliament soon brought a broader spirit into legislation. Its finest fruits began to ripen about 1838, when an agitation for the repeal of the foolish and wicked English "corn-laws" was opened by Cobden and Bright. In the day of the "rotten boroughs," when the landlords controlled Parliament, they imagined that they had "protected" the farming interest, and secured higher rents to themselves, by laying heavy duties on the importation of foreign bread-stuffs. A famous "sliding scale" of such duties had been invented, which raised the duties when prices in the home market dropped, and lowered them proportionately when home prices rose. Thus the consumers were always deprived, as much as possible, of any cheapening of their bread which bountiful Nature might offer, and paid a heavy tax to increase the gains of the owners and cultivators of land.

Now that other "interests" besides the agricultural had a voice in Parliament, and had become very strong, they began to cry out against this iniquity, and demand that the "corn laws" be done away with. The famous "anti-corn-law league," organized mainly by the exertions of Richard Cobden, conducted an agitation of the question which brought about the repeal of the laws in 1846.

But the effect of the agitation did not end there. So thorough and prolonged a discussion of the matter had enlightened the English people upon the whole question between "protection" and free trade. The manufacturers and mechanics, who had led the movement against protective duties on food-stuffs, were brought to see that they were handicapped more than protected by duties on imports in their own departments of production. So Cobden and his party continued their attacks on the theory of "protection" until every vestige of it was cleared from the English statute books.

The Revolutions of 1848.

Another year of revolutions throughout Europe came in 1848, and the starting point of excitement was not, this time, at Paris, but, strangely enough, in the Vatican, at Rome. Pius IX. had been elected to the papal chair in 1846, and had immediately rejoiced the hearts and raised the hopes of the patriots in misgoverned Italy by his liberal measures of reform and his promising words. The attitude of the Pope gave encouragement to popular demonstrations in various Italian states during the later part of 1847; and

in January 1848 a formidable rising occurred in Sicily, followed in February by another in Naples. King Ferdinand II. was compelled to change his ministers and to concede a constitution, which he did not long respect.

Lombardy was slow this time in being kindled; but when the flame of revolution burst out it was very fierce. The Austrians were driven first from Milan (March, 1848), and then from city after city, until they seemed to be abandoning their Italian possessions altogether. Venice asserted its republican independence under the presidency of Daniel Manin. Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, thought the time favorable for recovering Lombardy to himself, and declared war against Austria. The expulsion of the Austrians became the demand of the entire peninsula, and even the Pope, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and the King of Naples were forced to join the patriotic movement in appearance, though not with sincerity. But the King of Sardinia brought ruin on the whole undertaking, by sustaining a fatal defeat in battle at Custoza, in July, 1848.

France had been for some time well prepared for revolt, and was quick to be moved by the first whisper of it from Italy. The short-lived popularity of Louis Philippe was a thing of the past. There was widespread discontent with many things, and especially with the limited suffrage. The French people had the desire and the need of something like that grand measure of electoral reform which England secured so peacefully in 1832; but they could not reach it in the peaceful way. The aptitude and the habit of handling and directing the great forces of public opinion effectively in such a situation were alike wanting among them. There was a mixture, moreover, of social theories and dreams in their political undertaking, which heated the movement and made it more certainly explosive. The Parisian mob took arms and built barricades on the 23d of February. The next day Louis Philippe signed an abdication, and a week later he was an exile in England. For the remainder of the year France was strangely ruled: first by a self-constituted provisional government, Lamartine at its head, which opened national workshops, and attempted to give employment and pay to 125,000 enrolled citizens in need; afterwards by a Constituent National Assembly, and an Executive Commission, which found the national workshops a devouring monster, difficult to control and hard to destroy. Paris got rid of the shops in June, at the cost of a battle which lasted four days, and in which more than 8,000 people were wounded or slain. In November a republican constitution, framed by the Assembly, was adopted, and on the 10th of December Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, son of Louis Bonaparte, once King of Holland, and of Hortense Beauharnais, daughter of the Empress Josephine, was elected President of the Republic by an enormous popular vote.

The revolutionary shock of 1848 was felt in Germany soon after the fall of the monarchy in France. In March there was rioting in Berlin and a collision with the troops, which alarmed the king so seriously that he yielded promises to almost every demand. Similar risings in other capitals had about the same success. At Vienna, the outbreak was more violent and drove both Metternich and the Emperor from the city. In

the first flush of these popular triumphs there came about a most hopeful-looking election of a Germanic National Assembly, representative of all Germany, and gathered at Frankfurt, on the invitation of the Diet, for a revision of the constitution of the Confederation. But the Assembly contained more learned scholars than practical statesmen, and its constitutional work was wasted labor. A Constituent Assembly elected in Prussia accomplished no more, and was dispersed in the end without resistance; but the king granted a constitution of his own framing. The revolutionary movement in Germany left its effects, in a general loosening of the bonds of harsh government, a general broadening of political ideas, a final breaking of the Metternich influence, even in Austria; but it passed over the existing institutions of the much-divided country with a very light touch.

In Hungary the revolution, stimulated by the eloquence of Kossuth, was carried to the pitch of serious war. The Hungarians had resolved to be an independent nation, and in the struggle which ensued they approached very near the attainment of their desire; but Russia came to the help of the Hapsburgs, and the armies of the two despotisms combined were more than the Hungarians could resist. Their revolt was abandoned in August, 1849, and Kossuth, with other leaders, escaped through Turkish territory to other lands.

The suppression of the Hungarian revolt was followed by a complete restoration of the despotism and domination of the Austrians in Italy. Charles Albert, of Sardinia, had taken courage from the struggle in Hungary and had renewed hostilities in March, 1849. But, again, he was crushingly defeated, at Novara, and resigned, in despair, the crown to his son, Victor Emmanuel II. Venice, which had resisted a long siege with heroic constancy, capitulated in August of the same year. The whole of Lombardy and Venetia was bowed once more under the merciless tyranny of the Austrians, and savage revenges were taken upon the patriots who failed to escape. Rome, whence the Pope—no longer a patron of liberal politics—had fled, and where a republic had been once more set up, with Garibaldi and Mazzini in its constituent assembly, was besieged and taken, and the republic overturned, by troops sent from republican France. The Neapolitan king restored his atrocious absolutism without help, by measures of the greatest brutality.

A civil war in Switzerland, which occurred simultaneously with the political collisions in surrounding countries, is hardly to be classed with them. It was rather a religious conflict, between the Roman Catholics and their opponents. The Catholic cantons, united in a League, called the Sonderbund, were defeated in the war; the Jesuits were expelled from Switzerland in consequence, and, in September, 1848, a new constitution for the confederacy was adopted.

The Second Empire in France.

The election of Louis Napoleon to the Presidency of the French Republic was ominous of a disposition among the people to bring back a Napoleonic régime, with all the falsities that it might imply. He so construed the vote which elected him, and does not seem to have been mistaken. Having surrounded himself with

unprincipled adventurers, and employed three years of his presidency in preparations for the attempt, he executed a coup d'état on the 2d of December, dispersing the National Assembly, arresting influential republicans, and submitting to popular vote a new constitution which prolonged his presidency to ten years. This was but the first step. A year later he secured a "plébiscite" which made him hereditary Emperor of the French. The new Empire—the Second Empire in France—was more vulgar, more false, more fraudulent, more swarmingly a nest of self-seeking and dishonest adventurers, than the First had been, and with nothing of the saving genius that was in the First. It rotted for eighteen years, and then it fell, France with it.

The Crimean War.

A certain respectability was lent to this second Napoleonic Empire by the alliance of England with it in 1854, against Russia. The Czar, Nicholas, had determined to defy resistance in Europe to his designs against the Turks. He first endeavored to persuade England to join him in dividing the possessions of "the sick man," as he described the Ottoman, and, that proposal being declined, he opened on his own account a quarrel with the Porte. France and England joined forces in assisting the Turks, and the little kingdom of Sardinia, from motives of far-seeing policy, came into the alliance. The principal campaign of the war was fought in the Crimea, and its notable incident was the long siege of Sebastopol, which the Russians defended until September, 1855. An armistice was concluded the following January, and the terms of peace were settled at a general conference of powers in Paris the next March. The results of the war were a check to Russia, but an improvement of the condition of the Sultan's Christian subjects. Moldavia and Wallachia were soon afterwards united under the name of Roumania, paying tribute to the Porte, but otherwise independent.

Liberation and Unification of Italy.

The part taken by Sardinia in the Crimean War gave that kingdom a standing in European politics which had never been recognized before. It was a measure of sagacious policy due to the able statesman, Count Cavour, who had become the trusted minister of Victor Emmanuel, the Sardinian king. The king and his minister were agreed in one aim—the unification of Italy under the headship of the House of Savoy. By her participation in the war with Russia, Sardinia won a position which enabled her to claim and secure admission to the Congress of Paris, among the greater powers. At that conference, Count Cavour found an opportunity to direct attention to the deplorable state of affairs in Italy, under the Austrian rule and influence. No action by the Congress was taken; but the Italian question was raised in importance at once by the discussion of it, and Italy was rallied to the side of Sardinia as the necessary head of any practicable movement toward liberation. More than that: France was moved to sympathy with the Italian cause, and Louis Napoleon was led to believe that his throne would be strengthened by espousing it. He encouraged Cavour and Victor Emmanuel, therefore, in an attitude toward

Austria which resulted in war (1859), and when the Sardinians were attacked he went to their assistance with a powerful force. At Magenta and Solferino the Austrians were decisively beaten, and the French emperor then abruptly closed the war, making a treaty which ceded Lombardy alone to Sardinia, leaving Venetia still under the oppressor, and the remainder of Italy unchanged in its state. For payment of the service he had rendered, Louis Napoleon exacted Savoy and Nice, and Victor Emmanuel was compelled to part with the original seat of his House.

There was bitter disappointment among the Italian patriots over the meagerness of the fruit yielded by the splendid victories of Magenta and Solferino. Despite the treaty of Villafranca, they were determined to have more, and they did. Tuscany, Parma, Modena and Romagna demanded annexation to Sardinia, and, after a plébiscite, they were received (March, 1860) into the kingdom and represented in its parliament. In the Two Sicilies there was an intense longing for deliverance from the brutalities of the Neapolitan Bourbons. Victor Emmanuel could not venture an attack upon the rotten kingdom, for fear of resentments in France and elsewhere. But the adventurous soldier, Garibaldi, now took on himself the task of completing the liberation of Italy. With an army of volunteers, he first swept the Neapolitans out of Sicily, and then took Naples itself, within the space of four months, between May and September, 1860. The whole dominion was annexed to what now became the Kingdom of Italy, and which embraced the entire peninsula except Rome, garrisoned for the Pope by French troops, and Venetia, still held in the clutches of Austria. In 1862, Garibaldi raised volunteers for an attack on Rome; but the unwise movement was suppressed by Victor Emmanuel. Two years later, the King of Italy brought about an agreement with the French emperor to withdraw his garrison from Rome, and, after that had been done, the annexation of Rome to the Italian kingdom was a mere question of time. It came about in 1870, after the fall of Louis Napoleon, and Victor Emmanuel transferred his capital to the Eternal City. The Pope's domain was then limited to the precincts of the Vatican.

The Austro-Prussian War.

The unification of Italy was the first of a remarkable series of nationalizing movements which have been the most significant feature of the history of the last half of the nineteenth century. The next of these movements to begin was in Germany—the much divided country of one peculiarly homogeneous and identical race. Influences tending toward unification had been acting on the Germans since Prussia rose to superiority in the north. By the middle of the century, the educated, military Prussia that was founded after 1806 had become a power capable of great things in capable hands; and the capable hands received it. In 1861, William I. succeeded his brother as king; in 1862, Otto von Bismarck became his prime minister. It was a remarkable combination of qualities and talents, and remarkable results came from it.

In 1864, Prussia and Austria acted together in taking Schleswig and Holstein, as German states, from Denmark. The next year they quarreled

over the administration of the duchies. In 1866, they fought, and Austria was entirely vanquished in a "seven weeks war." The superiority of Prussia, organized by her great military administrator and soldier, Moltke, was overpowering. Her rival was left completely at her mercy. But Bismarck and his king were wisely magnanimous. They refrained from inflicting on the Austrians a humiliation that would rankle and keep enmities alive. They foresaw the need of future friendship between the two powers of central Europe, as against Russia on the one side and France on the other, and they shaped their policy to secure it. It sufficed them to have put Austria out of the German circle, forever; to have ended the false relation in which the Hapsburgs—rulers of an essentially Slavonic and Magyar dominion—had stood towards Germany so long.

Prussia now dominated the surrounding German states so commandingly that the mode and the time of their unification may be said to have been within her own control. Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, Schleswig-Holstein, and Frankfurt were incorporated in the Prussian kingdom at once. Saxony and the other states of the north were enveloped in a North German Confederation, with the King of Prussia for its hereditary president and commander of its forces. The states of southern Germany were left unfederated for the time being, but bound themselves by treaty to put their armies at the disposal of Prussia. Thus Germany as a whole was already made practically one power, under the control of King William and his great minister.

Final Expulsion of Austria from Italy.

The same war which unified Germany carried forward the nationalization of Italy another step. Victor Emmanuel had shrewdly entered into an alliance with Prussia before the war began, and attacked Austria in Venetia simultaneously with the German attack on the Bohemian side. The Italians were beaten at Custozza, and their navy was defeated in the Adriatic; but the victorious Prussians exacted Venetia for them in the settlement of peace, and Austria had no more footing in the peninsula.

Austria-Hungary.

It is greatly to the credit of Austria, long blinded and stupefied by the narcotic of absolutism, that the lessons of the war of 1866 sank deep into her mind and produced a very genuine enlightenment. The whole policy of the court of Vienna was changed, and with it the constitution of the Empire. The statesmen of Hungary were called into consultation with the statesmen of Austria, and the outcome of their discussions was an agreement which swept away the old Austria, holding Hungary in subjection, and created in its place a new power—a federal Austria-Hungary—equalized in its two principal parts, and united under the same sovereign with distinct constitutions.

The Franco-German War.

The surprising triumph of Prussia in the Seven Weeks War stung Louis Napoleon with a jealousy which he could not conceal. He was incapable of perceiving what it signified,—of perfection in the organization of the Prussian

kingdom and of power in its resources. He was under illusions as to the strength of his own Empire. It had been honeycombed by the rascalities that attended and surrounded him, and he did not know it. He imagined France to be capable of putting a check on Prussian aggrandizement; and he began very early after Sadowa to pursue King William with demands which were tolerably certain to end in war. When the war came, in July, 1870, it was by his own declaration; yet Prussia was prepared for it and France was not. In six weeks time from the declaration of war,—in one month from the first action,—Napoleon himself was a prisoner of war in the hands of the Germans, surrendered at Sedan, with the whole army which he personally commanded; the Empire was in collapse, and a provisional government had taken the direction of affairs. On the 20th of September Paris was invested; on the 28th of October Bazaine, with an army of 150,000 men, capitulated at Metz. A hopeless attempt to rally the nation to fresh efforts of defence in the interior, on the Loire, was valiantly made under the lead of Gambetta; but it was too late. When the year closed, besieged Paris was at the verge of starvation and all attempts to relieve the city had failed. On the 28th of January, 1871, an armistice was sought and obtained; on the 30th, Paris was surrendered and the Germans entered it. The treaty of peace negotiated subsequently ceded Alsace to Germany, with a fifth of Lorraine, and bound France to pay a war indemnity of five milliards of francs.

The Paris Commune.

In February, 1871, the provisional "Government of National Defense" gave way to a National Assembly, duly elected under the provisions of the armistice, and an executive was instituted at Bordeaux, under the presidency of M. Thiers. Early in March, the German forces were withdrawn from Paris, and control of the city was immediately seized by that dangerous element—Jacobinical, or Red Republican, or Communistic, as it may be variously described—which always shows itself with promptitude and power in the French capital, at disorderly times. The Commune was proclaimed, and the national government was defied. From the 2d of April until the 28th of May Paris was again under siege, this time by forces of the French government, fighting to overcome the revolutionists within. The proceedings of the latter were more wantonly destructive than those of the Terrorists of the Revolution, and scarcely less sanguinary. The Commune was suppressed in the end with great severity.

The Third French Republic.

M. Thiers held the presidency of the Third Republic in France until 1873, when he resigned and was succeeded by Marshal MacMahon. In 1875 the constitution which has since remained, with some amendments, in force, was framed and adopted. In 1878 Marshal MacMahon gave place to M. Jules Grévy, and the latter to M. Sadi Carnot in 1887. Republican government seems to be firmly and permanently established in France at last. The country is in a prosperous state, and nothing but its passionate desire to recover Alsace and to avenge Sedan appears threatening to its future.

The new German Empire.

While the army of the Germans was still besieging Paris, and King William and Prince Bismarck were at Versailles, in January, 1871, the last act which completed the unification and nationalization of Germany was performed. This was the assumption of the title of Emperor by King William, in response to the prayer of the princes of Germany and of the North German Parliament. On the 16th of the following April, a constitution for the German Empire was proclaimed.

The long and extraordinary reign of the Emperor William I. was ended by his death in 1888. His son, Frederick III., was dying at the time of an incurable disease, and survived his father only three months. The son of Frederick III., William II., signalized the beginning of his reign by dismissing, after a few months, the great minister, Count Bismarck, on whom his strong grandfather had leaned, and who had wrought such marvels of statesmanship and diplomacy for the German race. What may lie at the end of the reign which had this self-sufficient beginning is not to be foretold.

The Russo-Turkish War.

Since the Franco-German War of 1870-1871, the peace of Europe has been broken but once by hostilities within the European boundary. In 1875 a rising against the unendurable misrule of the Turks began in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and was imitated the next year in Bulgaria. Serbia and Montenegro declared war against Turkey and were overcome. Russia then espoused the cause of the struggling Slavs, and opened, in 1877, a most formidable new attempt to crush the Ottoman power, and to accomplish her coveted extension to the Mediterranean. From May until the following January the storm of war raged fiercely along the Balkans. The Turks fought stubbornly, but they were beaten back, and nothing but a dangerous opposition of feeling among the other powers in Europe stayed the hand of the Czar from being laid upon Constantinople. The powers required a settlement of the peace between Russia and Turkey to be made by a general Congress, and it was held at Berlin in June, 1878. Bulgaria was divided by the Congress into two states, one tributary to the Turk, but freely governed, the other subject to Turkey, but under a Christian governor. This arrangement was set aside seven years later by a bloodless revolution, which formed one Bulgaria in nominal relations of dependence upon the Porte. This was the third important nationalizing movement within a quarter of a century, and it is likely to go farther in southeastern Europe, until it settles, perhaps, "the Eastern question," so far as the European side of it is concerned.

Bosnia and Herzegovina were given to Austria by the Congress of Berlin; the independence of Roumania, Serbia, and Montenegro was made more complete; the island of Cyprus was turned over to Great Britain for administration.

Spain in the last half Century.

A few words will tell sufficiently the story of Spain since the successor of Joseph Bonaparte quitted the scene. Ferdinand VII. died in 1833, and his infant daughter was proclaimed queen,

as Isabella II., with her mother, Christina, regent. Isabella's title was disputed by Don Carlos, the late king's brother, and a civil war between Carlists and Christians went on for years. When Isabella came of age she proved to be a dissolute woman, with strong proclivities toward arbitrary government. A liberal party, and even a republican party, had been steadily gaining ground in Spain, and the queen placed herself in conflict with it. In 1868 a revolution drove her into France. The revolutionists offered the crown to a prince distantly related to the royal family of Prussia. It was this incident that gave Louis Napoleon a pretext for quarreling with the King of Prussia in 1870 and declaring war. Declined by the Hohenzollern prince, the Spanish crown was then offered to Amadeo, son of the King of Italy, who accepted it, but resigned it again in 1873, after a reign of two years, in disgust with the factions which troubled him. Castelar, the distinguished republican orator, then formed a republican government which held the reins for a few months, but could not establish order in the troubled land. The monarchy was restored in December, 1874, by the coronation of Alfonso XII., son of the exiled Isabella. Since that time Spain has preserved a tolerably peaceful and contented state.

England and Ireland.

In recent years, the part which Great Britain has taken in Continental affairs has been slight; and, indeed, there has been little in those affairs to bring about important international relations. In domestic politics, a single series of questions, concerning Ireland and the connection of Ireland with the British part of the United Kingdom, has mastered the field, overriding all others and compelling the statesmen of the day to take them in hand. The sudden imperiousness of these questions affords a peculiar manifestation of the political conscience in nations which the nineteenth century has wakened and set astir. Through all the prior centuries of their subjection, the treatment of the Irish people by the English was as cruel and as heedless of justice and right as the treatment of Poles by Russians or of Greeks by Turks. They were trebly oppressed: as conquered subjects of an alien race, as religious enemies, as possible rivals in production and trade. They were deprived of political and civil rights; they were denied the ministrations of their priests; the better employments and more honorable professions were closed to them; the industries which promised prosperity to their country were suppressed. A small minority of Protestant colonists became the recognized nation, so far as a nationality in Ireland was recognized at all. When Ireland was said to have a Parliament, it was the Parliament of the minority alone. No Catholic sat in it; no Catholic was represented in it. When Irishmen were permitted to bear arms, they were Protestant Irishmen only who formed the privileged militia. Seven-tenths of the inhabitants of the island were politically as non-existent as actual serfdom could have made them. For the most part they were peasants and their state as such scarcely above the condition of serfs. They owned no land; their leases were insecure; the laws protected them in the least possible degree; their landlords were mostly of the hostile creed and race. No country in

Europe showed conditions better calculated to distress and degrade a people.

This was the state of things in Ireland until nearly the end of the eighteenth century. In 1782 legislative independence was conceded; but the independent legislature was still the Parliament in which Protestants sat alone. In 1793 Catholics were admitted to the franchise; but seats in Parliament were still denied to them and they must elect Protestants to represent them. In 1800 the Act of Union, creating the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, extinguished the Parliament at Dublin and provided for the introduction of Irish peers and members to represent Irish constituencies in the greater Parliament at London; but still no Catholic could take a seat in either House. Not until 1829, after eighteen years of the fierce agitation which Daniel O'Connell stirred up, were Catholic disabilities entirely removed and the people of that faith placed on an equal footing with Protestants in political and civil rights.

O'Connell's agitation was not for Catholic emancipation alone, but for the repeal of the Act of Union and the restoration of legislative independence and national distinctness to Ireland. That desire has been hot in the Irish heart from the day the Union was accomplished. After O'Connell's death, there was quiet on the subject for a time. The fearful famine of 1845-7 deadened all political feeling. Then there was a recurrence of the passionate animosity to British rule which had kindled unfortunate rebellions in 1798 and 1803. It produced the Fenian conspiracies, which ran their course from about 1858 to 1867. But soon after that time Irish nationalism resumed a more politic temper, and doubled the energy of its efforts by confining them to peaceful and lawful ways. The Home Rule movement, which began in 1873, was aimed at the organization of a compact and well-guided Irish party in Parliament, to press the demand for legislative independence and to act with united weight on lines of Irish policy carefully laid down. This Home Rule party soon acquired a powerful leader in Mr. Charles Parnell, and was successful in carrying questions of reform in Ireland to the forefront of English politics.

Under the influence of its great leader, Mr. Gladstone, the Liberal party had already, before the Home Rule party came into the field, begun to adopt measures for the redress of Irish wrongs. In 1869, the Irish branch of the Church of England, calling itself the Church of Ireland, was disestablished. The membership of that church was reckoned to be one-tenth of the population; but it had been supported by the taxation of the whole. The Catholics, the Presbyterians and other dissenters were now released from this unjust burden. In 1870, a Land Bill—the first of several, which restrict the power of Irish landlords to oppress their tenants, and which protect the latter, while opening opportunities of land-ownership to them—was passed. The land question became for a time more prominent than the Home Rule question, and the party of Mr. Parnell was practically absorbed in an Irish National Land League, formed to force landlords to a reduction of rents. The methods of coercion adopted brought the League into collision with the Liberal Government, notwithstanding the general sympathy of the latter with Irish complaints. For a time the Irish Nationalists went

into alliance with the English Conservatives; but in 1886 Mr. Gladstone became convinced, and convinced the majority of his party, that just and harmonious relations between Ireland and Great Britain could never be established without the concession of Home Rule to the former. A bill which he introduced to that end was defeated in the House of Commons and Mr. Gladstone resigned. In 1892 he was returned to power, and in September of the following year he carried in the House of Commons a bill for the transferring of Irish legislation to a distinct Parliament at Dublin. It was defeated, however, in the House of Lords, and the question now rests in an unsettled state. Mr. Gladstone's retirement from the premiership and from the leadership of his party, which occurred in March, 1894, may affect the prospects of the measure; but the English Liberals are committed to its principle, and it appears to be certain that the Irish question will attain some solution within no very long time.

Conclusion.

The beginning of the year 1894, when this is written, finds Europe at peace, as it has been for a number of years. But the peace is not of friendship, nor of honorable confidence, nor of good will. The greater nations are lying on their arms, so to speak, watching one another with strained eyes and with jealous hearts. France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Russia, are marshaling armies in the season of peace that, not many years ago, would have seemed monstrous for war. Exactions of military service and taxation for military expenditure are pressed upon their people to the point of last endurance. The preparation for battle is so vast in its scale, so unceasing, so increasing, so far in the lead over all other efforts among men, that it seems like a new affirmation of belief that war is the natural order of the world.

And yet, the dread of war is greater in the civilized world than ever before. The interests and influences that work for peace are more powerful than at any former time. The wealth which war threatens, the commerce which it interrupts, the industry which it disturbs, the intelligence which it offends, the humanity which it shocks, the Christianity which it grieves, grow stronger to resist it, year by year. The statesman and the diplomatist are under checks of responsibility which a generation no older than Palmerston's never felt. The arbitrator and the tribunal of arbitration have become familiar within a quarter of a century. The spirit of the age opposes war with rising earnestness and increasing force; while the circumstance and fact of the time seem arranged for it as the chief business of mankind. It is a singular and a critical situation; the outcome from it is impenetrably hidden.

Within itself, too, each nation is troubled with hostilities that the world has not known before. Democracy in politics is bringing in, as was inevitable, democracy in the whole social system; and the period of adjustment to it, which we are passing through, could not fail to be a period of trial and of many dangers. The Anarchist, the Nihilist, the Socialist in his many variations—what are they going to do in the time that lies before us?

Europe, at the present stage of its history, is in the thick of many questions; and so we leave it.

EURYMEDON, Battles of the (B. C. 466). See ATHENS: B. C. 470-466.

EUSKALDUNAC. See BASQUES.

EUTAW SPRINGS, Battle of (1781). See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780-1781.

EUTHYNI, The. See LOGISTÆ.

EUTYCHIAN HERESY. See NESTORIAN AND MONOPHYSITE CONTROVERSY.

EUXINE, The.—Euxinus Pontus, or Pontus Euxinus, the Black Sea, as named by the Greeks.

EVACUATION DAY.—The anniversary of the evacuation of New York by the British, Nov. 25, 1783. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1783 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER).

EVANGELICAL UNION OF GERMANY, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1608-1618.

EVELYN COLLEGE. See EDUCATION, MODERN: REFORMS: A. D. 1804-1891.

EVER VICTORIOUS ARMY, The. See CHINA: A. D. 1850-1864.

EVESHAM, Battle of (1265).—The battle which finished the civil war in England known as the Barons' War. It was fought Aug. 3, 1265, and Earl Simon de Montfort, the soul of the popular cause, was slain, with most of his followers. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1216-1274.

EVICTIONS, Irish. See IRELAND: A. D. 1886.

EXARCHS OF RAVENNA. See ROME: A. D. 554-800.

EXARCHS OF THE DIOCESE. See PRIMATES.

EXCHEQUER.—EXCHEQUER ROLLS.—EXCHEQUER TALLIES.—"The Exchequer of the Norman kings was the court in which the whole financial business of the country was transacted, and as the whole administration of justice, and even the military organisation, was dependent upon the fiscal officers, the whole framework of society may be said to have passed annually under its review. It derived its name from the chequered cloth which covered the table at which the accounts were taken, a name which suggested to the spectator the idea of a game at chess between the receiver and the payer, the treasurer and the sheriff. . . . The record of the business was preserved in three great rolls; one kept by the Treasurer, another by the Chancellor, and a third by an officer nominated by the king, who registered the matters of legal and special importance. The rolls of the Treasurer and Chancellor were duplicates; that of the former was called from its shape the great roll of the Pipe, and that of the latter the roll of the Chancery. These documents are mostly still in existence. The Pipe Rolls are complete from the second year of Henry II. and the Chancellor's Rolls nearly so. Of the preceding period only one roll, that of the thirty-first year of Henry I., is preserved, and this with Domesday book is the most valuable store of information which exists for the administrative history of the age. The financial reports were made to the barons by the sheriffs of the counties. At Easter and Michaelmas each of these magistrates produced his own accounts and paid in to the Exchequer such an instalment or proffer as he could afford, retaining in hand sufficient money for current expenses. In token of receipt a tally was made; a long piece of wood in which a number of notches were cut, marking the pounds, shillings, and pence received; this stick was then split down the middle, each half contained exactly the same num-

ber of notches, and no alteration could of course be made without certain detection. . . . The fire which destroyed the old Houses of Parliament is said to have originated in the burning of the old Exchequer tallies."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11, sect. 126.—"The wooden 'tallies' on which a large notch represented £1,000, and smaller notches other sums, while a halfpenny was denoted by a small round hole, were actually in use at the Exchequer until the year 1824."—Sir J. Lubbock, *Preface to Hall's "Antiquities and Curiosities of the Exchequer."*

ALSO IN: E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Doc's of the Middle Ages*, bk. 1, no. 5.—See, also, CURIA REGIS and CHIEFS.

EXCHEQUER, Chancellor of the.—In the reign of Henry III., of England, "was created the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, to whom the Exchequer seal was entrusted, and who with the Treasurer took part in the equitable jurisdiction of the Exchequer, although not in the common law jurisdiction of the barons, which extended itself as the legal fictions of pleading brought common pleas into this court."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 15, sect. 237.

EXCLUSION BILL, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1679-1681.

EXCOMMUNICATIONS AND INTERDICTS.—"Excommunication, whatever opinions may be entertained as to its religious efficacy, was originally nothing more in appearance than the exercise of a right which every society claims, the expulsion of refractory members from its body. No direct temporal disadvantages attended this penalty for several ages; but as it was the most severe of spiritual censures, and tended to exclude the object of it, not only from a participation in religious rites, but in a considerable degree from the intercourse of Christian society, it was used sparingly and upon the gravest occasions. Gradually, as the church became more powerful and more imperious, excommunications were issued upon every provocation, rather as a weapon of ecclesiastical warfare than with any regard to its original intention. . . . Princes who felt the inadequacy of their own laws to secure obedience called in the assistance of more formidable sanctions. Several capitularies of Charlemagne denounce the penalty of excommunication against incendiaries or deserters from the army. Charles the Bald procured similar censures against his revolted vassals. Thus the boundary between temporal and spiritual offences grew every day less distinct; and the clergy were encouraged to fresh encroachments, as they discovered the secret of rendering them successful. . . . The support due to church censures by temporal judges is vaguely declared in the capitularies of Pepin and Charlemagne. It became in later ages a more established principle in France and England, and, I presume, in other countries. By our common law an excommunicated person is incapable of being a witness or of bringing an action; and he may be detained in prison until he obtains absolution. By the Establishments of St. Louis, his estate or person might be attached by the magistrate. These actual penalties were attended by marks of abhorrence and ignominy still more calculated to make an impression on ordinary minds. They were to be shunned, like men infected with leprosy, by their servants, their friends, and their families. . . . But as excommunication, which

attacked only one and perhaps a hardened sinner, was not always efficacious, the church had recourse to a more comprehensive punishment. For the offence of a nobleman she put a county, for that of a prince his entire kingdom, under an interdict or suspension of religious offices. No stretch of her tyranny was perhaps so outrageous as this. During an interdict the churches were closed, the bells silent, the dead unburied, no rite but those of baptism and extreme unction performed. The penalty fell upon those who had neither partaken nor could have prevented the offence; and the offence was often but a private dispute, in which the pride of a pope or bishop had been wounded. Interdicts were so rare before the time of Gregory VII., that some have referred them to him as their author; instances may however be found of an earlier date."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 7, pt. 1.

ALSO IN: M. Gosselin, *The Power of the Pope in the Middle Ages*, pt. 2, ch. 1, art. 3.—H. C. Lea, *Studies in Church Hist.*, pt. 3.—P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, v. 4, ch. 8, sect. 86.

EXECUTIVE SESSIONS. See CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

EXEGETÆ, The.—A board of three persons in ancient Athens "to whom application might be made in all matters relating to sacred law, and also, probably, with regard to the significance of the Diosemia, or celestial phenomena and other signs by which future events were

foretold."—G. F. Schömann, *Antiq. of Greece: The State*, pt. 3, ch. 3.

EXETER, Origin of.—"Isca Damnoniorum, Caer Wisc, Exanceaster, Exeter, keeping essentially the same name under all changes, stands distinguished as the one great English city which has, in a more marked way than any other, kept its unbroken being and its unbroken position throughout all ages. The City on the Exe, in all ages and in all tongues keeping its name as the City on the Exe, allows of an easy definition. . . . It is the one city [of England] in which we can feel sure that human habitation and city life have never ceased from the days of the early Cæsars to our own."—E. A. Freeman, *Exeter*, ch. 1-2.

EXILARCH, The. See JEWS: 7TH CENTURY.

EXODUS FROM EGYPT, The. See JEWS: THE ROUTE OF THE EXODUS.

EXPLORATION, African and Polar. See AFRICA, and POLAR.

EYLAU, Battle of (1807). See GERMANY: A. D. 1806-1807.

EYRE, Governor, and the Jamaica insurrection. See JAMAICA: A. D. 1865.

EYSTEIN I., King of Norway, A. D. 1116-1122. . . . Eystein II., 1155-1157.

EZZELINO, OR ECCELINO DI ROMANO, The tyranny of, and the crusade against. See VERONA: A. D. 1236-1259.

F.

FABIAN POLICY.—FABIAN TACTICS.

—The policy pursued by Q. Fabius Maximus, the Roman Dictator, called "the Cunctator" or Lingerer, in his campaigns against Hannibal. See PUNIC WAR, THE SECOND.

FACTORY LEGISLATION, English.—

"During the 17th and 18th centuries, when the skill of the workmen had greatly improved, and the productiveness of labour had increased, various methods were resorted to for the purpose of prolonging the working day. The noontide nap was first dispensed with, then other intervals of rest were curtailed, and ultimately artificial light was introduced, which had the effect of abolishing the difference between the short days of winter and the long days of summer, thus equalising the working day throughout the year. The opening of the 19th century was signalled by a new cry, namely, for a reduction in the hours of labour; this was in consequence of the introduction of female and child labour into the factories, and the deterioration of the workers as a result of excessive overwork. . . . The overwork of the young, and particularly the excessive hours in the factories, became such crying evils that in 1801 the first Act was passed to restrict the hours of labour for apprentices, who were prohibited from working more than 12 hours a day, between six A. M. and nine P. M., and that provision should be made for teaching them to read and write, and other educational exercises. This Act further provided that the mills should be whitewashed at least once a year; and that doors and windows should be made to admit fresh air. This Act was followed by a series of commissions and committees of inquiry, the result being that it was several times amended. The details of the evidence given be-

fore the several commissions and committees of inquiry are sickening in the extreme; the medical testimony was unanimous in its verdict that the children were physically ruined by overwork; those who escaped with their lives were so crippled and maimed that they were unable to maintain themselves in after life, and became paupers. It was proven that out of 4,000 who entered the factory before they were 30 years of age, only 600 were to be found in the mills after that age. By Sir Robert Peel's Bill in 1819 it was proposed to limit the hours to 11 per day with one and a half for meals, for those under 16 years of age. But the mill-owners prophesied the ruin of the manufacturers of the country—they could not compete with the foreign markets, it was an interference with the freedom of labour, the spare time given would be spent in debauchery and riot, and that if passed, other trades would require the same provisions. The Bill was defeated, and the hours fixed at 72 per week; the justices, that is to say the manufacturers, were entrusted with the enforcement of the law. In 1825 a new law was passed defining the time when breakfast and dinner was to be taken, and fixing the time to half an hour for the first repast, and a full hour for dinner; the traditional term of apprentices was dropped and the modern classification of children and young persons was substituted, and children were once more prohibited from working more than 12 hours a day. But every means was adopted to evade the law. . . . After thousands of petitions, and numerous angry debates in Parliament, the Act of 1833 was passed, which limited the working hours of children to 48 hours per week, and provided that each child should have a certain amount of schooling, and with it factory inspectors were appointed to

enforce the law. But the law was not to come into operation until March 1, 1836, during which time it had to be explained and defended in one session, amended in a second, and made binding in a third. After several Royal Commissions and inquiries by select committees, this Act has been eight times amended, until the working hours of children are now limited to six per day, and for young persons and women to 56 per week; these provisions with certain modifications are now extended to workshops, and the whole law is being consolidated and amended. . . . The whole series of the Factory Acts, dating from 42 George III., c. 73, to the 37 and 38 Victoria 1874, forms a code of legislation, in regard to working people, unexampled in any age and unequalled in any country in the world. . . . Outside Parliament efforts have been constantly made to further reduce the working hours."—G. Howell, *The Conflicts of Capital and Labour*, pp. 298–301.—"The continental governments, of course, have been obliged to make regulations covering kindred subjects, but rarely have they kept pace with English legislation. America has enacted progressive laws so far as the condition of factory workers has warranted. It should be remembered that the abuses which crept into the system in England never existed in this country in any such degree as we know they did in the old country. Yet there are few States in America where manufactures predominate or hold an important position in which law has not stepped in and restricted either the hours of labor, or the conditions of labor, and insisted upon the education of factory children, although the laws are usually silent as to children of agricultural laborers. It is not wholly in the passage of purely factory acts that the factory system has influenced the legislation of the world. England may have suffered temporarily from the effects of some of her factory legislation, and the recent reduction of the hours of labor to nine and one-half per day, less than in any other country, has had the effect of placing her works at a disadvantage; but, in the long run, England will be the gainer on account of all the work she has done in the way of legislative restrictions upon labor. In this she has changed her whole policy. Formerly trade must be restricted and labor allowed to demoralize itself under the specious plea of being free; now, trade must be free and labor restricted in the interests of society, which means in the interest of good morals. The factory system has not only wrought this change, but has compelled the economists to recognize the distinction between commodities and services. There has been greater and greater freedom of contract in respect to commodities, but the contracts which involve labor have become more and more completely under the authority and supervision of the State. 'Seventy-five years ago scarcely a single law existed in any country for regulating the contract for services in the interest of the laboring classes. At the same time the contract for commodities was everywhere subject to minute and incessant regulations' [Hon. F. A. Walker]. Factory legislation in England, as elsewhere, has had for its chief object the regulation of the labor of children and women; but its scope has constantly increased by successive and progressive amendments until they have attempted to secure the physical and moral well-being of the working-

man in all trades, and to give him every condition of salubrity and of personal safety in the workshops. The excellent effect of factory legislation has been made manifest throughout the whole of Great Britain. 'Physically, the factory child can bear fair comparison with the child brought up in the fields,' and, intellectually, progress is far greater with the former than with the latter. Public opinion, struck by these results, has demanded the extension of protective measures for children to every kind of industrial labor, until parliament has brought under the influence of these laws the most powerful industries. To carry the factory regulations and those relative to schooling into effect, England has an efficient corps of factory inspectors. The manufacturers of England are unanimous in acknowledging that to the activity, to the sense of impartiality, displayed by these inspectors, is due the fact that an entire application of the law has been possible without individual interests being thereby jeopardized to a very serious extent. . . . In no other country is there so elaborate a code of factory laws as the 'British factory and workshop act' of 1878 (41 Vict., chap. 16), it being an act consolidating all the factory acts since Sir Robert Peel's act of 1802."—C. D. Wright, *Factory Legislation (Tenth Census of the U. S., v. 2)*.

ALSO IN: *First annual Rep't of the Factory Inspectors of the State of New York*, 1886, appendix.—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, v. 8, ch. 22 and 27.—H. Martineau, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' Peace*, v. 2, pp. 512–515.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1832–1833.

FADDILEY, Battle of.—Fought successfully by the Britons with the West Saxons, on the border of Cheshire, A. D. 583.—J. R. Green, *The Making of England*, p. 206.

FAENZA, Battle of (A. D. 542). See ROME: A. D. 535–553.

FÆSULÆ. See FLORENCE, ORIGIN AND NAME.

FAGGING. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—ENGLAND.—THE GREAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

FAGGIOLA, Battle of (1425). See ITALY: A. D. 1412–1447.

FAINEANT KINGS. See FRANKS: A. D. 511–752.

FAIR OAKS, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY: VIRGINIA).

FAIRFAX AND THE PARLIAMENTARY ARMY. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1645 (JANUARY–APRIL), and (JUNE); 1647 (APRIL–AUGUST); 1648 (NOVEMBER); 1649 (FEBRUARY).

FALAISE.—"The Castle [in Normandy] where legend fixes the birth of William of Normandy, and where history fixes the famous homage of William of Scotland, is a vast donjon of the eleventh or twelfth century. One of the grandest of those massive square keeps which I have already spoken of as distinguishing the earliest military architecture of Normandy crowns the summit of a precipitous rock, fronted by another mass of rock, wilder still, on which the cannon of England were planted during Henry's siege. To these rocks, these 'felsen,' the spot owes its name of Falaise. . . . Between these two rugged heights lies a narrow dell. . . . The dell is crowded with mills and tanneries, but the mills and tanneries of Falaise have their share in the historic interest of the place. . . . In

every form which the story has taken in history or legend, the mother of the Conqueror appears as the daughter of a tanner of Falaise."—E. A. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, ch. 8, sect. 1.

FALAISE, Peace of (1175). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1174-1189.

FALK LAWS, The. See GERMANY: A. D. 1873-1887.

FALKIRK, Battles of (1298 and 1746). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1290-1305; and 1745-1746.

FAMAGOSTA: A. D. 1571.—Taken by the Turks. See TURKS: A. D. 1566-1571.

FAMILIA.—Roman slaves of one master were collectively called familia.

FAMILISTERE. See SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: A. D. 1859-1887.

FAMILY COMPACT, The First Bourbon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733.... **The Second.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1743 (OCTOBER).... **The Third.** See FRANCE: A. D. 1761 (AUGUST).

FAMILY COMPACT IN CANADA, The. See CANADA: A. D. 1820-1837.

FAMINE, The Cotton. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1861-1865.

FAMINE, The Irish. See IRELAND: A. D. 1845-1847.

FANARIOTS. See PHANARIOTS.

FANEUIL HALL.—"The fame of Faneuil Hall [Boston, Mass.] is as wide as the country itself. It has been called the 'Cradle of Liberty,' because dedicated by that early apostle of freedom, James Otis, to the cause of liberty, in a speech delivered in the hall in March, 1763. . . . Its walls have echoed to the voices of the great departed in times gone by, and in every great public exigency the people, with one accord, assembled together to take counsel within its hallowed precincts. . . . The Old Market-house . . . existing in Dock Square in 1734, was demolished by a mob in 1736-37. There was contention among the people as to whether they would be served at their houses in the old way, or resort to fixed localities, and one set of disputants took this summary method of settling the question. . . . In 1740, the question of the Market-house being revived, Peter Faneuil proposed to build one at his own cost on the town's land in Dock Square, upon condition that the town should legally authorize it, enact proper regulations, and maintain it for the purpose named. Mr. Faneuil's noble offer was courteously received, but such was the division of opinion on the subject that it was accepted by a majority of only seven votes, out of 727 persons voting. The building was completed in September, 1742, and three days after, at a meeting of citizens, the hall was formally accepted and a vote of thanks passed to the donor. . . . The town voted that the hall should be called Faneuil Hall forever. . . . The original size of the building was 40 by 100 feet, just half the present width; the hall would contain 1,000 persons. At the fire of January 13, 1763, the whole interior was destroyed, but the town voted to rebuild in March, and the State authorized a lottery in aid of the design. The first meeting after the rebuilding was held on the 14th March, 1763, when James Otis delivered the dedicatory address. In 1806 the Hall was enlarged in width to 80 feet, and by the addition of a third story."—S. A. Drake, *Old Landmarks of Boston*, ch. 4.

FANNIAN LAW, The. See ORCHIAN, FANNIAN, DIDIAN LAWS.

FARM. See FERM.

FARMERS' ALLIANCE. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1877-1891.

FARMER'S LETTERS, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1767-1768.

FARNESE, Alexander, Duke of Parma, in the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577-1581, to 1588-1593.

FARNESE, The House of. See PARMA: A. D. 1545-1592.

FARRAGUT, Admiral David G.—Capture of New Orleans. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (APRIL: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).... **Attack on Vicksburg.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY—JULY: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).... **Victory in Mobile Bay.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (AUGUST: ALABAMA).

FARSAKH, OR FARSAANG, The. See PARASANG.

FASCES. See LICTORS.

FASTI.—"Dies Fasti were the days upon which the Courts of Justice [in ancient Rome] were open, and legal business could be transacted before the Praetor; the Dies Nefasti were those upon which the Courts were closed. . . . All days consecrated to the worship of the Gods by sacrifices, feasts or games, were named Festi. . . . For nearly four centuries and a-half after the foundation of the city the knowledge of the Calendar was confined to the Pontifices alone. . . . These secrets which might be, and doubtless often were, employed for political ends, were at length divulged in the year B. C. 314, by Cn. Flavius, who drew up tables embracing all this carefully-treasured information, and hung them up in the Forum for the inspection of the public. From this time forward documents of this description were known by the name of Fasti. . . . These Fasti, in fact, corresponded very closely to a modern Almanac. . . . The Fasti just described have, to prevent confusion, been called *Calendaria*, or *Fasti Calendarum*, and must be carefully distinguished from certain compositions also named Fasti by the ancients. These were regular chronicles in which were recorded each year the names of the Consuls and other magistrates, together with the remarkable events, and the days on which they occurred. The most important were the *Annales Maximi*, kept by the Pontifex Maximus."—W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 11.

FATIMITE CALIPHS, The. See MAHOMETAN CONQUEST AND EMPIRE: A. D. 908-1171; also, ASSASSINS.

FAURE, President, Election. See FRANCE: A. D. 1894-1895.

FEAST OF LIBERTY. See GREECE: B. C. 479: PERSIAN WARS.—PLATÆA.

FEAST OF REASON, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (NOVEMBER).

FEAST OF THE FEDERATION, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1789-1791.

FEAST OF THE SUPREME BEING, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793-1794 (NOVEMBER—JUNE).

FECIALES.—FETIALES. See FETIALES.

FEDELI. See CATTANI.

FEDERAL CITY, The. See WASHINGTON (CITY): A. D. 1791.

FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF SWITZERLAND. See CONSTITUTION OF THE SWISS CONFEDERATION.

FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AM. See CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—FEDERATIONS.—"Two requisites seem necessary to constitute a Federal Government in . . . its most perfect form. On the one hand, each of the members of the Union must be wholly independent in those matters which concern each member only. On the other hand, all must be subject to a common power in those matters which concern the whole body of members collectively. Thus each member will fix for itself the laws of its criminal jurisprudence, and even the details of its political constitution. And it will do this, not as a matter of privilege or concession from any higher power, but as a matter of absolute right, by virtue of its inherent powers as an independent commonwealth. But in all matters which concern the general body, the sovereignty of the several members will cease. Each member is perfectly independent within its own sphere; but there is another sphere in which its independence, or rather its separate existence, vanishes. It is invested with every right of sovereignty on one class of subjects, but there is another class of subjects on which it is as incapable of separate political action as any province or city of a monarchy or of an indivisible republic. . . . Four Federal Commonwealths . . . stand out, in four different ages of the world, as commanding, above all others, the attention of students of political history. Of these four, one belongs to what is usually known as 'ancient,' another to what is commonly called 'mediæval' history; a third arose in the period of transition between mediæval and modern history; the creation of the fourth may have been witnessed by some few of those who are still counted among living men. . . . These four Commonwealths are, First, the Achaian League [see GREECE: B. C. 280-146] in the later days of Ancient Greece, whose most flourishing period comes within the third century before our era. Second, the Confederation of the Swiss Cantons [see CONSTITUTION OF THE SWISS CONFEDERATION], which, with many changes in its extent and constitution, has lasted from the thirteenth century to our own day. Third, the Seven United Provinces of the Netherlands [see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577-1581, and after], whose Union arose in the War of Independence against Spain, and lasted, in a republican form, till the war of the French Revolution. Fourth, the United States of North America [see CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AM.], which formed a Federal Union after their revolt from the British Crown under George the Third, and whose destiny forms one of the most important, and certainly the most interesting, of the political problems of our own time. Of these four, three come sufficiently near to the full realization of the Federal idea to be entitled to rank among perfect Federal Governments. The Achaian League, and the United States since the adoption of the present Constitution, are indeed the most perfect developments of the Federal principle which the world has ever seen. The Swiss Confederation, in its origin a Union of the loosest kind, has gradually drawn the Federal bond tighter and tighter, till, within our own times, it has assumed a form which fairly entitles it to rank beside Achaia and America. The claim of

the United Provinces is more doubtful; their union was at no period of their republican being so close as that of Achaia, America, and modern Switzerland."—E. A. Freeman, *Hist. of Federal Government*, v. 1, pp. 3-6.

Classification of Federal Governments.—"To the classification of federal governments publicists have given great attention with unsatisfactory results. History shows a great variety of forms, ranging from the lowest possible organization, like that of the Amphictyonic Council [see AMPHICTYONIC COUNCIL] to the highly centralized and powerful German Empire. Many writers deny that any fixed boundaries can be described. The usual classification is, however, into three divisions,—the Staatenstaat, or state founded on states; the Staatenbund, or union of states—to which the term Confederacy nearly corresponds; and the Bundesstaat, or united state, which answers substantially to the term federation as usually employed. The Staatenstaat is defined to be a state in which the units are not individuals, but states, and which, therefore, has no operation directly on individuals, but deals with and legislates for its corporate members; they preserve undisturbed their powers of government over their own subjects. The usual example of a Staatenstaat is the Holy Roman Empire [see ROMAN EMPIRE, THE HOLY]. This conception . . . is, however, illogical in theory, and never has been carried out in practice. . . . Historically, also, the distinction is untenable. The Holy Roman Empire had courts, taxes, and even subjects not connected with the states. In theory it had superior claims upon all the individuals within the Empire; in practice it abandoned control over the states. The second category is better established. Jellinek says: 'When states form a permanent political alliance, of which common defence is at the very least the purpose, with permanent federal organs, there arises a Staatenbund.' This form of government is distinguished from an alliance by the fact that it has permanent federal organs; from a commercial league by its political purpose; from a Bundesstaat by its limited purpose. In other words, under Staatenbund are included the weaker forms of true federal government, in which there is independence from other powers, and, within the purposes of the union, independence from the constituent states. . . . The Staatenbund form includes most of the federal governments which have existed. The Greek confederations (except perhaps the Lycian and Achaean) and all the mediæval leagues were of this type; even the strong modern unions of the United States, Germany, and Switzerland, have gone through the Staatenbund stage in their earlier history. Between the Staatenbund and the more highly developed form, the Bundesstaat, no writer has described an accurate boundary. There are certain governments, notably those of Canada, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States, in which is found an elaborate and powerful central organism, including federal courts; to this organism is assigned all or nearly all the common concerns of the nation; within its exclusive control are war, foreign affairs, commerce, colonies, and national finances; and there is an efficient power of enforcement against states. Such governments undoubtedly are Bundesstaaten."—A. B. Hart, *Introd. to the Study of Federal Gov't* (*Harvard Historical Monographs*, no. 2), ch. 1.

Greek Federations.—"Under the conditions of the Græco-Roman civic life there were but two practicable methods of forming a great state and diminishing the quantity of warfare. The one method was conquest with incorporation, the other method was federation. . . . Neither method was adopted by the Greeks in their day of greatness. The Spartan method of extending its power was conquest without incorporation: when Sparta conquered another Greek city, she sent a harmost to govern it like a tyrant; in other words she virtually enslaved the subject city. The efforts of Athens tended more in the direction of a peaceful federalism. In the great Delian confederacy [see GREECE: B. C. 478-477, and ATHENS: B. C. 466-454], which developed into the maritime empire of Athens, the Ægean cities were treated as allies rather than subjects. As regards their local affairs they were in no way interfered with, and could they have been represented in some kind of a federal council at Athens, the course of Grecian history might have been wonderfully altered. As it was, they were all deprived of one essential element of sovereignty,—the power of controlling their own military forces. . . . In the century following the death of Alexander, in the closing age of Hellenic independence, the federal idea appears in a much more advanced stage of elaboration, though in a part of Greece which had been held of little account in the great days of Athens and Sparta. Between the Achaian federation, framed in 274 B. C., and the United States of America, there are some interesting points of resemblance which have been elaborately discussed by Mr. Freeman, in his 'History of Federal Government.' About the same time the Ætolian League [see ÆTOLIAN LEAGUE] came into prominence in the north. Both these leagues were instances of true federal government, and were not mere confederations; that is, the central government acted directly upon all the citizens and not merely upon the local governments. Each of these leagues had for its chief executive officer a General elected for one year, with powers similar to those of an American President. In each the supreme assembly was a primary assembly at which every citizen from every city of the league had a right to be present, to speak, and to vote; but as a natural consequence these assemblies shrank into comparatively aristocratic bodies. In Ætolia, which was a group of mountain cantons similar to Switzerland, the federal union was more complete than in Achaia, which was a group of cities. . . . In so far as Greece contributed anything towards the formation of great and pacific political aggregates, she did it through attempts at federation. But in so low a state of political development as that which prevailed throughout the Mediterranean world in pre-Christian times, the more barbarous method of conquest with incorporation was more likely to be successful on a great scale. This was well illustrated in the history of Rome,—a civic community of the same generic type with Sparta and Athens, but presenting specific differences of the highest importance. . . . Rome early succeeded in freeing itself from that insuperable prejudice which elsewhere prevented the ancient city from admitting aliens to a share in its franchise. And in this victory over primeval political ideas lay the whole secret of Rome's mighty career."—J. Fiske, *American Political Ideas*, lect. 2.

Mediæval Leagues in Germany.—"It is hardly too much to say that the Lombard League led naturally to the leagues of German cities. The exhausting efforts of the Hohenstaufen Emperors to secure dominion in Italy compelled them to grant privileges to the cities in Germany; the weaker emperors, who followed, bought support with new charters and privileges. The inability of the Empire to keep the peace or to protect commerce led speedily to the formation of great unions of cities, usually commercial in origin, but very soon becoming political forces of prime importance. The first of these was the Rhenish League, formed in 1254. The more important cities of the Rhine valley, from Basle to Cologne, were the original members; but it eventually had seventy members, including several princes and ruling prelates. The league had Colloquia, or assemblies, at stated intervals; but, beyond deciding upon a general policy, and the assignment of military quotas, it had no legislative powers. There was, however, a Commission, or federal court, which acted as arbiter in disputes between the members. The chief political service of the league was to maintain peace during the interregnum in the Empire (1256-1273). During the fourteenth century it fell apart, and many of its members joined the Hansa or Suabian League. . . . In 1377 seventeen Suabian cities, which had been mortgaged by the Emperor, united to defend their liberties. They received many accessions of German and Swiss cities; but in 1388 they were overthrown by Leopold III. of Austria, and all combinations of cities were forbidden. A federal government they cannot be said to have possessed; but political, almost federal relations continued during the fifteenth century. The similar leagues of Frankfort and Wetterau were broken up about the same time. Other leagues of cities and cantons were in a like manner formed and dissolved,—among them the leagues of Hauenstein and Burgundy; and there was a confederation in Franche Comté, afterward French territory. All the mediæval leagues thus far mentioned were defensive, and had no extended relations beyond their own borders. The great Hanseatic League [see HANSA TOWNS], organized as a commercial union, developed into a political and international power, which negotiated and made war on its own account with foreign and German sovereigns; and which was for two centuries one of the leading powers of Europe."—A. B. Hart, *Introd. to the Study of Federal Gov't* (Harvard Historical Monographs, no. 2), ch. 3.

Mediæval League of Lombardy.—When Frederick Barbarossa entered Italy for the fifth time in 1163, to enforce the despotic sovereignty over that country which the German kings, as emperors, were then claiming (see ITALY: A. D. 961-1039), a league of the Lombard cities was formed to resist him. "Verona, Vicenza, Padua, and Treviso, the most powerful towns of the Veronese marches, assembled their consuls in congress, to consider of the means of putting an end to a tyranny which overwhelmed them. The consuls of these four towns pledged themselves by oath in the name of their cities to give mutual support to each other in the assertion of their former rights, and in the resolution to reduce the imperial prerogatives to the point at which they were fixed under the reign of Henry IV. Frederick, informed of this association,

returned hastily into Northern Italy, to put it down . . . but he soon perceived that the spirit of liberty had made progress in the Ghibeline cities as well as in those of the Guelphs. . . . Obligated to bend before a people which he considered only as revolted subjects, he soon renounced a contest so humiliating, and returned to Germany, to levy an army more submissive to him. Other and more pressing interests diverted his attention from this object till the autumn of 1166. . . . When Frederick, in the month of October, 1166, descended the mountains of the Grisons to enter Italy by the territory of Brescia, he marched his army directly to Lodi, without permitting any act of hostility on the way. At Lodi, he assembled, towards the end of November, a diet of the kingdom of Italy, at which he promised the Lombards to redress the grievances occasioned by the abuses of power by his podestats, and to respect their just liberties; . . . to give greater weight to his negotiation, he marched his army into Central Italy. . . . The towns of the Veronese marches, seeing the emperor and his army pass without daring to attack them, became bolder: they assembled a new diet, in the beginning of April, at the convent of Pontida, between Milan and Bergamo. The consuls of Cremona, of Bergamo, of Brescia, of Mantua and Ferrara met there, and joined those of the marches. The union of the Guelphs and Ghibelines, for the common liberty, was hailed with universal joy. The deputies of the Cremonese, who had lent their aid to the destruction of Milan, seconded those of the Milanese villages in imploring aid of the confederated towns to rebuild the city of Milan. This confederation was called the League of Lombardy. The consuls took the oath, and their constituents afterwards repeated it, that every Lombard should unite for the recovery of the common liberty; that the league for this purpose should last twenty years; and, finally, that they should aid each other in repairing in common any damage experienced in this sacred cause, by any one member of the confederation: extending even to the past this contract for reciprocal security, the league resolved to rebuild Milan. . . . Lodi was soon afterwards compelled, by force of arms, to take the oath to the league; while the towns of Venice, Piacenza, Parma, Modena, and Bologna voluntarily and gladly joined the association."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *History of the Italian Republics*, ch. 2.—In 1226 the League was revived or renewed against Frederick II. (see ITALY: A. D. 1183–1250).—"Milan and Bologna took the lead, and were followed by Piacenza, Verona, Brescia, Faenza, Mantua, Vercelli, Lodi, Bergamo, Turin, Alessandria, Vicenza, Padua, and Treviso. . . . Nothing could be more unlike, than the First and the Second Lombard Leagues, That of 1167, formed against Frederick the First after the most cruel provocation, was sanctioned by the Pope, and had for its end the deliverance of Lombardy. That of 1226, formed against Frederick the Second, after no provocation received, was discountenanced by the Pope, and resulted in the frustration of the Crusade and in sowing the germ of endless civil wars. This year is fixed upon by the Brescian Chronicler as the beginning of 'those plaguy factions of Guelph and Ghibeline, which were so engrained into the minds of our forefathers, that they have handed them down as an heir-loom to their posterity,

never to come to an end.'"—T. L. Kington, *Hist. of Frederick the Second*, v. 1, p. 265–266.

Modern Federations.—"A remarkable phenomenon of the last hundred years is the 'impetus that has been given to the development of Federal institutions. There are to-day contemporaneously existing no less than eight distinct Federal Governments. First and foremost is the United States of America, where we have an example of the Federal Union in the most perfect form yet attained. Then comes Switzerland, of less importance than the United States of America, but most nearly approaching it in perfection. Again we have the German Empire [see CONSTITUTION OF GERMANY], that great factor in European politics, which is truly a Federal Union, but a cumbrous one and full of anomalies. Next in importance comes the Dominion of Canada [see CONSTITUTION OF CANADA], which is the only example of a country forming a Federal Union and at the same time a colony. Lastly come the Argentine Republic, Mexico, and the States of Colombia and Venezuela [see CONSTITUTIONS]. This is a very remarkable list when we consider that never before the present century did more than two Federal Unions ever coexist, and that very rarely, and that even those unions were far from satisfying the true requirements of Federation. Nor is this all. Throughout the last hundred years we can mark a growing tendency in countries that have adopted the Federal type of Government to perfect that Federal type and make it more truly Federal than before. In the United States of America, for instance, the Constitution of 1789 was more truly Federal than the Articles of Confederation, and certainly since the Civil War we hear less of State Rights, and more of Union. It has indeed been remarked that the citizens of the United States have become fond of applying the words 'Nation' and 'National' to themselves in a manner formerly unknown. We can mark the same progress in Switzerland. Before 1789, Switzerland formed a very loose system of Confederated States—in 1815, a constitution more truly Federal was devised; in 1848, the Federal Union was more firmly consolidated; and lastly, in 1874, such changes were made in the Constitution that Switzerland now presents a very fairly perfect example of Federal Government. In Germany we may trace a similar movement. In 1815, the Germanic Confederation was formed; but it was only a system of Confederated States, or what the Germans call *Staatenbund*; but after various changes, amongst others the exclusion of Austria in 1866, it became, in 1871, a composite State or, in German language, a *Bundestaat*. Beyond this, we have to note a further tendency to Federation. In the year 1886, a Bill passed the Imperial Parliament to permit of the formation of an Australasian Council for the purposes of forming the Australasian Colonies into a Federation. Then we hear of further aspirations for applying the Federal system, as though there were some peculiar virtue or talismanic effect about it which rendered it a panacea for all political troubles. There has, also, been much talk about Imperial Federation. Lastly, some people think they see a simple solution of the Irish Question in the application of Federation, particularly the Canadian form of it, to Ireland."—*Federal Government* (*Westminster Rev.*, May, 1888, pp. 573–574).—"The federal is one of the oldest forms of

government known, and its adaptability to the largest as well as to the smallest states is shown in all political formations of late years. States in the New and in the Old World, all in their aggregation, alike show ever a stronger tendency to adopt it. Already all the central states of Europe are federal—Switzerland, Germany, Austria [see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1866–1867, and 1866–1887]; and if ever the various Slav principalities in south-eastern Europe—the Serb, the Albanian, the Rouman, the Bulgar, and the Czech—are to combine, it will probably be (as Mr. Freeman so long ago as 1862 remarked) under a federal form,—though whether under Russian or Austrian auspices, or neither, remains to be seen. . . . In the German lands from early ages there has existed an aggregation of tribes and states, some of them even of non-German race, each of which preserved for domestic purposes its own arrangements and laws, but was united with the rest under one supreme head and central authority as regards its relation to all external powers. Since 1871 all the states of Germany 'form an eternal union for the protection of the realm and the care of the welfare of the German people.' For legislative purposes, under the Emperor as head, are the two Houses of Assembly; first, the Upper House of the Federated States, consisting of 62 members, who represent the individual States, and thus as the guardian of State rights, answers very closely to the Senate of the American Union, except that the number of members coming from each state is not uniform, but apportioned. . . . Each German state has its own local constitution and home rule for its internal affairs. Generally there are two chambers, except in some of the smallest states, the population of which does not much exceed in some cases that of our larger towns. . . . Since 1867 the Austro-Hungarian monarchy has been a political Siamese twin, of which Austria is the one body, and Hungary the other; the population of the Austrian half is 24 millions, and that of Hungary about 16 millions. Each of the two has its own parliament; the connecting link is the sovereign (whose civil list is raised half by one and half by the other) and a common army, navy, and diplomatic service, and another Over-parliament of 120 members, one-half chosen by the legislature of Hungary, and the other half by the legislature of Austria (the Upper House of each twin returns twenty, and the Lower of each forty delegates from their own number, who thus form a kind of Joint Committee of the Four Houses). The jurisdiction of this Over-parliament is limited to foreign affairs and war. . . . The western or Austrian part of the twin . . . is a federal government in itself. . . . Federated Austria consists of seventeen distinct states. The German element constitutes 36 per cent. of the inhabitants of these, and the Slav 57 per cent. There are a few Magyars, Italians, and Roumanians. Each of these seventeen states has its own provincial parliament of one House, partly composed of ex-officio members (the bishops and archbishops of the Latin and Greek Churches, and the chancellors of the universities), but chiefly of representatives chosen by all the inhabitants who pay direct taxation. Some of these are elected by the landowners, others by the towns, others by the trade-guilds and boards of commerce; the representatives of the rural communes, however, are elected by delegates, as in Prussia. They legis-

late concerning all local matters, county taxation, land laws and farming, education, public worship, and public works. . . . Turning next to the oldest federation in Europe, that of Switzerland, which with various changes has survived from 1308, though its present constitution dates only from 1874, we find it now embraces three nationalities—German, French, Italian. The original nucleus of the State, however, was German, and even now three-fourths of the population are German. The twenty-two distinct states are federated under one president elected annually, and the Federal Assembly of two chambers. . . . Each of the cantons is sovereign and independent, and has its own local parliament, scarcely any two being the same, but all based on universal suffrage. Each canton has its own budget of revenue and expenditure, and its own public debt."—J. N. Dalton, *The Federal States of the World* (Nineteenth Century, July, 1884).

Canadian Federation.—"A convention of thirty-three representative men was held in the autumn of 1864 in the historic city of Quebec, and after a deliberation of several weeks the result was the unanimous adoption of a set of seventy-two resolutions embodying the terms and conditions on which the provinces through their delegates agreed to a federal union in many respects similar in its general features to that of the United States federation, and in accordance with the principles of the English constitution. These resolutions had to be laid before the various legislatures and adopted in the shape of addresses to the queen whose sanction was necessary to embody the wishes of the provinces in an imperial statute. . . . In the early part of 1867 the imperial parliament, without a division, passed the statute known as the 'British North America Act, 1867,' which united in the first instance the province of Canada, now divided into Ontario and Quebec, with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and made provisions for the coming in of the other provinces of Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, British Columbia, and the admission of Rupert's Land and the great North-west. Between 1867 and 1873 the provinces just named, with the exception of Newfoundland, which has persistently remained out of the federation, became parts of the Dominion and the vast North-west Territory was at last acquired on terms eminently satisfactory to Canada and a new province of great promise formed out of that immense region, with a complete system of parliamentary government. . . . When the terms of the Union came to be arranged between the provinces in 1864, their conflicting interest had to be carefully considered and a system adopted which would always enable the Dominion to expand its limits and bring in new sections until it should embrace the northern half of the continent, which, as we have just shown, now constitutes the Dominion. It was soon found, after due deliberation, that the most feasible plan was a confederation resting on those principles which experience of the working of the federation of the United States showed was likely to give guarantees of elasticity and permanency. The maritime provinces had been in the enjoyment of an excellent system of laws and representative institutions for many years, and were not willing to yield their local autonomy in its entirety. The people of the province of Quebec, after experience of a union that lasted from 1841 to 1867, saw decidedly

great advantages to themselves and their institutions in having a provincial government under their own control. The people of Ontario recognized equal advantages in having a measure of local government, apart from French Canadian influences and interference. The consequence was the adoption of the federal system, which now, after twenty-six years' experience, we can truly say appears on the whole well devised and equal to the local and national requirements of the people."—J. G. Bourinot, *Federal Gov't in Canada* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, 7th Series, nos. 10-13), lect. 1-2.

Britannic Federation, Proposed.—"The great change which has taken place in the public mind in recent years upon the importance to the Empire of maintaining the colonial connection found expression at a meeting held at the Westminster Palace Hotel in July 1884, under the guidance of the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, who occupied the chair. At that meeting—which was attended by a large number of members of Parliament of both parties, and representatives of the colonies—it was moved by the Right Hon. W. H. Smith: 'That, in order to secure the permanent unity of the Empire, some form of federation is essential.' That resolution was seconded by the Earl of Rosebery, and passed unanimously. In November of the same year the Imperial Federation League was formed to carry out the objects of that resolution; and the subject has received considerable attention since. . . . I believe all are agreed that the leading objects of the Imperial Federation League are to find means by which the colonies, the outlying portions of the Empire, may have a certain voice and weight and influence in reference to the foreign policy of this country, in which they are all deeply interested, and sometimes more deeply interested than the United Kingdom itself. In the next place, that measures may be taken by which all the power and weight and influence that these great British communities in Australasia, in South Africa, and in Canada possess shall be brought into operation for the strengthening and defence of the Empire. The discussion of these questions has led to a great deal of progress. We have got rid of a number of fallacies that obtained in the minds of a good many persons in relation to the means by which those objects are to be attained. Most people have come to the conclusion stated by Lord Rosebery at the Mansion House, that a Parliamentary Federation, if practicable, is so remote, that during the coming century it is not likely to make any very great advance. We have also got rid of the fallacy that it was practicable to have a common tariff throughout the Empire. It is not, in my opinion, consistent with the constitution either of England or of the autonomous colonies. The tariff of a country must rest of necessity mainly with the Government of the day, and involves such continual change and alteration as to make uniformity impracticable. . . . I regard the time as near at hand when the great provinces of Australasia will be confederated under one Government. . . . When that has been done it will be followed, I doubt not, at a very early day, by a similar course on the part of South Africa, and then we shall stand in the position of having three great dominions, commonwealths, or realms, or whatever name is found most desirable on the part of the people who adopt them

—three great British communities, each under one central and strong Government. When that is accomplished, the measure which the Marquis of Lorne has suggested, of having the representatives of these colonies during the term of their office here in London, practically Cabinet Ministers, will give to the Government of England an opportunity of learning in the most direct and complete manner the views and sentiments of each of those great British communities in regard to all questions of foreign policy affecting the colonies. I would suggest that the representatives of those three great British communities here in London should be leading members of the Cabinet of the day of the country they represent, going out of office when their Government is changed. In that way they would always represent the country, and necessarily the views of the party in power in Canada, in Australasia, and in South Africa. That would involve no constitutional change; it would simply require that whoever represented those dominions in London should have a seat in their own Parliament, and be a member of the Administration."—C. Tupper, *Federating the Empire* (Nineteenth Cent., Oct., 1891).—"Recent expensive wars at the Cape, annexations of groups of islands in the neighbourhood of Australia, the Fishery and other questions that have arisen, and may arise, on the North American continent, have all compelled us to take a review of our responsibilities in connection with our Colonies and to consider how far, in the event of trouble, we may rely upon their assistance to adequately support the commercial interests of our scattered Empire. It is remarkable that, although the matters here indicated are slowly coming to the surface, and have provoked discussion, they have not been forced upon the public attention suddenly, or by any violent injury or catastrophe. The review men are taking of our position, and the debates as to how best we can make our relationships of standing value, have been the natural outcome of slowly developing causes and effects. Politicians belonging to both of the great parties in the State have joined the Federation League. The leaders have expressly declared that they do not desire at the present moment to propound any definite theories, or to push any premature scheme for closer union of the Empire. The society has been formed for the purpose of discussing any plans proposed for such objects. The suggestions actually made have varied in importance from comprehensive projects of universal commercial union and common contributions for a world-wide military and naval organization, to such a trivial proposal as the personal recognition of distinguished colonists by a nomination to the peerage."—The Marquis of Lorne, *Imperial Federation*, ch. 1.—"Many schemes of federation have been propounded, and many degrees of federal union are possible. Lord Rosebery has not gone further, as yet, than the enunciation of a general principle. 'The federation we aim at (he has said) is the closest possible union of the various self-governing States ruled by the British Crown, consistently with that free development which is the birthright of British subjects all over the world—the closest union in sympathy, in external action, and in defence.' . . . The representation of the Colonies in the Privy Council has been viewed with favour, both by statesmen and by

theoretical writers. Earl Grey has proposed the appointment of a Federal Committee, selected from the Privy Council, to advise with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The idea thus shadowed forth has been worked out with greater amplitude of detail by Mr. Creswell, in an essay to which the prize offered by the London Chamber of Commerce was awarded. 'The Imperial assembly which we want,' says Mr. Creswell, 'must be an independent body, constitutional in its origin, representative in its character, and supreme in its decisions. Such a body we have already in existence in the Privy Council. Its members are chosen, irrespective of party considerations, from among the most eminent of those who have done service to the State. To this body colonists of distinguished public service could be elected. In constituting the Imperial Committee of the Privy Council, representation might be given to every part of the empire, in proportion to the several contributions to expenditure for Imperial defence.' The constitution of a great Council of the Empire, with similar functions in relation to foreign affairs to those which are exercised in the United States by a Committee of the Senate, is a step for which public opinion is not yet prepared. In the meanwhile the utmost consideration is being paid at the Foreign Office to Colonial feelings and interests. No commitments or engagements are taken which would not be approved by Colonial opinion. Another proposal which has been warmly advocated, especially by the Protectionists, is that for a customs-union between the Mother-country and the Colonies. It cannot be said that at the present time proposals for a customs-union are ripe for settlement, or even for discussion, at a conference of representatives from all parts of the empire. The Mother-country has been committed for more than a generation to the principle of Free-trade. By our policy of free imports of food and raw materials we have so cheapened production that we are able to compete successfully with all comers in the neutral markets of the world. . . . It would be impossible to entertain the idea of a reversal of our fiscal policy, in however restricted a sense, without careful and exhaustive inquiry. . . . Lord Rosebery has recently declared that in his opinion it is impracticable to devise a scheme of representation for the Colonies in the House of Commons and House of Lords, or in the Privy Council. The scheme of an Imperial customs-union, ably put forward by Mr. Hoffmeyer at the last Colonial Conference, he equally rejects. Lord Rosebery would limit the direct action of the Imperial Government for the present to conferences, summoned at frequent intervals. Our first conference was summoned by the Government at the instance of the Imperial Federation League. It was attended by men of the highest distinction in the Colonies. Its deliberations were guided by Lord Knutsford with admirable tact and judgment; it considered many important questions of common interest to the different countries of the empire; it arrived at several important decisions, and it cleared the air of not a few doubts and delusions. The most tangible, the most important, and the most satisfactory result of that conference was the recognition by the Australian colonies of the necessity for making provision for the naval defence of their own waters by means of ships, provided by the Government of

the United Kingdom, but maintained by the Australian Governments. Lord Rosebery holds that the question of Imperial Federation depends for the present on frequent conferences. In his speech at the Mansion House he laid down the conditions essential to the success of conferences in the future. They must be held periodically and at stated intervals. The Colonies must send the best men to represent them. The Government of the Mother-country must invest these periodical congresses with all the authority and splendour which it is in their power to give. The task to be accomplished will not be the production of statutes, but the production of recommendations. Those who think that a congress that only meets to report and recommend has but a neutral task before it, have a very inadequate idea of the influence which would be exercised by a conference representing a quarter of the human race, and the immeasurable opulence and power that have been garnered up by the past centuries of our history. If we have these conferences, if they are allowed to discuss, as they must be allowed to discuss, all topics which any parties to these conferences should recommend to be discussed, Lord Rosebery cannot apprehend that they would be wanting in authority or in weight. Lord Salisbury, in his speeches recently delivered in reply to the Earl of Dunraven in the House of Lords, and in reply to the deputation of the Imperial Federation League at the Foreign Office, has properly insisted on the chief practical obstacle to a policy of frequent conferences. Attendance at conferences involves grave inconvenience to Colonial statesmen. . . . In appealing to the Imperial Federation League for some practical suggestions as to the means by which the several parts of the British Empire may be more closely knit together, Lord Salisbury threw out some pregnant hints. To make a united empire both a Zollverein and a Kriegsverein must be formed. In the existing state of feeling in the Mother-country a Zollverein would be a serious difficulty. The reasons have been already stated. A Kriegsverein was, perhaps, more practicable, and certainly more urgent. The space which separates the Colonies from possible enemies was becoming every year less and less a protection. We may take concerted action for defence without the necessity for constitutional changes which it would be difficult to carry out."—Lord Brassey, *Imperial Federation: An English View (Nineteenth Cent., Sept., 1891)*. —"The late Mr. Forster launched under the high-sounding title of the 'Imperial Federation League,' a scheme by which its authors proposed to solve all the problems attending the administration of our colonial empire. From first to last the authors of this scheme have never condescended on particulars. 'Imperial federation,' we were always told, was the only specific against the disintegration of the Empire, but as to what this specific really was, no information was vouchsafed. . . . It is very natural that the citizens of a vast but fragmentary empire, whose territorial atoms (instead of forming, like those of the United States, a 'ring-fence' domain) are scattered over the surface of the globe, should cast about for some artificial links to bind together the colonies we have planted, and 'the thousand tribes nourished on strange religions and lawless slaveries' which we have gathered under our rule. This anxiety has been naturally

augmented by a chronic agitation for the abandonment of all colonies as expensive and useless. For though there may be little to boast of in the fact that Great Britain has in the course of less than three centuries contrived by war, diplomacy, and adventure, to annex about a fifth of the globe, it can hardly be expected that she should relinquish without an effort even the nominal sway she still holds over her colonial empire. Hence it comes to pass that any scheme which seems to supply the needed links is caught up by those who, possessing slight acquaintance with the past history or the present aspirations of our colonists, are simply looking out for some new contrivance by which they may hope that an enduring bond of union may be provided. 'Imperial federation' is the last new 'notion' which has cropped up in pursuance of this object. . . . Some clue . . . to its objects and aims may be gained by a reference to the earliest exposition by Mr. Forster of his motives contained in his answer five years ago to the question, 'Why was the League formed at all?' 'For this reason,' says Mr. Forster, 'because in giving self-government to our colonies we have introduced a principle which must eventually shake off from Great Britain, Greater Britain, and divide it into separate states, which must, in short, dissolve the union unless counteracting measures be taken to preserve it.' Believing, as we do, that it has only been by conceding to our larger groups of colonies absolute powers of self-government that we have retained them at all, and that the secret of our protracted empire lies in the fact of this abandonment of central arbitrary power, the retention of which has caused the collapse of all the European empires which preceded us in the path of colonisation, we are bound to enter our emphatic protest against an assumption so utterly erroneous as that propounded by Mr. Forster. So far from believing that the permanent union of the British Empire is to be secured by 'measures which may counteract the workings of colonial self-government,' we are convinced that the only safety for our Empire lies in the unfettered action of that self-government which we have ourselves granted to our colonies. It would almost seem that for Lord Rosebery and his fellow workers the history of the colonial empires of Portugal, Spain, Holland, and France had been written in vain. For if we ask why these colonial empires have dwindled and decayed, the answer is simply because that self-government which is the life of British colonies was never granted to their dependencies. There was a time when one hundred and fifty sovereign princes paid tribute to the treasury of Lisbon. For two hundred years, more than half the South American continent was an appanage of Spain. Ceylon, the Cape, Guiana, and a vast cluster of trade factories in the East were at the close of the seventeenth century colonies of Holland; while half North America, comprising the vast and fertile valleys of the St. Lawrence, the Mississippi, and the Ohio, obeyed, a little more than a century ago, the sceptre of France. Neither Portugal, nor Spain, nor Holland, nor France, has lacked able rulers or statesmen, but the colonial empire of all these states has crumbled and decayed. The exceptional position of Great Britain in this respect can only be ascribed to the relinquishment of all the advantages, political and commercial, ordinarily presumed to result to dominant states from

the possession of dependencies. . . . The romantic dreams of the Imperial Federation League were in fact dissipated beforehand by the irrevocable grant of independent legislatures to all our most important colonies, and Lord Rosebery may rest assured that, charm he never so wisely, they will not listen to his blandishments at the cost of one iota of the political privileges already conferred on them."—*Imperial Federation* (*Edinburgh Rev.*, July, 1889).—" 'Britannic Confederation' is defined to be an union of 'the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, British North America, British South Africa, and Australasia.' The West Indies and one or two other British Dependencies seem here to be shut out; but, at any rate, with this definition we at least know where we are. The terms of the union we are not told; but, as the word 'confederation' is used, I conceive that they are meant to be strictly federal. That is to say, first of all, the Parliament of the United Kingdom will give up its right to legislate for British North America, British South Africa, and Australasia. Then the United Kingdom, British North America, British South Africa and Australasia will enter into a federal relation with one another. They may enter either as single members (States or Cantons) or as groups of members. That is, Great Britain and Ireland might enter as a single State of the Confederation, or England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales—or possibly smaller divisions again—might enter as separate States. Or Great Britain, Australia, Canada, &c., might enter as themselves Leagues, members of a greater League, as in the old state of things in Graubünden. I am not arguing for or against any of these arrangements. I am only stating them as possible. But whatever the units are to be—Great Britain and Australia, England and Victoria, or anything larger or smaller—if the confederation is to be a real one, each State must keep some powers to itself, and must yield some powers to a central body. That Central body, in which all the States must be represented in some way or other, will naturally deal with all international matters, all matters that concern the Britannic Confederation as a whole. The legislatures of Great Britain and Australia, England and Victoria, or whatever the units fixed on may be, will deal only with the internal affairs of those several cantons. Now such a scheme as this is theoretically possible. That is, it involves no contradiction in terms, as the talk about Imperial Federation does. It is purely federal; there is nothing 'imperial' about it. It is simply applying to certain political communities a process which has been actually gone through by certain other political communities. It is proposing to reconstruct a certain political constitution after the model of certain other political constitutions which are in actual working. It is therefore something better than mere talk and theory. But, because it is theoretically possible, it does not follow that it is practically possible, that is, that it is possible in this particular case. . . . Of the federations existing at this time the two chief are Switzerland and the United States of America. They differ in this point, that one is very large and the other very small; they agree in this, that the territory of both is continuous. But the proposed Britannic Confederation will be scattered, scattered over every part of the world. I know of

no example in any age of a scattered confederation, a scattered Bundesstaat. The Hanse Towns were not a Bundesstaat; they were hardly a Staatenbund. Of the probable working of such a body as that which is now proposed the experience of history can teach us nothing; we can only guess what may be likely. The Britannic Confederation will have its federal congress sitting somewhere, perhaps at Westminster, perhaps at Melbourne, perhaps at some Washington called specially into being at some point more central than either. . . . For a while their representatives will think it grand to sit at Westminster; presently, as the spirit of equality grows, they are not unlikely to ask for some more central place; they may even refuse to stir out of their own territory. That is to say, they will find that the sentiment of national unity, which they undoubtedly have in no small measure, needs some physical and some political basis to stand on. It is hard to believe that States which are united only by a sentiment, which have so much, both political and physical, to keep them asunder, will be kept together for ever by a sentiment only. And we must further remember that that sentiment is a sentiment for the mother-country, and not for one another. . . . Canada and Australia care a great deal for Great Britain; we may doubt whether, apart from Great Britain, Canada and Australia care very much for one another. There may be American States which care yet less for one another; but in their case mere continuity produces a crowd of interests and relations common to all. We may doubt whether the confederation of States so distant as the existing colonies of Great Britain, whether the bringing them into closer relations with one another as well as with Great Britain, will at all tend to the advance of a common national unity among them. We may doubt whether it will not be likely to bring out some hidden tendencies to disunion among them. . . . In the scattered confederation all questions and parties are likely to be local. It is hard to see what will be the materials for the formation of great national parties among such scattered elements."—E. A. Freeman, *The Physical and Political Bases of National Unity* (*Britannic Confederation*, ed. by A. S. White).—"I have the greatest respect for the aspirations of the Imperial Federationists, and myself most earnestly desire the moral unity of our race and its partnership in achievement and grandeur. But an attempt at formal Federation, such as is now proposed, would in the first place exclude the people of the United States, who form the largest portion of the English-speaking race, and in the second place it would split us all to pieces. It would, I am persuaded, call into play centrifugal forces against which the centripetal forces could not contend for an hour. What interests of the class with which a Federal Parliament would deal have Australia and Canada in common? What enemy has either of them whom the other would be inclined to fight? Australia, it seems, looks forward to a struggle with the Chinese for ascendancy in that quarter of the globe. Canada cares no more about a struggle between the Australians and the Chinese at the other extremity of the globe than the Australians would care about a dispute between Canada and her neighbours in the United States respecting Canadian boundaries or the Fisheries Question.

The circumstances of the two groups of colonies, to which their policy must conform, are totally different. Australia lies in an ocean by herself: Canada is territorially interlocked and commercially bound up, as well as socially almost fused, with the great mass of English-speaking population which occupies the larger portion of her continent. Australia again is entirely British. Canada has in her midst a great block of French population, constituting a distinct nationality, which instead of being absorbed is daily growing in intensity; and she would practically be unable to take part in any enterprise or support any policy, especially any policy entailing an increase of taxation, to which the French Canadians were opposed. Of getting Canada to contribute out of her own resources to wars or to the maintenance of armaments, for the objects of British diplomacy in Europe or in the East, no one who knows the Canadians can imagine that there would be the slightest hope. The very suggestion, at the time of the Soudan Expedition, called forth emphatic protests on all sides. The only results of an experiment in formal Federation, I repeat, would be repudiation of Federal demands, estrangement and dissolution."—Goldwin Smith, *Straining the Silken Thread* (*Macmillan's Magazine*, Aug., 1888).

European Federation.—"While it is obvious that Imperial Federation of the British Empire would cover many of the defects in our relationship with the colonies, it is equally apparent that it is open to the fatal objection of merely making us a more formidable factor in the field of international anarchy. Suppose the colonies undertook to share equitably the great cost of imperial defence in the present state of things throughout Europe—and that is a very large assumption—England would be entirely dependent, in case of war, for the supply of food on the fleet, any accident to which would place us at the enemy's mercy. Even without actual hostilities, however, our additional strength would cause another increase of foreign armaments to meet the case of war with us. This process has taken place invariably on the increase of armaments of any European state, and may be taken to be as certain as that the sun will rise to-morrow. But all the benefits accruing from Imperial Federation may be secured by European Federation, plus a reduction of military liability, which Imperial Federation would not only not reduce, but increase. There is nothing to prevent the self-governing colonies from joining in a European Federation, and thus enlarging the basis of that institution enormously, and cutting off in a corresponding degree the chance of an outbreak of violence in another direction, which could not fail to have serious consequences to the colonies at any rate."—C. D. Farquharson, *Federation, the Polity of the Future* (*Westminster Rev.*, Dec., 1891), pp. 602-603.

FEDERALIST, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787-1789.

FEDERALISTS, The party of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1789-1792; also 1812; and 1814 (DECEMBER): THE HARTFORD CONVENTION.

FEDS.—CONFEDS. See BOYS IN BLUE.

FEE. See FEUDALISM.

FEHDERECHT.—The right of private warfare, or diffidation, exercised in mediæval Germany. See LANDFRIEDE.

FEHRBELLIN, Battle of (1675). See **BRANDENBURG**: A. D. 1640-1688; and **SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN)**: A. D. 1644-1697.

FEIS OF TARA. See **TARA**.

FELICIAN HERESY. See **ADOPTIANISM**.

FELIX V., Pope, A. D. 1439-1449 (elected by the Council of Basle).

FENIAN MOVEMENT, The. See **IRELAND**: A. D. 1858-1867; and **CANADA**: A. D. 1866-1871.

FENIAN: Origin of the Name.—An Irish poem of the ninth century called the *Duan Eireannach*, or *Poem of Ireland*, preserves a mythical story of the origin of the Irish people, according to which they sprang from one Fenius Farsaidh who came out of Scythia. Nel, or Niul, the son of Fenius, travelled into Egypt and married Scota, a daughter of Forann (Pharaoh). "Niul had a son named Gaedhuil Glas, or Green Gael; and we are told that it is from him the Irish are called Gaedhil (Gael) or Gadelians, while from his mother is derived the name of Scoti, or Scots, and from Fenius that of Feni or Fenians."—M. Haverty, *Hist. of Ireland*, p. 10.—From this legend was derived the name of the Fenian Brotherhood, organized in Ireland and America for the liberation of the former from British rule, and which played a disturbing but unsuccessful part in Irish affairs from about 1865 to 1871.

FEODORE. See **THEODORE**.

FEODUM. See **FEUDALISM**.

FEOF. See **FEUDALISM**.

FEORM FULTUM. See **FERM**.

FERDINAND, King of Portugal, A. D. 1367-1383. . . . Ferdinand I., Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary and Bohemia, 1835-1848. . . . Ferdinand I., Germanic Emperor, 1558-1564; Archduke of Austria, and King of Hungary and Bohemia, 1526-1564; King of the Romans, 1531-1558. . . . Ferdinand I., King of Aragon and Sicily, 1412-1416. . . . Ferdinand I., King of Castile, 1035-1065; King of Leon, 1037-1065. . . . Ferdinand I., King of Naples, 1458-1494. . . . Ferdinand II., Germanic Emperor and King of Bohemia and Hungary, 1619-1637. . . . Ferdinand II., King of Aragon, 1479-1516; V. of Castile (King-Consort of Isabella of Castile and Regent), 1474-1516; II. of Sicily, 1479-1516; and III. of Naples, 1503-1516. . . . Ferdinand II., King of Leon, 1157-1188. . . . Ferdinand II., King of Naples, 1495-1496. . . . Ferdinand II., called Bomba, King of the Two Sicilies, 1830-1859. . . . Ferdinand III., Germanic Emperor, and King of Hungary and Bohemia, 1637-1657. . . . Ferdinand III., King of Castile, 1217-1230; King of Leon and Castile, united, 1230-1252. . . . Ferdinand IV., King of Leon and Castile, 1295-1312. . . . Ferdinand IV., King of Naples, and I. of the Two Sicilies, 1759-1806; and 1815-1825. . . . Ferdinand VI., King of Spain, 1746-1759. . . . Ferdinand VII., King of Spain, 1808; and 1814-1833.

FERIÆ. See **LUDI**.

FERM.—FIRMA.—FARM.—"A sort of composition for all the profits arising to the king [in England, Norman period] from his ancient claims on the land and from the judicial proceedings of the shire-moot; the rent of detached pieces of demesne land, the remnants of the ancient folk-land; the payments due from corporate bodies and individuals for the primitive gifts, the offerings made in kind, or the hospitality—

the *feorm-fultum*—which the kings had a right to exact from their subjects, and which were before the time of Domesday generally commuted for money; the fines, or a portion of the fines, paid in the ordinary process of the county courts, and other small miscellaneous incidents. These had been, soon after the composition of Domesday, estimated at a fixed sum, which was regarded as a sort of rent or composition at which the county was let to the sheriff and recorded in the '*Rotulus Exactorius*'; for this, under the name of *ferm*, he answered annually; if his receipts were in excess, he retained the balance as his lawful profit, the wages of his service; if the proceeds fell below the *ferm*, he had to pay the difference from his own purse. . . . The farm, *ferm*, or *firma*, the rent or composition for the ancient *feorm-fultum*, or provision payable in kind to the Anglo-Saxon kings. The history of the word in its French form would be interesting. The use of the word for a pecuniary payment is traced long before the Norman Conquest."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11, sect. 126, and note.

FERNANDO. See **FERDINAND**.

FEROZESHUR, Battle of (1845). See **INDIA**: A. D. 1845-1849.

FERRARA: The House of Este. See **ESTE**.

A. D. 1275.—Sovereignty of the Pope confirmed by Rodolph of Hapsburg. See **GERMANY**: A. D. 1273-1308.

A. D. 1597.—Annexation to the states of the Church.—End of the house of Este.—Decay of the city and duchy. See **PAPACY**: A. D. 1597.

A. D. 1797.—Joined to the Cispadine Republic. See **FRANCE**: A. D. 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

FERRY BRIDGE, Battle of (1461). See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1455-1471.

FETIALES.—FECIALES.—"The duties of the *feciales*, or *fetiales* [among the Romans], extended over every branch of international law. They gave advice on all matters of peace or war, and the conclusion of treaties and alliances. . . . They fulfilled the same functions as heralds, and, as such, were frequently entrusted with important communications. They were also sent on regular embassies. To them was entrusted the reception and entertainment of foreign envoys. They were required to decide on the justice of a war about to commence, and to proclaim and consecrate it according to certain established formalities. . . . The College of *Feciales* consisted of nearly twenty members, with a president, who was called *Pater Patratus*, because it was necessary that he should have both father and children living, that he might be supposed to take greater interest in the welfare of the State, and look backwards as well as forwards. . . . The name of *Feciales* . . . still existed under the emperors, as well as that of *Pater Patratus*, though only as a title of honour, while the institution itself was for ever annihilated; and, after the reign of Tiberius, we cannot find any trace of it."—E. C. G. Murray, *Embassies and Foreign Courts*, pp. 8-10.—See, also, **AUGURS**.

FEUDAL AIDS.—"In theory the duty of the noble vassal towards his lord was a purely personal one and to commute it for a money pay-

ment was a degradation of the whole feudal relation. The payment of money, especially if it were a fixed and regular payment, carried with it a certain ignoble idea against which, in the form of state taxation, the feudal spirit rebelled to the last. When the vassal agreed to pay something to his lord, he called it, not a tax, but an 'aid' (auxilium), and made it generally payable, not regularly, like the tax-bill of the citizen, but only upon certain occasions—a present, as it were, coming out of his good-will and not from compulsion; e. g., whenever a fief was newly granted, when it changed its lord, and sometimes when it changed its vassal, it was from the beginning customary to acknowledge the investiture by a small gift to the lord, primarily as a symbol of the grant; then, as the institution grew and manners became more luxurious, the gift increased in value and was thought of as an actual price for the investiture, until finally, at the close of our period, it suffered the fate of all similar contributions and was changed into a definite money payment, still retaining, however, its early name of 'relief.' . . . The occasions for levying the aids were various but always, in theory, of an exceptional sort. The journey of a lord to the court of his suzerain, or to Rome, or to join a crusade, the knighting of his eldest son, the marriage of his eldest daughter, and his ransom from imprisonment are among the most frequent of the feudal 'aids.' The right of the lord to be entertained and provisioned, together with all his following, was one of the most burdensome, and at the same time, most difficult to regulate. Its conversion into a money-tax was, perhaps for this reason, earlier than that of many other of the feudal contributions."—E. Emerton, *Mediæval Europe*, ch. 14.

FEUDAL TENURES.—"After the feudal system of tenure had been fully established, all lands were held subject to certain additional obligations, which were due either to the King, (not as sovereign, but as feudal lord) from the original grantees, called tenants-in-chief (tenentes in capite), or to the tenants-in-chief themselves from their under tenants. Of these obligations the most honourable was that of knight-service. This was the tenure by which the King granted out fiefs to his followers, and by which they in turn provided for their own military retainers. The lands of the bishops and dignified ecclesiastics, and of most of the religious foundations, were also held by this tenure. A few exceptions only were made in favour of lands which had been immemorially held in frankalmoign, or free-alms. On the grant of a fief, the tenant was publicly invested with the land by a symbolical or actual delivery, termed livery of seisin. He then did homage, so called from the words used in the ceremony: 'Je deveigne votre homme' ['I become your man']. . . . In the case of a subtenant (vavassor), his oath of fealty was guarded by a reservation of the faith due to his sovereign lord the King. For every portion of land of the annual value of £20, which constituted a knight's fee [in England], the tenant was bound, whenever required, to render the services of a knight properly armed and accoutred, to serve in the field forty days at his own expense. . . . Tenure by knight-service was also subject to several other incidents of a burdensome character. . . . There was a species of tenancy in chief by Grand Serjeanty, . . . whereby the

tenant was bound, instead of serving the King generally in his wars, to do some special service in his own proper person, as to carry the King's banner or lance, or to be his champion, butler, or other officer at his coronation. . . . Grants of land were also made by the King to his inferior followers and personal attendants, to be held by meaner services. . . . Hence, probably, arose tenure by Petit Serjeanty, though later on we find that term restricted to tenure 'in capite' by the service of rendering yearly some implement of war to the King. . . . Tenure in Free Socage (which still subsists under the modern denomination of Freehold, and may be regarded as the representative of the primitive alodial ownership) denotes, in its most general and extensive signification, a tenure by any certain and determinate service, as to pay a fixed money rent, or to plough the lord's land for a fixed number of days in the year. . . . Tenure in Burgage was a kind of town socage. It applied to tenements in any ancient borough, held by the burgesses, of the King or other lord, by fixed rents or services. . . . This tenure, which still subsists, is subject to a variety of local customs, the most remarkable of which is that of borough-English, by which the burgage tenement descends to the youngest instead of to the eldest son. Gavelkind is almost confined to the county of Kent. . . . The lands are held by suit of court and fealty, a service in its nature certain. The tenant in Gavelkind retained many of the properties of alodial ownership: his lands were devisable by will; in case of intestacy they descended to all his sons equally; they were not liable to escheat for felony . . . and they could be aliened by the tenant at the age of fifteen. Below Free Socage was the tenure in Villeinage, by which the agricultural labourers, both free and servile, held the land which was to them in lieu of money wages."—T. P. Taswell-Langmead, *Eng. Const. Hist.*, pp. 58-65.

FEUDALISM.—"Feudalism, the comprehensive idea which includes the whole governmental policy of the French kingdom, was of distinctly Frank growth. The principle which underlies it may be universal; but the historic development of it with which the constitutional history of Europe is concerned may be traced step by step under Frank influence, from its first appearance on the conquered soil of Roman Gaul to its full development in the jurisprudence of the Middle Ages. In the form which it has reached at the Norman Conquest, it may be described as a complete organisation of society through the medium of land tenure, in which from the king down to the lowest landowner all are bound together by obligation of service and defence: the lord to protect his vassal, the vassal to do service to his lord; the defence and service being based on and regulated by the nature and extent of the land held by the one of the other. In those states which have reached the territorial stage of development, the rights of defence and service are supplemented by the right of jurisdiction. The lord judges as well as defends his vassal; the vassal does suit as well as service to his lord. In states in which feudal government has reached its utmost growth, the political, financial, judicial, every branch of public administration, is regulated by the same conditions. The central authority is a mere shadow of a name. This institution had grown up from two

great sources — the beneficium, and the practice of commendation, — and had been specially fostered on Gallic soil by the existence of a subject population which admitted of any amount of extension in the methods of dependence. The beneficiary system originated partly in gifts of land made by the kings out of their own estates to their kinsmen and servants, with a special undertaking to be faithful; partly in the surrender by landowners of their estates to churches or powerful men, to be received back again and held by them as tenants for rent or service. By the latter arrangement the weaker man obtained the protection of the stronger, and he who felt himself insecure placed his title under the defence of the church. By the practice of commendation, on the other hand, the inferior put himself under the personal care of a lord, but without altering his title or divesting himself of his right to his estate; he became a vassal and did homage. . . . The union of the beneficiary tie with that of commendation completed the idea of feudal obligation; the two-fold hold on the land, that of the lord and that of the vassal, was supplemented by the two-fold engagement, that of the lord to defend, and that of the vassal to be faithful. A third ingredient was supplied by the grants of immunity by which in the Frank empire, as in England, the possession of land was united with the right of judicature: the dwellers on a feudal property were placed under the tribunal of the lord, and the rights which had belonged to the nation or to its chosen head were devolved upon the receiver of a fief. The rapid spread of the system thus originated, and the assimilation of all other tenures to it, may be regarded as the work of the tenth century. . . . The word feudum, fief, or fee, is derived from the German word for cattle; . . . the secondary meaning being goods, especially money; hence property in general."—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 9, sect. 93, and notes (c. 1).—"Hardly any point in the whole history of European institutions has been the subject of so violent controversy as this of the origin of Feudalism. . . . The first person to represent what we may call the modern view of the feudal system was Georg Waitz, in the first edition of his *History of the German Constitution*, in the years 1844–47. Waitz presented the thing as a gradual growth during several centuries, the various elements of which it was composed growing up side by side without definite chronological sequence. This view was met by Paul Roth in his *History of the Institution of the Benefice*, in the year 1850. He maintained that royal benefices were unknown to the Merovingian Franks, and that they were an innovation of the earliest Carolingians. They were, so he believed, made possible by a grand confiscation of the lands of the Church, not by Charles Martel, as the earlier writers had believed, but by his sons, Pippin and Karlmann. The first book of Roth was followed in the year 1863 by another on *Feudalism and the Relation of the Subject to the State* (*Feudalität und Unterthanenverband*), in which he attempted to show that the direct subjection of the individual to the government was not a strange idea to the early German, but that it pervaded all forms of Germanic life down to the Carolingian times, and that therefore the feudal relation was a something entirely new, a break in the practice of the Germans. In the years 1880–1885 appeared a new

edition of Waitz's *History of the German Constitution*, in which, after acknowledging the great services rendered by Roth to the cause of learning, he declares himself unable to give up his former point of view, and brings new evidence in support of it. Thus for more than thirty years this question has been before the world of scholars, and may be regarded as being quite as far from a settlement as ever."—E. Emerton, *An Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*, p. 236 (foot-note).—"The latest investigations of Brunner . . . have established the proof that feudalism originated in consequence of the introduction of cavalry service into the military system of the Frankish kingdom, and that it retained its original character until well on towards the close of the Middle Ages. The Franks, like the Lombards, learned the use of cavalry from the Moors or Saracens. Charles Martel was led by his experiences after the battle of Poitiers to the conclusion that only with the help of mounted armies could these enemies be opposed with lasting success. It was between 732 and 758 that the introduction of cavalry service into the Frankish army took place; it had hitherto consisted mainly of infantry. The attempt was first made, and with marked success, in Aquitaine and Septimania; almost contemporaneously also among the Lombards. In order to place the secular nobles in condition to fit out larger masses of cavalry a forced loan from the church was carried through by Charles Martel and his sons, it being under the latter that the matter was first placed upon a legal footing. The nobles received ecclesiastical benefices from the crown and regranted them in the way of sub-loans. The custom of having a 'following' and the old existing relationships of a vassal to his lord furnished a model for the responsibilities of those receiving benefices at first and at second hand. The secular nobles became thus at once vassals of the crown and lords (seigneurs) of those to whom they themselves in turn made grants. The duty of the vassals to do cavalry service was based on the 'commendation': their fief was not the condition of their doing service but their reward for it. Hence the custom of denominating the fief (Lehn) as a 'fee' (feudum)—a designation which was first applied in southern France, and which in Germany, occasionally in the eleventh and even more frequently in the twelfth century, is used side by side with the older term 'benefice,' until in the course of the first half of the 13th century it completely displaces it. With the further development of cavalry service that of the feudal system kept regular pace. Already in the later Carolingian period Lorraine and Burgundy followed southern France and Italy in becoming feudalized states. To the east of the Rhine on the contrary the most flourishing time of cavalry service and of the feudal system falls in the time of the Hohenstaufens, having undoubtedly been furthered by the Crusades. Here even as late as the middle of the twelfth century the horsemen preferred dismounting and fighting with the sword because they could not yet manage their steeds and the regular cavalry weapons, the shield and the spear, like their western neighbors. But never in Germany did feudalism make its way into daily life as far as it did in France, where the maxim held true: 'nulle terre sans seigneur.' There never was here a lack of considerable allodial possessions, although occa-

sionally, out of respect for the feudal theory, these were put down as 'fiefs of the sun.' The principle, too, was firmly maintained that a fief granted from one's own property was no true fief; for so thoroughly was feudal law the law governing the realm that a true fief could only be founded on the fief above it, in such manner that the king was always the highest feudal lord. That was the reason why a fief without homage, that is, without the relationship of vassalage and the need of doing military service for the state, could not be looked upon as a true fief. The knight's fee only (*feudum militare*) was such, and only a man of knightly character, who united a knightly manner of living with knightly pedigree, was 'perfect in feudal law,'—in possession, namely, of full feudal rights or of the 'Heerschild.' Whether or not he had been personally dubbed knight made no difference; the fief of a man who was still a squire was also a true fief. . . . The object of the feudal grant could be anything which assured a regular emolument,—especially land, tithes, reuts, and other sources of income, tolls and jurisdictions, churches and monasteries; above all, offices of state. In course of time the earlier distinction between the office and the fief which was meant to go with the office ceased to be made. . . . The formal course of procedure when granting was a combination, exactly on the old plan, of the act of commendation, now called *Hulde*, which was the basis of vassalage, and the act of conferring (*investiture*) which established the real right of the man to the fief. . . . The *Hulde* consisted in giving the hand (—the performing of *mannschaft*, *homagium*, *hominium*, *Hulde*) often combined with the giving of a kiss and the taking of an oath (the swearing of *fidelitas* or *Hulde*) by which the man swore to be 'true, loyal and willing' as regarded his lord. The custom earlier connected with commendation of presenting a weapon had lost its former significance and had become merged in the ceremony of investiture: the weapon had become a symbol of investiture. . . . These symbols of investiture were in part the same as in territorial law: the glove, the hat, the cape, the staff, the twig; occasionally probably also a ring, but quite especially the sword or spear. As regarded the principalities it had quite early become the custom to fasten a banner on the end of the spear in token of the royal rights of supremacy that were to be conferred. Thus the banner became the sole symbol of investiture in the granting of secular principalities and the latter themselves came to be called 'banner fiefs.' The installation of the ecclesiastical princes by the king took place originally without any distinction being made between the office and the appanage of the office. It was done by conferring the pastoral staff (*ferula*, *virga pastoralis*) of the former bishop or abbot; in the case of bishops since the time of Henry III. by handing the ring and crosier. In the course of the struggle concerning the ecclesiastical investitures both sides came to the conviction that a distinction could be made between the appanaging of the church with secular estates and jurisdictions on the one hand, and the office itself and the immediate appurtenances of the church—the so-called 'sacred objects' on the other. A union was arrived at in the Concordat of Worms which provided that for the granting of the former (the so-called *Regalia*) the secular symbol of the sceptre might replace

the purely ecclesiastical symbols. As this custom was retained even after the incorporation of the ecclesiastical principalities in the feudalized state-system, the ecclesiastical principalities, as opposed to the secular banner-fiefs, were distinguished as 'sceptre-fiefs.'—Schröder, *Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (1889) pp. 381–388. —"By the time at which we have arrived (the Hohenstaufen Period) the knights themselves, 'ordo equestris major,' had come to form a class so distinct and so exclusive that no outsiders could enter it except in the course of three generations or by special decree of the king. Only to those whose fathers and grandfathers were of knightly origin could fiefs now be granted; only such could engage in judicial combat, in knightly sports and, above all, in the tournament or joust. . . . Feudalism did much to awaken a moral sentiment; fidelity, truth and sincerity were the suppositions upon which the whole system rested, and a great solidarity of interests came to exist between the lord and his vassals. The latter might bring no public charges against their master in matters affecting his life, limb or honor; on three grand occasions, in case of captivity, the knighting of his son, the marriage of his daughter, they were obliged to furnish him with pecuniary aid. Knightly honor and knightly graces come in the twelfth century to be a matter of fashion and custom; a new and important element, too, the adoration of woman, is introduced. A whole literature arises that has to do almost exclusively with knightly prowess and with knightly love."—E. F. Henderson, *A History of Germany in the Middle Ages*, pp. 424–425. —See, also, FRANCE: A. D. 987–1327.

FEUILLANTS, Club and Party of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 1790, and 1791 (OCTOBER).

FEZ: Founding of the city and kingdom. See **EDRISITES**.

FEZZAN. The Phazania of the ancient Romans; a part of the Sahara region in northern Africa which has been attached since 1842 to the Turkish province of Tripoli.

FIANNA EIRINN.—The ancient militia of Erin, famous in old Irish romance and song.—T. Moore, *Hist. of Ireland*, v. 1, ch. 7.

FIDENÆ.—An ancient city on the Tiber, at war with Rome until the latter destroyed it, B. C. 426.

FIEFS. See **FEUDAL TENURES**; and **FEUDALISM**.

FIELD OF LIES, The.—Ludwig, or Louis, the Pious, son and successor of Charlemagne, was a man of gentle character, and good intentions—too amiable and too honest in his virtues for the commanding of a great empire in times so rude. He lost the control of his state, and his family, alike. His own sons headed a succession of revolts against his authority. The second of these insurrections occurred in the year 833. Father and sons confronted one another with hostile armies, on the plain of Rothfeld, not far from Colmar in Alsace. Intrigue instead of battle settled the controversy, for the time being. The adherents of the old emperor were all enticed away from him. To signify the treacherous methods by which this defection was brought about, the "Rothfeld" (Red-field) on which it occurred received the name of "Lügenfeld," or Field of Lies.—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *The French under the Carlovingians*; tr. by Bellingham, ch. 7.

FIELD OF THE CLOTH OF GOLD, The.—The place of the famous meeting of Henry VIII. of England with Francis I. of France, which took place in the summer of 1520 [see FRANCE: A. D. 1520-1523], is notable in history, from the magnificence of the preparations made for it, as The Field of the Cloth of Gold. It was at Guisnes, or between Guisnes and Arde, near Calais (then English territory). "Guisnes and its castle offered little attraction, and if possible less accommodation, to the gay throng now to be gathered within its walls. . . . But on the castle green, within the limits of a few weeks, and in the face of great difficulties, the English artists of that day contrived a summer palace, more like a vision of romance, the creation of some fairy dream (if the accounts of eye-witnesses of all classes may be trusted), than the dull every-day reality of clay-born bricks and mortar. No 'palace of art' in these beclouded climates of the West ever so truly deserved its name. . . . The palace was an exact square of 328 feet. It was pierced on every side with oriel windows and clerestories curiously glazed, the mullions and posts of which were overlaid with gold. An embattled gate, ornamented on both sides with statues representing men in various attitudes of war, and flanked by an embattled tower, guarded the entrance. From this gate to the entrance of the palace arose in long ascent a sloping dais or hall-pace, along which were grouped 'images of sore and terrible countenances,' in armour of argentine or bright metal. At the entrance, under an embowed landing place, facing the great doors, stood 'antique' (classical) figures girt with olive branches. The passages, the roofs of the galleries from place to place and from chamber to chamber, were ceiled and covered with white silk, fluted and embowed with silken hanging of divers colours and braided cloths, 'which showed like bullions of fine burnished gold.' The roofs of the chambers were studded with roses, set in lozenges, and diapered on a ground of fine gold. Panels enriched with antique carving and gilt bosses covered the spaces between the windows; whilst all along the corridors and from every window hung tapestry of silk and gold, embroidered with figures. . . . To the palace was attached a spacious chapel, still more sumptuously adorned. Its altars were hung with cloth of gold tissue embroidered with pearls; cloth of gold covered the walls and desks. . . . Outside the palace gate, on the greensward, stood a gilt fountain, of antique workmanship, with a statue of Bacchus 'birlyng the wine.' Three runlets, fed by secret conduits hid beneath the earth, spouted claret, hypocras, and water into as many silver cups, to quench the thirst of all comers. . . . In long array, in the plain beyond, 2,800 tents stretched their white canvas before the eyes of the spectator, gay with the pennons, badges, and devices of the various occupants; whilst miscellaneous followers, in tens of thousands, attracted by profit or the novelty of the scene, camped on the grass and filled the surrounding slopes, in spite of the severity of provost-marshal and reiterated threats of mutilation and chastisement. . . . From the 4th of June, when Henry first entered Guisnes, the festivities continued with unabated splendour for twenty days. . . . The two kings parted on the best of terms, as the world thought."—J. S. Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII.*, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: Lady Jackson, *The Court of France in the 16th Century*, v. 1, ch. 11-12.—Miss Pardoe, *The Court and Reign of Francis I.*, v. 1, ch. 14.

FIESCO, Conspiracy of. See GENOA: A. D. 1528-1559.

FIESOLE. See FLORENCE: ORIGIN AND NAME.

FIFTEEN, The (Jacobite Rebellion). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1715.

FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1869-1870.

FIFTH MONARCHY MEN.—One of the most extremely fanatical of the politico-religious sects or factions which rose in England during the commonwealth and the Protectoral reign of Cromwell, was that of the so-called Fifth Monarchy Men, of whom Major-General Harrison was the chief. Their belief is thus described by Carlyle: "The common mode of treating Universal History, . . . not yet entirely fallen obsolete in this country, though it has been abandoned with much ridicule everywhere else for half a century now, was to group the Aggregate Transactions of the Human Species into Four Monarchies: the Assyrian Monarchy of Nebuchadnezzar and Company; the Persian of Cyrus and ditto; the Greek of Alexander; and lastly the Roman. These I think were they; but am no great authority on the subject. Under the dregs of this last, or Roman Empire, which is maintained yet by express name in Germany, 'Das heilige Römische Reich,' we poor moderns still live. But now say Major-General Harrison and a number of men, founding on Bible Prophecies, Now shall be a Fifth Monarchy, by far the blessedest and the only real one,—the Monarchy of Jesus Christ, his Saints reigning for Him here on Earth,—if not He himself, which is probable or possible,—for a thousand years, &c., &c.— O Heavens, there are tears for human destiny; and immortal Hope itself is beautiful because it is steeped in Sorrow, and foolish Desire lies vanquished under its feet! They who merely laugh at Harrison take but a small portion of his meaning with them."—T. Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches*, pt. 8, speech 2.—The Fifth Monarchy fanaticism, sternly repressed by Oliver Cromwell, gave some signs of turbulence during Richard Cromwell's protectorate, and broke out in a mad way the year after the Restoration. The attempted insurrection in London was headed by one Venner, and was called Venner's Insurrection. It was easily put down. "It came as the expiring flash of a fanatical creed, which had blended itself with Puritanism, greatly to the detriment of the latter; and, dying out rather slowly, it left behind the quiet element of Millenarianism."—J. Stoughton, *Hist. of Religion in Eng.*, v. 3, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: D. Masson, *Life of John Milton*, v. 5, p. 16.

"FIFTY-FOUR FORTY OR FIGHT." See OREGON: A. D. 1844-1846.

FIJI ISLANDS, The.—"The Fiji Group comprises more than eighty inhabited islands in the South Pacific, between longitude 176° east and 178° west, and latitude 16° and 21° south, and is situated 1760 miles N.E. of Sydney, and 1175 N. of Auckland. Viti Levu (or Big Fiji), the largest island of the group, is half as large as Jamaica, and larger than Cyprus; the second island of importance, Vanua Levu, is three times the size of Mauritius, and ten times that of Barbadoes,

and the aggregate area of the whole is greater than all the British West Indies. . . . The country is well watered by numerous rivers, several of them being of respectable size. The Rewa in Viti Levu is navigable by vessels of light draught for 50 miles, and on the banks of this river there are thousands of acres of the richest alluvial flats, with soil 14 or 15 feet deep. . . . The first known European who mentions Fiji is the Dutch navigator Tasman, who in 1643 passed between the islands of Taviuni and Kaimea, and the straits to this day bear his name. He christened the group Prince William's Islands. Captains Cook, Bligh, and Wilson are among the early discoverers who mention the group. . . . In 1808 a brig called the *Elisa* was wrecked off the reef of Nairai, and the escaped crew and passengers, mostly runaway convicts from New South Wales, found there were seven powerful chiefs in the group, that of Verata being leader. The sailors and convicts, however, under the command of a certain Charley Savage, took the side of the Bau people [Bau being one of the small islands of the group]. Powder and shot soon settled the question of ascendancy, and since the *Elisa* was lost Bau has retained it. The chief of Bau at this time was a certain Na Ulivou, and was a brave leader of men. So great was his success that he was accorded the title of Vuni Valu, 'Root of War,' or as some translators have it, 'Source of Power,'—a distinction which has since been hereditary in the chiefs of Bau. Internecine fighting chiefly constituted the Fijian life of those days, but the Vuni Valu of the time maintained the position he had won. He died in 1829, and was succeeded by his brother Tanoa, who, after a troubled reign, five years of which were passed in exile, died on the 8th of December, 1852."—H. Stonehewer Cooper, *Coral Lands*, v. 1, ch. 2 and 4.—"After 1835, two Wesleyan missionaries, bold pioneers of civilisation, penetrated to the Fiji Islands. They found there a frightful state of things; wars, massacres, and banquets of human flesh were the order of the day. But they found there also a certain organisation, a sort of customary law, fourteen kinglets, statesmen, politicians, and persons whose business it was to carry from tribe to tribe the news of the day. . . . Among the great chiefs of the Fijian archipelago, Thakombau [spelt, after the orthography invented by the missionaries, Cakobau, which does not correspond with the sound of the word] occupied the first rank, thanks to his intelligence, his energy, and the extent of his dominions. For greater personal safety, he resided in the little island of Bau. He succeeded even in getting himself proclaimed King of Fiji by a certain number of great chiefs. But an attempt of his to subjugate the other tribes became the cause of his downfall. . . . The missionaries had endeavoured in vain to convert him; but this task was accomplished by the King of Tonga. Thakombau, menaced by a formidable coalition of Fijian chiefs, had applied to King George of Tonga for assistance. The latter came at the head of an imposing force, rescued the King of the Fijis, who was then besieged in his small island, re-established his authority, and enjoined him to embrace the faith of the whites. He obeyed, and the other chiefs followed his example. Thus it was that in 1857 Christianity was introduced into the archipelago. The second part of Thakombau's reign was, so far

as he was personally concerned, an alternation of ups and downs, but for his country, a period of progress, inasmuch as the manners of the people became more and more civilised, and cannibalism gradually disappeared. The credit of this was, as we have seen, in great part due to the missionaries, who had acquired a great influence in political matters, and also to the English Consulate, then recently established at Levuka. But the wars continued, and the prestige of the king declined; so, following the advice of his white friends, he endeavoured to get rid of the dangers that surrounded him by granting his subjects a constitution similar to that which the American missionaries had introduced in the Sandwich Islands. But it appeared that the worthy Fijians were not yet ripe for these blessings. The king's position got worse and worse, and in the end became altogether untenable. One means of escape alone remained: to cede his kingdom to the British Crown, and this he did in 1874. In the latter years of his reign, his two principal advisers were his daughter, the Princess Andiquilla, and an English resident, Mr. Thurston. . . . From his abdication to his death in 1882, Thakombau lived a retired life, with his numerous family, at his former capital, Bau, maintaining the most friendly relations with the English authorities, and sometimes giving them useful advice. . . . For now [1884] nearly ten years the Fijian Archipelago, including the group of the Exploring Islands, has been under British rule. It owes to that rule undeniable benefits: a comparative degree of prosperity; domestic peace, notwithstanding tribal animosities which in spite of restraint still continue in a latent form; perfect security of life and property; indirect but effectual protection against the enticements of kidnappers, and finally, an organisation adapted as far as is possible to local traditions and usages. . . . A small body of troops, composed exclusively of natives, protects the lives of the Governor and his family, as well as his staff and the white residents. Excepting the young officer who commands these raw recruits, there is not an English military man in these islands. And note this well: the coloured subjects of the Queen form 98 per cent of the whole population of the Archipelago. There are other wonders which might be recorded. Nevertheless, it must be confessed that the opinions expressed by the old residents, who are best qualified to know the country, differ amazingly. Some of them ascribe the merit of the advantages already obtained to the Government, others to the working of the new constitution, to the missionaries, or to the influence of Europeans. But there are also those, not less entitled to speak . . . who seriously maintain that the Fijians, so far from having been savages, had attained a high degree of civilisation before the introduction of Christianity."—Baron von Hüner, *Through the British Empire*, v. 2, pt. 5, ch. 2.—See, also, TONGA ISLANDS.

FILI.—A class of poets among the early Irish, who practiced originally certain rites of incantation. Their art was called *Filidecht*. "The bards, who recited poems and stories, formed at first a distinct branch from the Fili. According as the true *Filidecht* fell into desuetude, and the Fili became simply a poet, the two orders practically coalesced and the names Fili and bard became synonymous. . . . In Pagan times and during the Middle Ages the Irish bards, like the Gaulish

ones, accompanied their recitation of poems on a stringed instrument called a crut. . . . The bard was therefore to the Fili, or poet, what the Jogler was to the Troubadour."—W. K. Sullivan, Article, *Celtic Literature, Encyc. Brit.*

FILIBUSTER.—"The difference between a filibuster and a freebooter is one of ends rather than of means. Some authorities say that the words have a common etymology; but others, including Charlevoix, maintain that the filibuster derived his name from his original occupation, that of a cruiser in a 'filbote,' or 'Vly-boat,' first used on the river Vly, in Holland. Yet another writer says that the name was first given to the gallant followers of Dominique de Gourgues, who sailed from Finisterre, or Finibuster, in France, on the famous expedition against Fort Caroline in 1567 [see FLORIDA: A. D. 1567-1568]. The name, whatever its origin, was long current in the Spanish as 'filibustero' before it became adopted into the English. So adopted, it has been used to describe a type of adventurer who occupied a curious place in American history during the decade from 1850 to 1860."—J. J. Roche, *The Story of the Filibusters, ch. 1.*—See, also, AMERICA: A. D. 1639-1700.

FILIBUSTERING EXPEDITIONS OF LOPEZ AND WALKER. See CUBA: A. D. 1845-1860; and NICARAGUA: A. D. 1855-1860.

FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY, The.—"The Council of Toledo, held under King Recared, A. D. 589, at which the Visigothic Church of Spain formally abjured Arianism and adopted the orthodox faith, put forth a version of the great creed of Nicæa in which they had interpolated an additional clause, which stated that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father 'and from the Son' (Filioque). Under what influence the council took upon itself to make an addition to the creed of the universal Church is unknown. It is probable that the motive of the addition was to make a stronger protest against the Arian denial of the co-equal Godhead of the Son. The Spanish Church naturally took a special interest in the addition it had made to the symbol of Nicæa, and sustained it in subsequent councils. . . . The Frankish Church seems to have early adopted it from their Spanish neighbours. . . . The question was brought before a council held at Aix in A. D. 809. . . . The council formally approved of the addition to the creed, and Charles [Charlemagne] sent two bishops and the abbot of Corbie to Rome to request the pope's concurrence in the decision. Leo, at a conference with the envoys, expressed his agreement with the doctrine, but strongly opposed its insertion into the creed. . . . Notwithstanding the pope's protest, the addition was adopted throughout the Frankish Empire. When the Emperor Henry V. was crowned at Rome, A. D. 1014, he induced Pope Benedict VIII. to allow the creed with the filioque to be chanted after the Gospel at High Mass; so it came to be generally used in Rome; and at length Pope Nicholas I. insisted on its adoption throughout the West. At a later period the controversy was revived, and it became the ostensible ground of the final breach (A. D. 1054) between the Churches of the West and those of the East."—E. L. Cutts, *Charlemagne, ch. 23.*—"The Filioque controversy relates to the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, and is a continuation of the trinitarian controversies of the Nicene age. It marks the chief and almost the only important

dogmatic difference between the Greek and Latin churches, . . . and has occasioned, deepened, and perpetuated the greatest schism in Christendom. The single word Filioque keeps the oldest, largest and most nearly related churches divided since the ninth century, and still forbids a reunion."—P. Schaff, *Hist. of the Ch. Church, v. 4, ch. 11, sect. 107.*

Also in: G. B. Howard, *The Schism between the Oriental and Western Churches.*—See, CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 330-1054.

FILIPPO MARIA, Duke of Milan, A. D. 1412-1447.

FILLMORE, Millard.—Vice-Presidential Election.—Succession to the Presidency.—Administration. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1848, to 1852.

FINE, The.—A clan or sept division of the tribe in ancient Ireland.

FINGALL. See NORMANS.—NORTHMEN: 8TH-9TH CENTURIES; also, IRELAND: 9TH-10TH CENTURIES.

FINLAND: A. D. 1808-1810.—Conquest by and peculiar annexation to Russia.—Constitutional independence of the Finnish grand duchy confirmed by the Czar. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1807-1810.

FINN GALLS. See IRELAND: 9TH-10TH CENTURIES.

FINNS. See HUNGARIANS.

FIODH-INIS. See IRELAND, THE NAME.

FIRBOLGS, The.—One of the races to which Irish legend ascribes the settlement of Ireland; said to have come from Thrace. See NEMEDIANS, and IRELAND: THE PRIMITIVE INHABITANTS.

FIRE LANDS, The. See OHIO: A. D. 1796-1796.

FIRMA. See FERM.

FIRST CONSUL OF FRANCE, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER).

FIRST EMPIRE (FRENCH), The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1804-1805, to 1815.

FIRST-FRUIT. See ANNATES.

FIRST REPUBLIC (FRENCH), The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER), to 1804-1805.

FISCALINI. See SLAVERY, MEDÆVAL: FRANCE.

FISCUS, The.—"The treasury of the senate [in the early period of the Roman empire] retained the old republican name of the ærarium; that of the emperor was denominated the fiscus, a term which ordinarily signified the private property of an individual. Hence the notion rapidly grew up, that the provincial resources constituted the emperor's private purse, and when in process of time the control of the senate over the taxes gave way to their direct administration by the emperor himself, the national treasury received the designation of fiscus, and the idea of the empire being nothing else than Cæsar's patrimony became fixed ineradicably in men's minds."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans, ch. 32.*

FISHER, Fort, The capture of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864-1865 (DECEMBER—JANUARY: N. CAROLINA).

FISHERIES, North American: A. D. 1501-1578.—The Portuguese, Norman, Breton and Basque fishermen on the Newfoundland Banks. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578.

A. D. 1610-1655.—Growth of the English interest. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1610-1655.

A. D. 1620.—Monopoly granted to the Council for New England. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1620-1623.

A. D. 1660-1688.—The French gain their footing in Newfoundland. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1660-1688.

A. D. 1713.—Newfoundland relinquished to England, with fishing rights reserved to France, by the Treaty of Utrecht. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1713.

A. D. 1720-1745.—French interests protected by the fortification of Louisbourg. See CAPE BRETON: A. D. 1720-1745.

A. D. 1748.—St. Pierre and Michelon islands on the Newfoundland coast ceded to France. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1745-1748.

A. D. 1763.—Rights secured to France on the island of Newfoundland and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence by the Treaty of Paris.—Articles V. and VI. of the Treaty of Paris (1763), which transferred Canada and all its islands from France to England, are in the following language: "The subjects of France shall have the liberty of fishing and drying, on a part of the coasts of the island of Newfoundland, such as it is specified in the 13th Article of the Treaty of Utrecht; which article is renewed and confirmed by the present treaty (except what relates to the island of Cape Breton, as well as to the other islands and coasts, in the mouth and in the gulph of St. Laurence); and his Britannic majesty consents to leave to the subjects of the most Christian king the liberty of fishing in the gulph of St. Laurence, on condition that the subjects of France do not exercise the said fishery, but at the distance of three leagues from all the coasts belonging to Great Britain, as well those of the continent, as those of the islands situated in the said gulph of St. Laurence. And as to what relates to the fishery on the coasts of the island of Cape Breton out of the said gulph, the subjects of the most Christian king shall not be permitted to exercise the said fishery, but at the distance of 15 leagues from the coasts of the island of Cape Breton; and the fishery on the coasts of Nova Scotia or Acadia, and everywhere else out of the said gulph, shall remain on the foot of former treaties. Art. VI. The King of Great Britain cedes the islands of St. Peter and Miquelon, in full right, to his most Christian majesty, to serve as a shelter to the French fishermen: and his said most Christian majesty engages not to fortify the said islands; to erect no buildings upon them, but merely for the convenience of the fishery; and to keep upon them a guard of 50 men only for the police."—*Text of the Treaty (Parliamentary Hist., v. 15, p. 1295).*

A. D. 1778.—French fishery rights recognized in the treaty between France and the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1783.—Rights secured to the United States by the Treaty of Paris. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1783 (SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1814-1818.—Disputed rights of American fishermen after the War of 1812.—Silence of the Treaty of Ghent.—The Convention of 1818.—Under the Treaty of Paris (1783) "we claimed that the liberty which was secured to the inhabitants of the United States to take fish on

the coasts of Newfoundland, under the limitation of not drying or curing the same on that island, and also on the other coasts, bays, and creeks, together with the limited rights of drying or curing fish on the coasts of Nova Scotia, Magdalen Islands, and Labrador, were not created or conferred by that treaty, but were simply recognized by it as already existing. They had been enjoyed before the Revolution by the Americans in common with other subjects of Great Britain, and had, indeed, been conquered, from the French chiefly, through the valor and sacrifices of the colonies of New England and New York. The treaty was therefore considered analogous to a deed of partition. It defined the boundaries between the two countries and all the rights and privileges belonging to them. We insisted that the article respecting fisheries was therefore to be regarded as identical with the possession of land or the demarcation of boundary. We also claimed that the treaty, being one that recognized independence, conceded territory, and defined boundaries, belonged to that class which is permanent in its nature and is not affected by subsequent suspension of friendly relations. The English, however, insisted that this treaty was not a unity; that while some of its provisions were permanent, other stipulations were temporary and could be abrogated, and that, in fact, they were abrogated by the war of 1812; that the very difference of the language used showed that while the rights of deep-sea fishing were permanent, the liberties of fishing were created and conferred by that treaty, and had therefore been taken away by the war. These were the two opposite views of the respective governments at the conferences which ended in the treaty of Ghent, of 1814." No compromise appearing to be practicable, the commissioners agreed, at length, to drop the subject from consideration. "For that reason the treaty of Ghent is entirely silent as to the fishery question [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (DECEMBER)]. . . . In consequence of conflicts arising between our fishermen and the British authorities, our point of view was very strongly maintained by Mr. Adams in his correspondence with the British Foreign Office, and finally, on October 20, 1818, Mr. Rush, then our minister at London, assisted by Mr. Gallatin, succeeded in signing a treaty, which among other things settled our rights and privileges by the first article, as follows: . . . 'It is agreed between the high contracting parties that the inhabitants of the said United States shall have forever, in common with the subjects of his Britannic Majesty, the liberty of taking fish of any kind on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Ray to the Rameau Islands; on the western and northern coasts of Newfoundland from the said Cape Ray to the Qurpon Islands; on the shores of the Magdalen Islands, and also on the coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks from Mont Joly, on the southern coast of Labrador, to and through the straits of Belle Isle, and thence northwardly indefinitely along the coast. And that the American fishermen shall have liberty forever to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbors, and creeks in the southern part of Newfoundland herein-before described, and of the coasts of Labrador; but as soon as the same, or any portion thereof, shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for said fishermen to dry or cure fish

at such portion, so settled, without previous agreement for such purpose with the inhabitants, proprietors, or possessors of the ground. And the United States hereby renounces forever any liberty heretofore enjoyed, claimed by the inhabitants thereof to take, dry, or cure fish on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors of his Britannic Majesty's dominions in America not included in the above-mentioned limits. Provided, however, That the American fishermen shall be permitted to enter such bays or harbors for the purpose of shelter, of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood, and obtaining water, and for no other purpose whatever. But they shall be under such restrictions as shall be necessary to prevent their taking, drying, or curing fish therein, or in any other manner whatever abusing the privileges hereby secured to them.' The American plenipotentiaries evidently labored to obtain as extensive a district of territory as possible for in-shore fishing, and were willing to give up privileges, then apparently of small amount, but now much more important, than of using other bays and harbors for shelter and kindred purposes. For that reason they acquiesced in omitting the word 'bait' in the first sentence of the proviso after 'water.' . . . The power of obtaining bait for use in the deep-sea fisheries is one which our fishermen were afterward very anxious to secure. But the mackerel fisheries in those waters did not begin until several years later. The only contention then was about the cod fisheries."—E. Schuyler, *American Diplomacy*, ch. 8.—*Treaties and Conventions between the United States and other Powers* (ed. of 1889), pp. 415-418.

A. D. 1854-1866.—Privileges defined under the Canadian Reciprocity Treaty. See **TARIFF LEGISLATION** (UNITED STATES AND CANADA): A. D. 1854-1866.

A. D. 1871.—Reciprocal privileges adjusted between Great Britain and the United States by the Treaty of Washington. See **ALABAMA CLAIMS**: A. D. 1871.

A. D. 1877-1888.—The Halifax award.—Termination of the Fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington.—The rejected Treaty of 1888.—In accordance with the terms of articles 22 and 23 of the Treaty of Washington (see **ALABAMA CLAIMS**: A. D. 1871), a Commission appointed to award compensation to Great Britain for the superior value of the fishery privileges conceded to the citizens of the United States by that treaty, met at Halifax on the 5th of June, 1877. The United States was represented on the Commission by Hon. E. H. Kellogg, of Massachusetts, and Great Britain by Sir Alexander F. Gault, of Canada. The two governments having failed to agree in the selection of the third Commissioner, the latter was named, as the Treaty provided, by the Austrian Ambassador at London, who designated M. Maurice Delfosse, Belgian Minister at Washington. The award was made November 27, 1877, when, "by a vote of two to one, the Commissioners decided that the United States was to pay \$5,500,000 for the use of the fishing privileges for 12 years. The decision produced profound astonishment in the United States." Dissatisfaction with the Halifax award, and generally with the main provisions of the Treaty of Washington relating to the fisheries, was so great in the United States that, when, in 1878, Congress appropriated money for the payment of the

award, it inserted in the bill a clause to the effect that "Articles 18 and 21 of the Treaty between the United States and Great Britain concluded on the 8th of May, 1871, ought to be terminated at the earliest period consistent with the provisions of Article 33 of the same Treaty." "It is a curious fact that during the time intervening between the signing of the treaty of Washington and the Halifax award an almost complete change took place in the character of the fisheries. The method of taking mackerel was completely revolutionized by the introduction of the purse-seine, by means of which vast quantities of the fish were captured far out in the open sea by enclosing them in huge nets. . . . This change in the method of fishing brought about a change in the fishing grounds. . . . The result of this change was very greatly to diminish the value of the North-eastern Fisheries to the United States fishermen." On the 1st of July, 1883, "in pursuance of instructions from Congress, the President gave the required notice of the desire of the United States to terminate the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington, which consequently came to an end the 1st of July, 1885. The termination of the treaty fell in the midst of the fishing season, and, at the suggestion of the British Minister, Secretary Bayard entered into a temporary arrangement whereby the American fishermen were allowed the privileges of the treaty during the remainder of the season, with the understanding that the President should bring the question before Congress at its next session and recommend a joint Commission by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain." This was done; but Congress disapproved the recommendation. The question of rights under former treaties, especially that of 1818, remained open, and became a subject of much irritation between the United States and the neighboring British American provinces. The local regulations of the latter were enforced with stringency and harshness against American fishermen; the latter solicited and procured retaliatory legislation from Congress. To end this unsatisfactory state of affairs, a treaty was negotiated at Washington in February, 1888, by Thomas F. Bayard, Secretary of State, William L. Putnam and James B. Angell, plenipotentiaries on the part of the United States, and Joseph Chamberlain, M. P., Sir L. S. Sackville West and Sir Charles Tupper, plenipotentiaries on the part of Great Britain, which treaty was approved by the President and sent to the Senate, but rejected by that body on the 21st of August, by a negative vote of 30, against 27 in its favor.—C. B. Elliott, *The United States and the North-eastern Fisheries*, pp. 79-100.

ALSO IN: J. H. De Ricci, *The Fisheries Dispute* (1888).—*Annual Report of United States Commission of Fish and Fisheries for 1886.*—*Corr. relative to proposed Fisheries Treaty* (Senate Ex. Doc., No. 113; 50th Cong., 1st Sess.).—*Doc's and Proceedings of Halifax Comm'n* (H. R. Ex. Doc., No. 89; 45th Cong., 2d Sess.).

FISHER'S HILL, Battle of. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1864 (AUGUST—OCTOBER: VIRGINIA).

FISHING CREEK, Battle of. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY: KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE).

FISKE UNIVERSITY. See **EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA**: A. D. 1865-1881.

FITCH, John, and the beginnings of steam navigation. See STEAM NAVIGATION.

FITZGERALD'S (LORD THOMAS) REBELLION IN IRELAND. See IRELAND: A. D. 1535-1553.

FIVE ARTICLES OF PERTH, The. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1618.

FIVE BLOODS, The. See IRELAND: 13TH-14TH CENTURIES.

FIVE BOROUGHs, The.—A confederation of towns occupied by the Danes in England, including Derby, Lincoln, Leicester, Nottingham and Stamford, which played a part in the events of the tenth and eleventh centuries. It afterwards became Seven Boroughs by addition of York and Chester.

FIVE FORKS, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MARCH-APRIL: VIRGINIA).

FIVE HUNDRED, The French Council of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1795 (JUNE-SEPTEMBER).

FIVE HUNDRED AT ATHENS, The. See ATHENS: B. C. 510-507.

FIVE MEMBERS, King Charles' attempt against the. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1642 (JANUARY).

FIVE MILE ACT, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1662-1665.

FIVE NATIONS OF INDIANS, The.—The five original tribes of the Iroquois Confederacy, — the Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, and Senecas, — were commonly called by the English the Five Nations. Subsequently, in 1715, a sixth tribe, the Tuscaroras, belonging to the same stock, was admitted to the confederacy, and its members were then known as the Six Nations. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY, and IROQUOIS TRIBES OF THE SOUTH.

FIVE THOUSAND, The. See ATHENS: B. C. 413-411.

FIVE YEARS' TRUCE, The. See ATHENS: B. C. 460-449.

FLAG, The American.—At the outbreak of the revolt of the colonies, a variety of devices appeared on the flags borne by the Continental troops. A pine tree seems to have been the favorite New England emblem; a coiled serpent, with the motto, "Beware," or "Don't tread on me," was that of the South. A representation of the thirteen colonies by alternate red and white stripes on a flag is said to have been made first at Washington's headquarters, Cambridge, on the 2d of January, 1776. The blue field of white stars, in the corner (the part of a flag called "the union"), was introduced, by order of Congress, on the 14th of June, 1777. There seems to be no doubt that the first flag, thus determined by law to be the flag of the United States, was made by Mrs. Betsey Ross, an upholsterer, on Arch street, Philadelphia, and, according to tradition, Washington pencilled the plan of it. The first military use of the flag is claimed to have been at Fort Stanwix (now Rome, N. Y.), when the fort was besieged in August, 1777. The banner was improvised on that occasion, out of a red petticoat, a white shirt, and Col. Gansevoort's blue cloak. In 1818, Congress decided that the number of stripes in the flag should thereafter be the original thirteen, but that the stars in "the union" should increase in number with the growing number of the states.

FLAG, The British.—In the national flag of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland the rectangular red cross of St. George (original emblem of England), the diagonal white cross of St. Andrew (emblem of Scotland), and the red diagonal cross of St. Patrick (emblem of Ireland) are ingeniously united, on a blue field, so that each is shown. This constitutes what is sometimes called the "royal jack," sometimes the "union jack," covering for some uses the whole flag, and for others, only the upper left-hand corner of a red or blue ensign.

FLAGELLANTS.— "Although the Church's forgiveness for sin might now [14th century] be easily obtained in other ways, still flagellation was not only greatly admired among the religious, but was also held in such high estimation by the common people, that in case of any calamity or plague, they thought they could propitiate the supposed wrath of God in no more effectual manner than by scourging, and processions of scourgers; just as though the Church's ordinary means of atonement were insufficient for extraordinary cases. . . . Clement VI. put an end to the public processions of Flagellants, which were already widely prevalent; but penance by the scourge was only thus forced into concealment. . . . Thus there now rose heretical Flagellants, called also by the common name of Beghards. . . . When the Whitemen (Bianchi) [see WHITE PENITENTS], scourging themselves as they went, descended from the Alps into Italy, they were received almost everywhere with enthusiasm by the clergy and the people; but in the Papal territory death was prepared for their leader, and the rest accordingly dispersed themselves."—J. C. L. Gieseler, *Compendium of Ecclesiastical Hist.*, sect. 123 (v. 4).—"Divided into companies of male and female devotees, under a leader and two masters, they stripped themselves naked to the waist, and publicly scourged themselves, or each other, till their shoulders were covered with blood. This expiatory ceremony was repeated every morning and afternoon for thirty-three days, equal in number to the years which Christ is thought to have lived upon earth. . . . The Flagellants appeared first in Hungary; but missionary societies were soon formed, and they hastened to impart the knowledge of the new gospel to foreign nations. . . . A colony reached England, and landed in London. . . . The missionaries made not a single proselyte."—J. Lingard, *Hist. of England*, v. 4, ch. 1.

FLAMENS. — FLAMINES.—"The pontifices, like several other priestly brotherhoods [of ancient Rome] . . . had sacrificial priests (flamines) attached to them, whose name was derived from 'flare' (to blow the fire). The number of flamines attached to the pontifices was fifteen, the three highest of whom, . . . viz., the Flamen Dialis, Martialis, and Quirinalis, were always chosen from old patrician families. . . . Free from all civil duties, the Flamen Dialis, with his wife and children, exclusively devoted himself to the service of the deity. His house . . . lay on the Palatine hill. His marriage was dissoluble by death only; he was not allowed to take an oath, mount a horse, or look at an army. He was forbidden to remain a night away from his house, and his hand touched nothing unclean, for which reason he never approached a corpse or a burial-place. . . . In the daytime the Flamen Dialis was not allowed to take off his head-

dress, and he was obliged to resign his office in case it fell off by accident. In his belt he carried the sacrificial knife, and in his hand he held a rod, in order to keep off the people on his way to the sacrifice. For the same purpose he was preceded by a lictor, who compelled everybody on the way to lay down his work, the flamen not being allowed to see the business of daily life."—E. Guhl and W. Koner, *Life of the Greeks and Romans*, sect. 103.—See AUGURS.

FLAMINIAN WAY. See **ROME**: B. C. 295-191.

FLAMINIUS, The defeat of. See **PUNIC WAR**, THE SECOND.

FLANDERS: A. D. 863.—Creation of the County.—Judith, daughter of Charles the Bald, of France (not yet called France), and a twice widowed queen of England, though hardly yet out of her girlhood (she had wedded Ethelwulf and Ethelbald, father and son, in succession), took a mate, at last, more to her liking, by a runaway match with one of her father's foresters, named Baudouin, or Baldwin, Bras-de-fer. This was in 862. King Charles, in his wrath, caused the impudent forester to be outlawed and excommunicated, both; but after a year of intercession and mediation he forgave the pair and established them in a suitable fief. Baudouin was made Count or Marquis of Flanders. "Previously to Baudouin's era, Flanders or 'Flandria' is a designation belonging, as learned men conjecture, to a Gau or Pagus, afterwards known as the Franc de Bruges, and noticed only in a single charter. Popularly, the name of Flanders had obtained with respect to a much larger surrounding Belgic country. . . . The name of 'Flanders' was thus given to the wide, and in a degree indefinite tract, of which the Forester Baudouin and his predecessors had the official range or care. According to the idiom of the Middle Ages, the term 'Forest' did not exactly convey the idea which the word now suggests, not being applied exclusively to wood-land, but to any wild and unreclaimed region. . . . Any etymology of the name of Flamingia, or Flanders, which we can guess at, seems intended to designate that the land was so called from being half-drowned. Thirty-five inundations, which afflicted the country at various intervals from the tenth to the sixteenth century, have entirely altered the coast-line; and the interior features of the country, though less affected, have been much changed by the diversions which the river-courses have sustained. . . . Whatever had been the original amplitude of the districts over which Baudouin had any control or authority, the boundaries were now enlarged and defined. Kneeling before Charles-le-Chauve, placing his hands between the hands of the Sovereign, he received his 'honour':—the Forester of Flanders was created Count or Marquis. All the countries between the Scheldt, the Somme and the sea, became his benefice; so that only a narrow and contested tract divided Baudouin's Flanders from Normandy. According to an antient nomenclature, ten counties, to wit, Thecemburch, Arras, Boulogne, Guisnes, Saint-Paul, Hesdin, Blandemont, Bruges, Harlebec, and Tournay, were comprehended in the noble grant which Baudouin obtained from his father-in-law."—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and of England*, bk. 1, ch. 4.

A. D. 1096.—The Crusade of Count Robert. See **CRUSADES**: A. D. 1096-1099.

A. D. 1201-1204.—The diverted Crusade of Count Baldwin and the imperial crown he won at Constantinople. See **CRUSADES**: A. D. 1201-1203; and **BYZANTINE EMPIRE**: A. D. 1204-1205.

A. D. 1214.—Humbled at the battle of Bouvines. See **BOUVINES**.

13th Century.—The industry, commerce and wealth of the Flemings.—"In the 13th century, Flanders was the most populous and the richest country in Europe. She owed the fact to the briskness of her manufacturing and commercial undertakings, not only amongst her neighbours, but throughout Southern and Eastern Europe. . . . Cloth, and all manner of woolen stuffs, were the principal articles of Flemish production, and it was chiefly from England that Flanders drew her supply of wool, the raw material of her industry. Thence arose between the two countries commercial relations which could not fail to acquire political importance. As early as the middle of the 12th century, several Flemish towns formed a society for founding in England a commercial exchange, which obtained great privileges, and, under the name of the Flemish hanse of London, reached rapid development. The merchants of Bruges had taken the initiative in it; but soon all the towns of Flanders—and Flanders was covered with towns—Ghent, Lille, Ypres, Courtrai, Furnes, Alost, St. Omer, and Douai, entered the confederation, and made unity as well as extension of liberties in respect of Flemish commerce the object of their joint efforts. Their prosperity became celebrated; and its celebrity gave it increase. It was a burgher of Bruges who was governor of the hanse of London, and he was called the Count of the Hanse. The fair of Bruges, held in the month of May, brought together traders from the whole world. 'Thither came for exchange,' says the most modern and most enlightened historian of Flanders (Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, '*Histoire de Flandre*,' t. ii., p. 300), 'the produce of the North and the South, the riches collected in the pilgrimages to Novgorod, and those brought over by the caravans from Samarcand and Bagdad, the pitch of Norway and the oils of Andalusia, the furs of Russia and the dates from the Atlas, the metals of Hungary and Bohemia, the figs of Granada, the honey of Portugal, the wax of Morocco, and the spice of Egypt; whereby, says an ancient manuscript, no land is to be compared in merchandise to the land of Flanders.' . . . So much prosperity made the Counts of Flanders very puissant lords. 'Marguerite II., called "the Black," Countess of Flanders and Hainault, from 1244 to 1280, was extremely rich,' says a chronicler, 'not only in lands, but in furniture, jewels, and money; . . . insomuch that she kept up the state of queen rather than countess.' Nearly all the Flemish towns were strongly organised communes, in which prosperity had won liberty, and which became before long small republics, sufficiently powerful not only for the defence of their municipal rights against the Counts of Flanders, their lords, but for offering an armed resistance to such of the sovereigns their neighbours as attempted to conquer them or to trammel them in their commercial relations, or to draw upon their wealth by forced contributions or by plunder."—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: J. Hutton, *James and Philip Van Arteveld*, pt. 1, ch. 2. See, also, TRADE.

A. D. 1299-1304.—The war with Philip the Fair.—As the Flemings advanced in wealth and consequence, the feudal dependence of their country upon the French crown grew increasingly irksome and oppressive to them, and their attitude towards France became one of confirmed hostility. At the same time, they were drawn to a friendly leaning towards England by common commercial interests. This showed itself decisively on the occasion of the quarrel that arose (A. D. 1295) between Philip IV., called the Fair, and Edward I. of England, concerning the rule of the latter in Aquitaine or Guienne. The French king found allies in Scotland; the English king found allies in Flanders. An alliance of marriage, in fact, had been arranged to take place between king Edward and the daughter of Guy de Dampierre, count of Flanders; but Philip contrived treacherously to get possession of the persons of the count and his daughter and imprisoned them both at Paris, declaring the states of the count to be forfeited. In 1299 the two kings settled their quarrel and abandoned their allies on both sides—Scotland to the tender mercies of Edward, and Flanders to the vengeance of the malignant king Philip the Fair. The territory of the Flemings was annexed to the crown of France, and Jacques de Châtillon, uncle of the queen, was appointed governor. Before two years had passed the impatient Flemings were in furious revolt. The insurrection began at Bruges, May 18, 1302, and more than 3,000 Frenchmen in that city were massacred in the first rage of the insurgents. This massacre was called the Bruges Matins. A French army entered Flanders to put down the rising and was confronted at Courtrai (July 11, A. D. 1302) by the Flemish militia. The latter were led by young Guy of Dampierre and a few knights, who dismounted to fight on equal terms with their fellows. "About 20,000 militia, armed only with pikes, which they employed also as implements of husbandry, resolved to abide the onset of 8,000 Knights of gentle blood, 10,000 archers, and 30,000 foot-soldiers, animated by the presence and directed by the military skill of Robert Count of Artois, and of Raoul de Nesle, Constable of France. Courtrai was the object of attack, and the Flemings, anxious for its safety, arranged themselves on a plain before the town, covered in front by a canal." An altercation which occurred between the two French commanders led to the making of a blind and furious charge on the part of the French horsemen, ignorant and heedless of the canal, into which they plunged, horses and riders together, in one inextricable mass, and where, in their helplessness, they were slain without scruple by the Flemings. "Philip had lost his most experienced Generals, and the flower of his troops; but his obstinacy was unbending." In repeated campaigns during the next two years, Philip strove hard to retrieve the disaster of Courtrai. He succeeded, at last (A. D. 1304), in achieving, with the help of the Genoese, a naval victory in the Zuruck-Zee, followed by a victory, personally his own, at Mons-en-Puelle, in September of the same year. Then, finding the Flemings as dauntlessly ready as ever to renew the fight, he gave up to their obstinacy and acknowledged the independence of the county.

A treaty was signed, in which "the independence of Flanders was acknowledged under its Count, Robert de Bethune (the eldest son of Guy de Dampierre), who, together with his brothers and all the other Flemish prisoners, was to be restored to liberty. The Flemings, on the other hand, consented to surrender those districts beyond the Lys in which the French language was vernacularly spoken; and to this territory were added the cities of Douai, Lille, and their dependencies. They engaged, moreover, to furnish by instalments 200,000 livres in order to cover the expenses which Philip had incurred by their invasion."—E. Smedley, *Hist. of France*, pt. 1, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: J. Hutton, *James and Philip Van Arteveld*, pt. 1, ch. 2-3.—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 5, ch. 2.

A. D. 1314.—Dishonesty of Philip of France.—Philip was one of the most treacherous of princes, and his treaty with the Flemings did not secure them against him. "The Flemings, who had paid the whole of the money stipulated by the treaty of 1305, demanded the restitution of that part of Flanders which had been given up as a pledge; but Philippe refused to restore it on the plea that it had been given to him absolutely and not conditionally. He commenced hostilities [A. D. 1314] by seizing upon the counties of Nevers and Rethel, belonging to the count of Flanders and his eldest son, who replied by laying siege to Lille." Philippe was making great exertions to raise money for a vigorous prosecution of the war, when he died suddenly, Nov. 25, 1314, as the result of an accident in hunting.—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, bk. 2, ch. 2.

A. D. 1328.—The Battle of Cassel.—The first act of Philip of Valois, King of France, after his coronation in 1328, was to take up the cause of his cousin, Louis de Nevers, Count of Flanders, who had been driven from his territories by the independent burghers of Bruges, Ypres, and other cities, and who had left to him no town save Ghent, in which he dared to appear. The French king "gathered a great host of feudal lords, who rejoiced in the thought of Flemish spoil, and marched to Arras, and thence onwards into Flanders. He pitched his tent under the hill of Cassel, 'with the fairest and greatest host in the world' around him. The Flemish, under Claus Dennequin, lay on the hill-top: thence they came down all unawares in three columns on the French camp in the evening, and surprised the King at supper and all but took him. The French soon recovered from the surprise; 'for God would not consent that lords should be discomfited by such riffraff': they slew the Flemish Captain Dennequin, and of the rest but few escaped; 'for they deemed not to flee,' so stubborn were those despised weavers of Flanders. This little battle, with its great carnage of Flemish, sufficed to lay all Flanders at the feet of its count."—G. W. Kitchen, *Hist. of France*, bk. 4, ch. 1.—"Sixteen thousand Flemings had marched to the attack in three divisions. Three heaps of slain were counted on the morrow in the French lines, amounting altogether to 13,000 corpses; and it is said that Louis . . . inflicted death upon 10,000 more of the rebels."—E. Smedley, *Hist. of France*, pt. 1, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: Froissart (Johnes), *Chronicles*, bk. 1, ch. 21-22.

A. D. 1335-1337.—The revolt under Jacques Van Arteveld.—The alliance with England.—The most important measure by which Edward III. of England prepared himself for the invasion of France, as a claimant of the French crown [See FRANCE: A. D. 1328-1339] was the securing of an alliance with the Flemish burghers. This was made easy for him by his enemies. "The Flemings happened to have a count who was wholly French—Louis de Nevers—who was only count through the battle of Cassel and the humiliation of his country, and who resided at Paris, at the court of Philippe de Valois. Without consulting his subjects, he ordered a general arrest of all the English throughout Flanders; on which Edward had all the Flemings in England arrested. The commerce, which was the life-blood of each country, was thus suddenly broken off. To attack the English through Guyenne and Flanders was to wound them in their most sensible parts, to deprive them of cloth and wine. They sold their wool at Bruges, in order to buy wine at Bordeaux. On the other hand, without English wool, the Flemings were at a standstill. Edward prohibited the exportation of wool, reduced Flanders to despair, and forced her to fling herself into his arms. At first, a crowd of Flemish workmen emigrated into England, whither they were allured at any cost, and by every kind of flattery and caress. . . . I take it that the English character has been seriously modified by these emigrations, which went on during the whole of the fourteenth century. Previously, we find no indications of that patient industry which now distinguishes the English. By endeavouring to separate Flanders and England the French king only stimulated Flemish emigration, and laid the foundation of England's manufactures. Meanwhile, Flanders did not resign herself. The towns burst into insurrection. They had long hated the count, either because he supported the country against the monopoly of the towns, or because he admitted the foreigners, the Frenchmen, to a share of their commerce. The men of Ghent, who undoubtedly repented of having withheld their aid from those of Ypres and of Bruges at the battle of Cassel, chose, in 1337, as their leader, the brewer, Jacquemart Arteveld. Supported by the guilds, and, in particular, by the fullers and clothiers, Arteveld organized a vigorous tyranny. He assembled at Ghent the men of the three great cities, 'and showed them that they could not live without the king of England; for all Flanders depended on cloth-making, and, without wool, one could not make cloth; therefore he recommended them to keep the English king their friend.'"—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 6, ch. 1.

Also in F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 20.—J. Hutton, *James and Philip Van Artevelde*, pt. 3.—J. Froissart, *Chronicles (Johnes's trans.)*, bk. 1, ch. 29.

A. D. 1345.—The end of Jacques Van Arteveld.—"Jacob von Arteveld, the citizen of Ghent that was so much attached to the king of England, still maintained the same despotic power over all Flanders. He had promised the king of England, that he would give him the inheritance of Flanders, invest his son the prince of Wales with it, and make it a duchy instead of an earldom. Upon which account

the king was, at this period, about St. John the Baptist's day, 1345, come to Sluys, with a numerous attendance of barons and knights. He had brought the prince of Wales with him, in order that Jacob von Arteveld's promises might be realized. The king remained on board his fleet in the harbour of Sluys, where he kept his court. His friends in Flanders came thither to see and visit him; and there were many conferences between the king and Jacob Von Arteveld on one side, and the councils from the different capital towns on the other, relative to the agreement before mentioned. . . . When on his return he [Van Arteveld] came to Ghent about mid-day, the townsmen who were informed of the hour he was expected, had assembled in the street that he was to pass through; as soon as they saw him, they began to murmur, and put their heads close together, saying, 'Here comes one who is too much the master, and wants to order in Flanders according to his will and pleasure, which must not be longer borne.' With this they had also spread a rumour through the town, that Jacob von Arteveld had collected all the revenues of Flanders, for nine years and more. . . . Of this great treasure he had sent part into England. This information inflamed those of Ghent with rage; and, as he was riding up the streets, he perceived that there was something in agitation against him; for those who were wont to salute him very respectfully, now turned their backs, and went into their houses. He began therefore to suspect all was not as usual; and as soon as he had dismounted, and entered his hôtel, he ordered the doors and windows to be shut and fastened. Scarcely had his servants done this, when the street which he inhabited was filled from one end to the other with all sorts of people, but especially by the lowest of the mechanics. His mansion was surrounded on every side, attacked and broken into by force. Those within did all they could to defend it, and killed and wounded many; but at last they could not hold out against such vigorous attacks, for three parts of the town were there. When Jacob von Arteveld saw what efforts were making, and how hardly he was pushed, he came to a window; and, with his head uncovered, began to use humble and fine language. . . . When Jacob von Arteveld saw that he could not appease or calm them, he shut the window, and intended getting out of his house the back way, to take shelter in a church adjoining; but his hôtel was already broke into on that side, and upwards of four hundred were there calling out for him. At last he was seized by them, and slain without mercy: his death-stroke was given him by a sadler, called Thomas Denys. In this manner did Jacob von Arteveld end his days, who in his time had been complete master of Flanders. Poor men first raised him, and wicked men slew him."—J. Froissart (Johnes), *Chronicles*, bk. 1, ch. 115 (v. 1).

A. D. 1379-1381.—The revolt of the White Hoods.—"We will . . . speak of the war in Flanders, which began about this time [A. D. 1379]. The people were very murderous and cruel, and multitudes were slain or driven out of the country. The country itself was so much ruined, that it was said a hundred years would not restore it to the situation it was in before the war. Before the commencement of these wars in Flanders, the country was so fertile, and everything in such abundance, that it was mar-

vellous to see; and the inhabitants of the principal towns lived in very grand state. You must know that this war originated in the pride and hatred that several of the chief towns bore to each other: those of Ghent against Bruges, and others, in like manner, vying with each other through envy. However, this could not have created a war without the consent of their lord, the earl of Flanders, who was so much loved and feared that no one dared anger him." It is in these words that the old court chronicler, Froissart, begins his fully detailed and graphic narrative of the miserable years, from 1379 to 1384, during which the communes of Flanders were at war with one another and at war with their worthless and oppressive count, Luis de Maele. The picturesque chronicle is colored with the prejudices of Froissart against the Flemish burghers and in favor of their lord; but no one can doubt that the always turbulent citizens were jealous of rights which the always rapacious lord never ceased to encroach upon. As Froissart tells the story, the outbreak of war began with an attempt on the part of the men of Bruges, to dig a canal which would divert the waters of the river Lys. When those of Ghent had news of this unfriendly undertaking, they took counsel of one John Yoens, or John Lyon, a burgher of much cunning, who had formerly been in favor with the count, but whom his enemies had supplanted. "When he [John Lyon] was prevailed on to speak, he said: 'Gentlemen, if you wish to risk this business, and put an end to it, you must renew an ancient custom that formerly subsisted in the town of Ghent: I mean, you must first put on white-hoods, and choose a leader, to whom every one may look, and rally at his signal.' This harangue was eagerly listened to, and they all cried out, 'We will have it so, we will have it so! now let us put on white-hoods.' White-hoods were directly made, and given out to those among them who loved war better than peace, and had nothing to lose. John Lyon was elected chief of the White Hoods. He very willingly accepted of this office, to avenge himself on his enemies, to embroil the towns of Ghent and Bruges with each other and with the earl their lord. He was ordered, as their chief, to march against the pioneers and diggers from Bruges, and had with him 200 such people as preferred rioting to quiet."—Froissart (Johnes) *Chronicles*, bk. 2, ch. 36-102 — When the White Hoods had driven the ditchers of Bruges from their canal, they returned to Ghent, but not to disband. Presently the jealous count required them to lay aside the peculiar badge of their association, which they declined to do. Then Count Louis sent his bailiff into Ghent with 200 horsemen, to arrest John Lyon, and some others of his band. The White Hoods rallied, slew the bailiff and drove his posse from the town; after which unmistakable deed Ghent and the count were distinctly at war. The city of the White Hoods took prompt measures to secure the alliance and support of its neighbors. Some nine or ten thousand of its citizens marched to Bruges, and partly by persuasion, partly by force, partly by the help of the popular party in the town, they effected a treaty of friendship and alliance — which did not endure, however, very long. Courtray, Damme, Ypres and other cities joined the league and it soon presented a formidable array. Oudenarde,

strongly fortified, by the count, became the key of the situation, and was besieged by the citizen-militia. In the midst of the siege, the Duke of Burgundy, son-in-law of the count, made successful efforts to bring about a peace (Dec. 1379). "The count promised to forget the past and return to his residence in Ghent. This peace, however, was of short duration; and the count, after passing only two or three days in Ghent, alleged some cause of dissatisfaction and returned to Lille, to recommence hostilities, in the course of which, with the assistance of the richer citizens, he made himself master of Bruges. Another peace was signed in the August of 1380, which was no more durable than the former, and the count reduced Ypres; and, at the head of an army of 60,000 men, laid siege to Ghent itself, the chief and soul of the popular confederacy, in the month of September. But the citizens of Ghent defended themselves so well that he was obliged to raise the siege in the middle of November, and agree to a truce. This truce also was broken by the count's party, the war renewed in the beginning of the year 1381, and the men of Ghent experienced a disastrous defeat in the battle of Nevelle towards the middle of May. It was a war of extermination, and was carried on with extreme ferocity. . . . Ghent itself, now closely blockaded by the count's troops, was only saved by the great qualities of Philip Van Artevelde [son of Jacques Van Arteveld, of the revolution of 1337], who, by a sort of peaceful revolution, was placed at the head of affairs [Jan. 25, 1381]. The victory of Beverholt, in which the count was defeated with great slaughter, and only escaped with difficulty, made the town of Ghent again master of Flanders."—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, bk. 2, ch. 8.

ALSO IN J. Hutton, *James and Philip Van Arteveld*, ch. 14-16.—W. C. Taylor, *Revolutions, Insurrections and Conspiracies of Europe*, v. 2, ch. 7-9.

A. D. 1382.—The rebellion crushed.—By the marriage of Philip, Duke of Burgundy, to the daughter and heiress of the Count of Flanders, that powerful French prince had become interested in the suppression of the revolt of the Flemish burghers and the restoration of the count to his lordship. His nephew, the young king of France, Charles VI., was easily persuaded to undertake a campaign to that end, and an army of considerable magnitude was personally led northwards by the monarch of fourteen years. "The object of the expedition was not only to restore to the Count of Flanders his authority, but to punish the turbulent commons, who stirred up those of France to imitate their example. Froissart avows it to have been a war between the commons and the aristocracy. The Flemings were commanded by Artaveldt, son of the famous brewer, the ally of Edward III. The town of Ghent had been reduced to the extreme of distress and famine by the count and the people of Bruges, who supported him. Artaveldt led the people of Ghent in a forlorn hope against Bruges, defeated the army of the count, and broke into the rival town, which he took and plundered. After this disaster, the count had recourse to France. The passage of the river Lys, which defended Flanders, was courageously undertaken, and effected with some hazard by the French. The Flemings were rather dispirited by this first success:

nevertheless, they assembled their forces; and the two armies of French knights and Flemish citizens met at Rosebecque [or Roosebeck], between Ypres and Courtray. The 27th of November, 1382, was the day of battle. Artaveldt had stationed his army on a height, to await the attack of the French, but their impatience forced him to commence. Forming his troops into one solid square, Artaveldt led them against the French centre. Froissart compares their charge to the headlong rush of a wild boar. It broke the opposite line, penetrating into its ranks: but the wings of the French turned upon the flank of the Flemings, which, not having the advantage of a charge or impulse, were beaten by the French men at arms. Pressed upon one another, the Flemings had not room to fight: they were hemmed in, surrounded, and slaughtered: no quarter was asked or given; nearly 30,000 perished. The 9,000 Ghentois that had marched under their banner were counted, to a man, amongst the slain: Artaveldt, their general, was among the foremost who had fallen. Charles ordered his body to be hung upon a tree. It was at Courtray, very near to the field where this battle was fought, that Robert of Artois, with a French army, had perished beneath the swords of the Flemings, nearly a century previous. The gilded spurs of the French knights still adorned the walls of the cathedral of Courtray. The victory of Rosebecque in the eyes of Charles had not sufficiently repaid the former defeat: the town of Courtray was pillaged and burnt; its famous clock was removed to Dijon, and formed the third wonder of this kind in France, Paris and Sens alone possessing similar ornaments. The battle of Rosebecque proved more unfortunate for the communes of France than for those of Flanders. Ghent, notwithstanding her loss of 9,000 slain, did not yield to the conqueror, but held out the war for two years longer; and did not finally submit until the Duke of Burgundy, at the death of their count, guaranteed to the burghers the full enjoyment of their privileges. The king avenged himself on the mutinous city of Paris; entered it as a conqueror; took the chains from the streets and unhinged the gates: one hundred of the citizens were sent to the scaffold; the property of the rich was confiscated; and all the ancient and most onerous taxes, the gabelle, the duty on sales, as well as that of entry, were declared by royal ordinance to be established anew. The principal towns of the kingdom were visited with the same punishments and exactions. The victory of Rosebecque overthrew the commons of France, which were crushed under the feet of the young monarch and his nobles."—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of France*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN Sir J. Froissart (Johnes) *Chronicles*, bk. 2, ch. 111-130.—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 7, ch. 1 (v. 2).—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 23 (v. 3).

A. D. 1383.—The Bishop of Norwich's Crusade.—The crushing defeat of the Flemings at Rosebeke produced alarm in England, where the triumph of the French was quickly felt to be threatening. "English merchants were expelled from Bruges, and their property was confiscated. Calais even was in danger. The French were at Dunkirk and Gravelines, and might by a sudden dash on Calais drive the English out." There

had been aid from England promised to Van Artevelde, but the promise had only helped on the ruin of the Ghent patriot by misleading him. No help had come when he needed it. Now, when it was too late, the English bestirred themselves. For some months there had been on foot among them a Crusade, which Pope Urban VI. had proclaimed against the supporters of the rival Pope Clement VII.—the "Schismatics." France took the side of the latter and was counted among the Schismatics. Accordingly, Pope Urban's Crusade, so far as the English people could be moved to engage in it, was now directed against the French in Flanders. It was led by the Bishop of Norwich, who succeeded in rousing a very considerable degree of enthusiasm in the country for the movement, despite the earnest opposition of Wyclif and his followers. The crusading army assembled at Calais in the spring of 1383, professedly for a campaign in France; but the Bishop found excuses for leading it into Flanders. Gravelines was first attacked, carried by storm, and its male defenders slaughtered to a man. An army of French and Flemings, encountered near Dunkirk, was routed, with fearful carnage, and the whole coast, including Dunkirk, fell into the hands of the English. Then they laid siege to Ypres, and there their disasters began. The city held out with stubbornness from the 9th of June until the 10th of August, when the baffled besiegers—repulsed in a last desperate assault which they had made on the 8th—marched away. "Ypres might rejoice, but the disasters of the long siege proved final. Her stately faubourgs were not rebuilt, and she has never again taken her former rank among the cities of Flanders." In September a powerful French army entered Flanders, and the English crusaders could do nothing but retreat before it, giving up Cassel (which the French burned), then Bergues, then Bourbourg, after a siege, and, finally, setting fire to Gravelines and abandoning that place. "Gravelines was utterly destroyed, but the French soon began to rebuild it. It was repopled from the surrounding country, and fortified strongly as a menace to Calais." The Crusaders returned to England "dripping with blood and disgracing their country. Blessed be God who confounds the proud," says one sharp critic, who appears to have been a monk of Canterbury."—G. M. Wrong, *The Crusade of MCCCLXXXIII.*

ALSO IN Sir J. Froissart, (Johnes) *Chronicles* bk. 2, ch. 130-145 (v. 1-2).

A. D. 1383.—Joined to the Dominions of the Duke of Burgundy.—"Charles V. [of France] had formed the design of obtaining Flanders for his brother Philip, Duke of Burgundy, afterwards known as Philip the Bold—by marrying him to Margaret [daughter and heiress of Louis de Maele, count of Flanders]. To gain the good will of the Communes, he engaged to restore the three bailiwicks of Lille, Douai, and Orchies as a substitute for the 10,000 livres a year promised to Louis de Maele and his successors in 1351, as well as the towns of Peronne, Crèveceur, Arleux and Château-Chinon, assigned to him in 1358. . . . On the 13th May, 1369, the 'Lion of Flanders' once more floated, after an interval of half a century, over the walls of Lille, Douai, and Orchies, and at the same time Flemish garrisons marched into St. Omer, Aire, Béthune and Hesdin. The marriage ceremony took place at

FLANDERS.

Ghent on the 19th of June." The Duke of Burgundy waited fourteen years for the heritage of his wife. In January, 1383, Count Louis died, and Flanders was added to the great and growing dominion of the new Burgundian house.—J. Hutton, *James and Philip van Arteveld*, ch. 14 and 18.

See BURGUNDY (THE FRENCH DUKEDOM): A. D. 1364.

A. D. 1451-1453.—Revolt against the Burgundian Gabelle. See GHENT: A. D. 1451-1453.

A. D. 1477.—Severance from Burgundy.—Transference to the Austrian House by marriage of Mary of Burgundy. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1477.

A. D. 1482-1488.—Resistance to Maximilian. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1482-1493.

A. D. 1494-1588.—The Austro-Spanish sovereignty and its oppressions.—The great revolt and its failure in the Flemish provinces. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1494-1519, and after.

A. D. 1529.—Pretensions of the king of France to Suzerainty resigned. See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

A. D. 1539-1540.—The unsupported revolt of Ghent. See GHENT: A. D. 1539-1540.

A. D. 1594-1884.—Later history. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1594-1609, to 1830-1884.

FLATHEAD INDIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: FLATHEADS.

FLAVIA CÆSARIENSIS. See BRITAIN: A. D. 323-337.

FLAVIAN AMPHITHEATRE, The. See COLOSSEUM.

FLAVIAN FAMILY, The.—"We have designated the second period of the [Roman] Empire by the name of the Flavian family—the family of Vespasian [Titus Flavius Vespasian]. The nine Emperors who were successively invested with the purple, in the space of the 123

FLORENCE.

years from his accession, were not all, however, of Flavian race, even by the rites of adoption, which in Rome was become a second nature; but the respect of the world for the virtues of Flavius Vespasian induced them all to assume his name, and most of them showed themselves worthy of such an affiliation. Vespasian had been invested with the purple at Alexandria, on the 1st of July, A. D. 69; he died in 79. His two sons reigned in succession after him; Titus, from 79 to 81; Domitian, from 81 to 96. The latter having been assassinated, Nerva, then an old man, was raised to the throne by the Senate (A. D. 96-98). He adopted Trajan (98-117); who adopted Adrian (117-138). Adrian adopted Antoninus Pius (138-161); who adopted Marcus Aurelius (161-180); and Commodus succeeded his father, Marcus Aurelius (180-192). No period in history presents such a succession of good and great men upon any throne: two monsters, Domitian and Commodus, interrupt and terminate it."—J. C. L. Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 2.

FLEETWOOD, OR BRANDY STATION, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (JUNE: VIRGINIA).

FLEIX, The Peace of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1578-1580.

FLEMINGS.—Flemish. See FLANDERS.

FLEMISH GUILDS. See GUILDS OF FLANDERS.

FLEURUS, Battle of (1622). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1621-1633.

FLEURUS, Battle of (1690). See FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690.

FLEURUS, Battle of (1794). See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (MARCH—JULY).

FLODDEN, Battle of (A. D. 1513). See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1513.

FLORALIA, The. See LUDI.

FLORÉAL, The month. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER).

FLORENCE.

Origin and Name: "Fæsulæ was situated on a hill above Florence. Florentine traditions call it the metropolis of Florence, which would accordingly be a colony of Fæsulæ; but a statement in Machiavelli and others describes Florence as a colony of Sulla, and this statement must have been derived from some local chronicle. Fæsulæ was no doubt an ancient Etruscan town, probably one of the twelve. It was taken in the war of Sulla [B. C. 82-81]. . . . My conjecture is, that Sulla not only built a strong fort on the top of the hill of Fæsulæ, but also the new colony of Florentia below, and gave to it the 'ager Fæsulanus.'"—B. G. Niebuhr, *Lects. on Ancient Ethnogr. and Geog.* v. 2, p. 228.—"We can reasonably suppose that the ancient trading nations may have pushed their small craft up the Arno to the present site of Florence, and thus have gained a more immediate communication with the flourishing city of Fiesole than they could through other ports of Etruria, from

whatever race its people might have sprung. Admitting the high antiquity of Fiesole, the imagined work of Atlas, and the tomb of his celestial daughter, we may easily believe that a market was from very early times established in the plain, where both by land and water the rural produce could be brought for sale without ascending the steep on which that city stood. Such arrangements would naturally result from the common course of events, and a more convenient spot could scarcely be found than the present site of Florence, to which the Arno is still navigable by boats from its mouth, and at that time perhaps by two branches. . . . 'There were,' says Villani, 'inhabitants round San Giovanni, because the people of Fiesole held their market there one day in the week, and it was called the Field of Mars, the ancient name: however it was always, from the first, the market of the Fiesolines, and thus it was called before Florence existed.' And again: 'The Prætor

Florus, with a Roman army, encamped beyond the Arno towards Fiesole and had two small villages there. . . . where the people of Fiesole one day in the week held a general market with the neighbouring towns and villages. . . . On the site of this camp, as we are also assured by Villani, was erected the city of Florence, after the capture of Fiesole by Pompey, Caesar, and Martius; but Leonardo Aretino, following Malespini, asserts that it was the work of Sylla's legions, who were already in possession of Fiesole. . . . The variety of opinions almost equals the number of authors. . . . It may be reasonably concluded that Florence, springing originally from Fiesole, finally rose to the rank of a Roman colony and the seat of provincial government; a miniature of Rome, with its Campus Martius, its Capitol, Forum, temple of Mars, aqueducts, baths, theatre and amphitheatre, all erected in imitation of the 'Eternal City;' for vestiges of all these are still existing either in name or substance. The name of Florence is as dark as its origin, and a thousand derivations have confused the brains of antiquarians and their readers without much enlightening them, while the beautiful *Giagiolo* or *Iris*, the city's emblem, still clings to her old grey walls, as if to assert its right to be considered as the genuine source of her poetic appellation. From the profusion of these flowers that formerly decorated the meads between the rivers Mugnone and Arno, has sprung one of the most popular opinions on the subject; for a white plant of the same species having shown itself amongst the rising fabrics, the incident was poetically seized upon and the Lily then first assumed its station in the crimson banner of Florence."—H. E. Napier, *Florentine History*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

A. D. 406.—Siege by Radagaisus.—Deliverance by Stilicho. See *ROME*: A. D. 404-408.

12th Century.—Acquisition of republican independence.—"There is . . . an assertion by Villani, that Florence contained 'twenty-two thousand fighting men, without counting the old men and children,' about the middle of the sixth century; and modern statisticians have based on this statement an estimate which would make the population of the city at that period about sixty-one thousand. There are reasons too for believing that very little difference in the population took place during several centuries after that time. Then came the sudden increase arising from the destruction, more or less entire, of Fiesole, and the incorporation of its inhabitants with those of the newer city, which led to the building of the second walls. . . . An estimate taking the inhabitants of the city at something between seventy and eighty thousand at the period respecting which we are inquiring [beginning of the 12th century] would in all probability be not very wide of the mark. The government of the city was at that time lodged in the hands of magistrates exercising both legislative and administrative authority, called Consuls, assisted by a senate composed of a hundred citizens of worth—*buoni uomini*. These Consuls 'guided everything, and governed the city, and decided causes, and administered justice.' They remained in office for one year. How long this form of government had been established in Florence is uncertain. It was not in existence in the year 897; but it was in activity in 1102. From 1188

we have a nearly complete roll of the names of the consuls for each year down to 1219. . . . The first recorded deeds of the young community thus governed, and beginning to feel conscious and proud of its increasing strength, were characteristic enough of the tone of opinion and sentiment which prevailed within its walls, and of the career on which it was entering. 'In the year 1107,' says Malispini, 'the city of Florence being much increased, the Florentines, wishing to extend their territory, determined to make war against any castle or fortress which would not be obedient to them. And in that year they took by force Monte Orlando, which belonged to certain gentlemen who would not be obedient to the city. And they were defeated, and the castle was destroyed.' These 'gentlemen,' so styled by the civic historian who thus curtly records the destruction of their home, in contradistinction to the citizens who by no means considered themselves such, were the descendants or representatives of those knights and captains, mostly of German race, to whom the Emperors had made grants of the soil according to the feudal practice and system. They held directly of the Empire, and in no wise owed allegiance or obedience of any sort to the community of Florence. But they occupied almost all the country around the rising city; and the citizens 'wanted to extend their territory.' Besides, these territorial lords were, as has been said, gentlemen, and lived as such, stopping wayfarers on the highways, levying tolls in the neighbourhood of their strongholds, and in many ways making themselves disagreeable neighbours to peaceable folks. . . . The next incident on the record, however, would seem to show that peaceful townfolk as well as marauding nobles were liable to be overrun by the car of manifest destiny, if they came in the way of it. 'In the same year,' says the curt old historian, 'the men of Prato rebelled against the Florentines; wherefore they went out in battle against it, and took it by siege and destroyed it.' Prato rebelled against Florence! It is a very singular statement; for there is not the shadow of a pretence put forward, or the smallest ground for imagining that Florence had or could have claimed any sort of suzerainty over Prato. . . . The territorial nobles, however, who held castles in the district around Florence were the principal objects of the early prowess of the citizens; and of course offence against them was offence against the Emperor. . . . In 1113, accordingly, we find an Imperial vicar residing in Tuscany at St. Miniato; not the convent-topped hill of that name in the immediate neighbourhood of Florence, but a little mountain city of the same name, overlooking the lower Valdarno, about half way between Florence and Pisa. . . . There the Imperial Vicars perched themselves hawk-like, with their Imperial troops, and swooped down from time to time to chastise and bring back such cities of the plain as too audaciously set at naught the authority of the Emperor. And really these upstart Florentines were taking the bit between their teeth, and going on in a way that no Imperial Vicar could tolerate. . . . So the indignant cry of the harried Counts Cadolingi, and of several other nobles holding of the Empire, whose houses had been burned over their heads by these audacious citizens, went up to the ears of 'Messer Ruberto,' the Vicar, in San Miniato. Whereupon that noble knight, indignant at the wrong

done to his fellow nobles, as well as at the offence against the authority of his master the Emperor, forthwith put lance in rest, called out his men, and descended from his mountain fortress to take summary vengeance on the audacious city. On his way thither he had to pass through that very gorge where the castle of Monte Orlando had stood, and under the ruins of the house from which the noble vassals of the Empire had been harried. . . . There were the leathern-jerkined citizens on the very scene of their late misdeed, come out to oppose the further progress of the Emperor's Vicar and his soldiers. And there, as the historian writes, with curiously impassible brevity, 'the said Messer Ruberto was discomfited and killed.' And nothing further is heard of him, or of any after consequences resulting from the deed. Learned legal antiquaries insist much on the fact, that the independence of Florence and the other Communes was never 'recognised' by the Emperors; and they are no doubt perfectly accurate in saying so. One would think, however, that that unlucky Vicar of theirs, Messer Ruberto, must have 'recognised' the fact, though somewhat tardily."—T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence*, bk. 1, ch. 1 (v. 1).—Countess Matilda, the famous friend of Pope Gregory VII., whose wide dominion included Tuscany, died in 1115, bequeathing her vast possessions to the Church (see PAPACY: A. D. 1077-1102). "In reality she was only entitled thus to bequeath her allodial lands, the remainder being imperial fiefs. But as it was not always easy to distinguish between the two sorts, and the popes were naturally anxious to get as much as they could, a fresh source of contention was added to the constant quarrels between the Empire and the Church. 'Henry IV. immediately despatched a representative into Tuscany, who under the title of Marchio, Judex, or Praeses, was to govern the Marquisate in his name.' 'Nobody,' says Professor Villari, 'could legally dispute his right to do this: but the opposition of the Pope, the attitude of the towns which now considered themselves independent and the universal confusion rendered the Marquis's authority illusory. The imperial representatives had no choice but to put themselves at the head of the feudal nobility of the contado and unite it into a Germanic party hostile to the cities. In the documents of the period the members of this party are continually described as Teutonici.' By throwing herself in this juncture on the side of the Pope, and thus becoming the declared opponent of the empire and the feudal lords, Florence practically proclaimed her independence. The grandi, having the same interests with the working classes, identified themselves with these; became their leaders, their consuls in fact if not yet in name. Thus was the consular commune born, or, rather, thus did it recognize itself on reaching manhood; for born, in reality, it had already been for some time, only so quietly and unconsciously that nobody had marked its origin or, until now, its growth. The first direct consequence of this self-recognition was that the rulers were chosen out of a larger number of families. As long as Matilda had chosen the officers to whom the government of the town was entrusted, the Uberti and a few others who formed their clan, their kinsmen, and their connections had been selected, to the exclusion of the mass of the citizens. Now more

people were admitted to a share in the administration: the offices were of shorter duration, and out of those selected to govern each family had its turn. But those who had formerly been privileged—the Uberti and others of the same tendencies and influence—were necessarily discontented with this state of things, and there are indications in Villani of burnings and of tumults such as later, when the era of faction fights had fairly begun, so often desolated the streets of Florence."—B. Duffy, *The Tuscan Republics*, ch. 6.—See ITALY: A. D. 1056-1152.

A. D. 1215-1250.—The beginning, the causes and the meaning of the strife of the Guelfs and Ghibellines.—Nearly from the beginning of the 13th century, all Italy, and Florence more than other Italian communities, became distracted and convulsed by a contest of raging factions. "The main distinction was that between Ghibellines and Guelfs—two names in their origin far removed from Italy. They were first heard in Germany in 1140, when at Winsberg in Suabia a battle was fought between two contending claimants of the Empire; the one, Conrad of Hohenstauffen, Duke of Franconia, chose for his battle-cry 'Waiblingen,' the name of his patrimonial castle in Württemberg; the other, Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, chose his own family name of 'Welf,' or 'Wölff.' Conrad proved victorious, and his kindred to the fourth ensuing generation occupied the imperial throne; yet both war-cries survived the contest which gave them birth, lingering on in Germany as equivalents of Imperialist and anti-Imperialist. By a process perfectly clear to philologists, they were modified in Italy into the forms Ghibellino and Guelfo; and the Popes being there the great opponents of the Emperors, an Italian Guelf was a Papalist. The cities were mainly Guelf; the nobles most frequently Ghibelline. A private feud had been the means of involving Florence in the contest."—M. F. Rossetti, *A Shadow of Dante*, ch. 3.—"The Florentines kept themselves united till the year 1215, rendering obedience to the ruling power, and anxious only to preserve their own safety. But, as the diseases which attack our bodies are more dangerous and mortal in proportion as they are delayed, so Florence, though late to take part in the sects of Italy, was afterwards the more afflicted by them. The cause of her first division is well known, having been recorded by Dante and many other writers; I shall, however, briefly notice it. Amongst the most powerful families of Florence were the Buondelmonti and the Uberti; next to these were the Amidei and the Donati. Of the Donati family there was a rich widow who had a daughter of exquisite beauty, for whom, in her own mind, she had fixed upon Buondelmonti, a young gentleman, the head of the Buondelmonti family, as her husband; but either from negligence, or because she thought it might be accomplished at any time, she had not made known her intention, when it happened that the cavalier betrothed himself to a maiden of the Amidei family. This grieved the Donati widow exceedingly; but she hoped, with her daughter's beauty, to disturb the arrangement before the celebration of the marriage; and from an upper apartment, seeing Buondelmonti approach her house alone, she descended, and as he was passing she said to him, 'I am glad to learn you have chosen a wife, although I had reserved my daughter for you';

and, pushing the door open, presented her to his view. The cavalier, seeing the beauty of the girl, . . . became inflamed with such an ardent desire to possess her, that, not thinking of the promise given, or the injury he committed in breaking it, or of the evils which his breach of faith might bring upon himself, said, 'Since you have reserved her for me, I should be very ungrateful indeed to refuse her, being yet at liberty to choose'; and without any delay married her. As soon as the fact became known, the Amidei and the Uberti, whose families were allied, were filled with rage," and some of them, lying in wait for him, assassinated him as he was riding through the streets. "This murder divided the whole city; one party espousing the cause of the Buondelmonti, the other that of the Uberti; and . . . they contended with each other for many years, without one being able to destroy the other. Florence continued in these troubles till the time of Frederick II., who, being king of Naples, endeavoured to strengthen himself against the church; and, to give greater stability to his power in Tuscany, favoured the Uberti and their followers, who, with his assistance, expelled the Buondelmonti; thus our city, as all the rest of Italy had long time been, became divided into Guelphs and Ghibellines."—N. Machiavelli, *Hist. of Florence*, bk. 2, ch. 1.—"Speaking generally, the Ghibellines were the party of the emperor, and the Guelphs the party of the Pope; the Ghibellines were on the side of authority, or sometimes of oppression, the Guelphs were on the side of liberty and self-government. Again, the Ghibellines were the supporters of an universal empire of which Italy was to be the head, the Guelphs were on the side of national life and national individuality. . . . If these definitions could be considered as exhaustive, there would be little doubt as to the side to which our sympathies should be given. . . . We should . . . expect all patriots to be Guelphs, and the Ghibelline party to be composed of men who were too spiritless to resist despotic power, or too selfish to surrender it. But, on the other hand, we must never forget that Dante was a Ghibelline."—O. Browning, *Guelphs and Ghibellines*, ch. 2.—See, also, ITALY: A. D. 1215.

A. D. 1248-1278.—The wars of a generation of the Guelphs and Ghibellines.—In 1248, the Ghibellines, at the instigation of Frederick II., and with help from his German soldiery, expelled the Guelphs from the city, after desperate fighting for several days, and destroyed the mansions of their chiefs, to the number of 38. In 1250 there was a rising of the people—of the under-stratum which the cleavage of parties hardly penetrated—and a popular constitution of government was brought into force. At the same time, the high towers, which were the strongholds of the contending nobles, were thrown down. An attempt was then made by the leaders of the people to restore peace between the Ghibellines and the Guelphs, but the effort was vain; whereupon the Guelphs (in January, 1251) came back to the city, and the Ghibellines were either driven away or were shut up in their city castles, to which they had retired when the people rose. In 1258 the restless Ghibellines plotted with Manfred, King of the Two Sicilies, to regain possession of Florence. The plot was discovered, and the enraged people drove the last lingerers of the faction from their midst and pulled down

their palaces. The great palace of the Uberti family, most obnoxious of all, was not only razed, but a decree was made that no building should ever stand again on its accursed site. The exiled Ghibellines took refuge at Siena, and there plotted again with King Manfred, who sent troops to aid them. The Florentines did not wait to be attacked, but marched out to meet them on Siennese territory, and suffered a terrible defeat at Montaperti (September 4, 1260), in the battle that Dante refers to, "which coloured the river Arbia red." "'On that day,' says Villani, . . . 'was broken and destroyed the old popular government of Florence, which had existed for ten years with so great power and dignity, and had won so many victories.' Few events have ever left a more endurable impression on the memory of a people than this great battle between two cities and parties animated both of them by the most unquenchable hatred. The memory of that day has lasted through 600 years, more freshly perhaps in Siena than in Florence." As a natural consequence of their defeat at Montaperti, the Guelphs were again forced to fly into exile from Florence, and this expatriation included a large number of even the commoner people. "So thorough had been the defeat, so complete the Ghibelline ascendancy resulting from it, that in every city the same scene on a lesser scale was taking place. Many of the smaller towns, which had always been Guelph in their sympathies, were now subjected to Ghibelline despotism. One refuge alone remained in Tuscany—Lucca. . . . And thither the whole body of the expatriated Guelphs betook themselves. . . . The Ghibellines entered Florence in triumph on the 16th of September, three days after their enemies had left it. . . . The city seemed like a desert. The gates were standing open and unguarded; the streets were empty; the comparatively few inhabitants who remained, almost entirely of the lowest class of the populace, were shut up in their obscure dwellings, or were on their knees in the churches. And what was worse, the conquerors did not come back alone. They had invited a foreign despot to restore order;" and so King Manfred's general, Giordano da Anglona, established Count Guido Novello in Florence as Manfred's vicar. "All the constitutional authorities established by the people, and the whole frame-work of the former government, were destroyed, and the city was ruled entirely by direction transmitted from the King's Sicilian court." There were serious proposals, even, that Florence itself should be destroyed, and the saving of the noble city from that untimely fate is credited to one patriotic noble, of the Uberti family, who withstood the proposition, alone. "The Ghibelline army marched on Lucca, and had not much more difficulty in reducing that city. The government was put into Ghibelline hands, and Lucca became a Ghibelline city like all the rest of Tuscany. The Lucchese were not required by the victors to turn their own Guelphs out of the city. But it was imperatively insisted on that every Guelph not a native citizen should be thrust forth from the gates." The unfortunate Florentines, thus made homeless again, now found shelter at Bologna, and presently helped their friends at Modena and Reggio to overcome the Ghibellines in those cities and recover control. But for five years their condition was one

of wretchedness. Then Charles of Anjou was brought into Italy (1265) by the Pope, to snatch the crown of the Two Sicilies from King Manfred, and succeeded in his undertaking.—See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1250-1268. The prop of the Ghibellines was broken. Guido Novello and his troopers rode away from Florence; 800 French horsemen, sent by the new Angevine king, under Guy de Montfort, took their places; the Guelfs swarmed in again—the Ghibellines swarmed out; the popular constitution was restored, with new features more popular than before. In 1273 there was a great attempt made by Pope Gregory X. in person, to reconcile the factions in Florence; but it had so little success that the Holy Father left the city in disgust and pronounced it under interdict for three years. In 1278 the attempt was renewed with somewhat better success. “‘And now, says Villani, ‘the Ghibellines were at liberty to return to Florence, they and their families. . . . And the said Ghibellines had back again their goods and possessions; except that certain of the leading families were ordered, for the safety of the city, to remain for a certain time beyond the boundaries of the Florentine territory.’ In fact, little more is heard henceforward of the Ghibellines as a faction within the walls of Florence. The old name, as a rallying cry for the Tory or Imperialist party, was still raised here and there in Tuscany; and Pisa still called herself Ghibelline. But the stream of progress had run past them and left them stranded.”—T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence*, bk. 1, ch. 4-5, and bk. 2, ch. 1 (v. 1).

ALSO IN N. Machiavelli, *Florentine Histories*, bk. 1.—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Italian Republics*, ch. 4.

A. D. 1250-1293.—Development of the popular constitution of the Commonwealth.—“When it became clear that the republic was to rule itself henceforth untrammelled by imperial interference, the people [in 1250] divided themselves into six districts, and chose for each district two Ancients, who administered the government in concert with the Potestà and the Captain of the People. The Ancients were a relic of the old Roman municipal organization. . . . The body of the citizens, or the popolo, were ultimately sovereigns in the State. Assembled under the banners of their several companies, they formed a parlamento for delegating their own power to each successive government. Their representatives, again, arranged in two councils, called the Council of the People and the Council of the Commune, under the presidency of the Captain of the People and the Potestà, ratified the measures which had previously been proposed and carried by the executive authority or signoria. Under this simple State system the Florentines placed themselves at the head of the Tuscan League, fought the battles of the Church, asserted their sovereignty by issuing the golden florin of the republic, and flourished until 1266. In that year an important change was effected in the Constitution. The whole population of Florence consisted, on the one hand, of nobles or Grandi, as they were called in Tuscany, and on the other hand of working people. The latter, divided into traders and handicraftsmen, were distributed in guilds called Arti; and at that time there were seven Greater and five Lesser Arti, the most

influential of all being the Guild of the Wool Merchants. These guilds had their halls for meeting, their colleges of chief officers, their heads, called Consoli or Priors, and their flags. In 1266 it was decided that the administration of the commonwealth should be placed simply and wholly in the hands of the Arti, and the Priors of these industrial companies became the lords or Signory of Florence. No inhabitant of the city who had not enrolled himself as a craftsman in one of the guilds could exercise any function of burghership. To be sciooperato, or without industry, was to be without power, without rank or place of honour in the State. The revolution which placed the Arts at the head of the republic had the practical effect of excluding the Grandi altogether from the government. . . . In 1293, after the Ghibellines had been defeated in the great battle of Campaldino, a series of severe enactments, called the Ordinances of Justice, were decreed against the unruly Grandi. All civic rights were taken from them; the severest penalties were attached to their slightest infringement of municipal law; their titles to land were limited; the privilege of living within the city walls was allowed them only under galling restrictions; and last not least, a supreme magistrate, named the Gonfalonier of Justice, was created for the special purpose of watching them and carrying out the penal code against them. Henceforward Florence was governed exclusively by merchants and artisans. The Grandi hastened to enroll themselves in the guilds, exchanging their former titles and dignities for the solid privilege of burghership. The exact parallel to this industrial constitution for a commonwealth, carrying on wars with emperors and princes, holding haughty captains in its pay, and dictating laws to subject cities, cannot, I think, be elsewhere found in history. It is as unique as the Florence of Dante and Giotto is unique.”—J. A. Symonds, *Florence and the Medici (Sketches and Studies in Italy)*, ch. 5).

ALSO IN C. Balbo, *Life and Times of Dante*, v. 1, Int.—A. Von Reumont, *Lorenzo de Medici*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

A. D. 1284-1293.—War with Pisa. See PISA: A. D. 1063-1293.

A. D. 1289.—The victory of Campaldino, and the jealousy among its heroes.—In 1289 the Ghibellines of Arezzo having expelled the Guelfs from that city, the Florentines made war in the cause of the latter and won a great victory at Campaldino. This “raised the renown and the military spirit of the Guelf party, for the fame of the battle was very great; the hosts contained the choicest chivalry of either side, armed and appointed with emulous splendour. The fighting was hard, there was brilliant and conspicuous gallantry, and the victory was complete. It sealed Guelf ascendancy. The Ghibelline warrior-bishop of Arezzo fell, with three of the Uberti, and other Ghibelline chiefs. . . . In this battle the Guelf leaders had won great glory. The hero of the day was the proudest, handsomest, craftiest, most winning, most ambitious, most unscrupulous Guelf noble in Florence—one of a family who inherited the spirit and recklessness of the proscribed Uberti, and did not refuse the popular epithet of ‘Malefami’—Corso Donati. He did not come back from the field of Campaldino, where he

had won the battle by disobeying orders, with any increased disposition to yield to rivals, or court the populace, or respect other men's rights. Those rivals, too—and they also had fought gallantly in the post of honour at Campaldino—were such as he hated from his soul—rivals whom he despised, and who yet were too strong for him [the family of the Cerchi]. His blood was ancient, they were upstarts; he was a soldier, they were traders; he was poor, they the richest men in Florence. . . . They had crossed him in marriages, bargains, inheritances. . . . The glories of Campaldino were not as oil on these troubled waters. The conquerors flouted each other all the more fiercely in the streets on their return, and ill-treated the lower people with less scruple.”—R. W. Church, *Dante and Other Essays*, pp. 27-31.

Also in C. Balbo, *Life and Times of Dante*, pt. 1, ch. 6 (v. 1).

A. D. 1295-1300.—New factions in the city, and Dante's relations to them.—The Bianchi and the Neri (Whites and Blacks).—Among the Nobles “who resisted the oppression of the people, Corso Donati must have been the chief, but he did not at first come forward; with one of his usual stratagems, however, he was the cause of a new revolution [January, 1295], which drove Giano della Bella, the leader of the people, from the city. . . . Notwithstanding the fall of Giano, the Nobles did not return into power. He was succeeded as a popular leader by one much his inferior, one Pecora, surnamed, from his trade, the Butcher. New disputes arose between the nobles and the people, and between the upper and lower ranks of the people itself. Villani tells us that, in the year 1295, ‘many families, who were neither tyrannical nor powerful, withdrew from the order of the nobles, and enrolled themselves among the people, diminishing the power of the nobles and increasing that of the people.’ Dante must have been precisely one of those nobles ‘who were neither tyrannical nor powerful;’ and . . . it is certain that he was among those who passed over from their own order to that of the Popolani, by being matriculated in one of the Arts. In a register from 1297 to 1300, of the Art of the physicians and druggists, the fifth of the seven major Arts, he is found matriculated in these words: ‘Dante d’Aldighiero degli Aldighieri poeta fiorentino.’ . . . Dante, by this means, obtained office under the popular government. . . . The new factions that arose in Florence, in almost all Tuscany, and in some of the cities in other parts of Italy, were merely subdivisions of the Guelf party; merely what, in time, happens to every faction after a period of prosperity, a division of the ultras and of the moderates, or of those who hold more or less extravagant views. . . . All this happened to the Guelf party in a very few years, and the Neri and Bianchi, the names of the two divisions of that party, which had arisen in 1300, were no longer mentioned ten years afterwards, but were again lost in the primitive appellations of Guelfs and Ghibellines. Thus this episode would possess little interest, and would be scarcely mentioned in the history of Italy, or even of Florence, had not the name of our sublime Poet been involved in it; and, after his love, it is the most important circumstance of his life, and the one to which he most

frequently alludes in his *Commedia*. It thus becomes a subject worthy of history. . . . Florentine historians attribute Corso Donati's hatred towards Vieri de Cerchi to envy. . . . This envy arose to such a height between Dante's neighbours in Florence that he has rendered it immortal. ‘Through envy,’ says Villani, ‘the citizens began to divide into factions, and one of the principal feuds began in the Sesto dello Scandalo, near the gate of St. Pietro, between the families of the Cerchi and the Donati [from which latter family came Dante's wife]. . . . Messer Vieri was the head of the House of the Cerchi, and he and his house were powerful in affairs, possessing a numerous kindred; they were very rich merchants, for their company was one of the greatest in the world.’” The state of animosity between these two families “was existing in Florence in the beginning of 1300, when it was increased by another rather similar family quarrel that had arisen in Pistoia. . . . ‘There was in Pistoia a family which amounted to more than 100 men capable of bearing arms; it was not of great antiquity, but was powerful, wealthy, and numerous; it was descended from one Cancellieri Notaio, and from him they had preserved Cancellieri as their family name. From the children of the two wives of this man were descended the 107 men of arms that have been enumerated; one of the wives having been named Madonna Bianca, her descendants were called Cancellieri Bianchi (White Cancellieri); and the descendants of the other wife, in opposition, were called Cancellieri Neri (Black Cancellieri).’” Between these two branches of the family of the Cancellieri there arose, some time near the end of the thirteenth century, an implacable feud. ‘Florence . . . exercised a supremacy over Pistoia . . . and fearing that these internal dissensions might do injury to the Guelf party, she took upon herself the lordship or supremacy of that city. The principal Cancellieri, both Bianchi and Neri, were banished to Florence itself; ‘the Neri took up their abode in the house of the Frescobaldi, beyond the Arno; the Bianchi at the house of the Cerchi, in the Garbo, from being connected with them by kindred. But as one sick sheep infects another, and is injurious to the flock, so this cursed seed of discord, that had departed from Pistoia and had now entered Florence, corrupted all the Florentines, and divided them into two parties.’ . . . The Cerchi, formerly called the Forest party (*parte selvaggia*), now assumed the name of Bianchi; and those who followed the Donati were now called Neri. . . . ‘There sided with [the Bianchi, says Villani] the families of the Popolani and petty artisans, and all the Ghibellines, whether Nobles or Popolani.’ . . . Thus the usual position in which the two parties stood was altered; for hitherto the Nobles had almost always been Ghibellines, and the Popolani Guelfs; but now, if the Popolani were not Ghibellines, they were at least not such strong Guelfs as the nobles. Sometimes these parties are referred to as White Guelfs and Black Guelfs.”—C. Balbo, *Life and Times of Dante*, ch. 10.

Also in H. E. Napier, *Florentine History*, bk. 1, ch. 14 (v. 1).—N. Machiavelli, *The Florentine Histories*, bk. 2.

A. D. 1301-1313.—Triumph of the Neri.—Banishment of Dante and his party.—Downfall and death of Corso Donati.—“In the year

1301, a serious affray took place between the two parties [the Bianchi and the Neri]; the whole city was in arms; the law, and the authority of the Signoria, among whom was the poet Dante Alighieri, was set at naught by the great men of each side, while the best citizens looked on with fear and trembling. The Donati, fearing that unaided they would not be a match for their adversaries, proposed that they should put themselves under a ruler of the family of the king of France. Such a direct attack on the independence of the state was not to be borne by the Signoria, among whom the poet had great influence. At his instigation they armed the populace, and with their assistance compelled the heads of the contending parties to lay down their arms, and sent into exile Messer Donati and others who had proposed the calling in of foreigners. A sentence of banishment was also pronounced against the most violent men of the party of the Bianchi, most of whom, however, were allowed, under various pretences, to return to their country. The party of the Donati in their exile carried on those intrigues which they had commenced while at home. They derived considerable assistance from the king of France's brother, Charles of Valois, whom Pope Boniface had brought into Italy. That prince managed, by means of promises, which he subsequently violated, to get admission for himself, together with several of the Neri, and the legate of the pope, into Florence. He then produced letters, generally suspected to be forgeries, charging the leaders of the Bianchi with conspiracy. The popularity of the accused party had already been on the wane, and after a violent tumult, the chief men among them, including Dante, were obliged to leave the city; their goods were confiscated, and their houses destroyed. . . . From this time Corso Donati, the head of the faction of the Neri, became the chief man at Florence. The accounts of its state at this period, taken from the most credible historians, warrant us in thinking that the severe invectives of Dante are not to be ascribed merely to indignation or resentment at the harsh treatment he had received. . . . The city was rent by more violent dissensions than ever. There were now three distinct sources of contention—the jealousy between the people and the nobles, the disputes between the Bianchi and the Neri, and those between the Ghibellines and the Guelfs. It was in vain that the legate of Pope Benedict, a man of great piety, went thither for the sake of trying to restore order. The inhabitants showed how little they respected him by exhibiting a scandalous representation of hell on the river Arno; and, after renewing his efforts without success, he cursed the city and departed [1302]. The reign of Corso Donati ended like that of most of those who have succeeded to power by popular violence. Six years after the banishment of his adversaries he was suspected, not without reason, of endeavouring to make himself independent of constitutional restraints. The Signori declared him guilty of rebellion. After a protracted resistance he made his escape from the city, but was pursued and taken at Rovesca [1308]. When he was led captive by those among whom his authority had lately been paramount, he threw himself under his horse, and, after having been dragged some

distance, he was dispatched by one of the captors. . . . The party that had been raised by Corso Donati continued to hold the chief power at Florence even after the death of their chief. The exiled faction, in the words of one of their leaders, . . . had not learned the art of returning to their country as well as their adversaries. Four years after the events alluded to, the Emperor, Henry VII., made some negotiations in their favour, which but imperfectly succeeded. The Florentines, however, were awed when he approached their city at the head of his army; and in the extremity of their danger they implored the assistance of King Robert of Naples, and made him Lord of their city for the space of five years. The Emperor's mysterious death [August 24, 1313] at Buonconvento freed them from their alarm."—W. P. Urquhart, *Life and Times of Francesco Sforza*, bk. 1, ch. 3 (v. 1).

ALSO in Mrs. Oliphant, *The Makers of Florence*, ch. 2.—B. Duffy, *The Tuscan Republics*, ch. 12.

A. D. 1310-1313.—Resistance to the Emperor, Henry VII.—Siege by the imperial army. See ITALY: A. D. 1310-1313.

A. D. 1313-1328.—Wars with Pisa and with Castruccio Castracani, of Lucca.—Disastrous battles of Montecatini and Altopascio. See ITALY: A. D. 1313-1330.

A. D. 1336-1338.—Alliance with Venice against Mastino della Scala. See VERONA: A. D. 1260-1338.

A. D. 1341-1343.—Defeat by the Pisans before Lucca.—The brief tyranny of the Duke of Athens.—In 1341, Mastino della Scala, of Verona, who had become master of Lucca in 1335 by treachery, offered to sell that town to the Florentines. The bargain was concluded; "but it appeared to the Pisans the signal of their own servitude, for it cut off all communication between them and the Ghibelines of Lombardy. They immediately advanced their militia into the Lucchese states to prevent the Florentines from taking possession of the town; vanquished them in battle, on the 2d of October, 1341, under the walls of Lucca; and, on the 6th of July following, took possession of that city for themselves. The people of Florence attributed this train of disasters to the incapacity of their magistrates. . . . At this period, Gauttier [Walter] de Brienne, duke of Athens, a French noble, but born in Greece, passed through Florence on his way from Naples to France. The duchy of Athens had remained in his family from the conquest of Constantinople till it was taken from his father in 1312. . . . It was for this man the Florentines, after their defeat at Lucca, took a sudden fancy. . . . On the 1st of August, 1342, they obliged the signoria to confer on him the title of captain of justice, and to give him the command of their militia." A month later, the duke, by his arts, had worked such a ferment among the lower classes of the population that they "proclaimed him sovereign lord of Florence for his life, forced the public palace, drove from it the gonfalonier and the priori, and installed him there in their place. . . . Happily, Florence was not ripe for slavery: ten months sufficed for the duke of Athens to draw from it 400,000 golden florins, which he sent either to France or Naples; but ten months sufficed also to undeceive all parties who had placed any confidence in him," and by a universal rising, in July, 1343,

he was driven from the city.—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Italian Republics*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence*, bk. 3, ch. 4 (v. 2).

14th Century.—Industrial Prosperity of the City.—"John Villani has given us an ample and precise account of the state of Florence in the earlier part of the 14th century. The revenue of the Republic amounted to 300,000 florins, a sum which, allowing for the depreciation of the precious metals, was at least equivalent to 600,000 pounds sterling; a larger sum than England and Ireland, two centuries ago, yielded annually to Elizabeth—a larger sum than, according to any computation which we have seen, the Grand Duke of Tuscany now derives from a territory of much greater extent. The manufacture of wool alone employed 200 factories and 30,000 workmen. The cloth annually produced sold, at an average, for 1,200,000 florins; a sum fairly equal, in exchangeable value, to two millions and a half of our money. Four hundred thousand florins were annually coined. Eighty banks conducted the commercial operations, not of Florence only, but of all Europe. The transactions of these establishments were sometimes of a magnitude which may surprise even the contemporaries of the Barings and the Rothschilds. Two houses advanced to Edward the Third of England upwards of 300,000 marks, at a time when the mark contained more silver than 50 shillings of the present day, and when the value of silver was more than quadruple of what it now is. The city and its environs contained 170,000 inhabitants. In the various schools about 10,000 children were taught to read; 1,200 studied arithmetic; 600 received a learned education. The progress of elegant literature and of the fine arts was proportioned to that of the public prosperity. . . . Early in the 14th century came forth the Divine Comedy, beyond comparison the greatest work of imagination which had appeared since the poems of Homer. The following generation produced indeed no second Dante: but it was eminently distinguished by general intellectual activity. The study of the Latin writers had never been wholly neglected in Italy. But Petrarch introduced a more profound, liberal, and elegant scholarship; and communicated to his countrymen that enthusiasm for the literature, the history, and the antiquities of Rome, which divided his own heart with a frigid mistress and a more frigid Muse. Boccaccio turned their attention to the more sublime and graceful models of Greece."—Lord Macaulay, *Machiavelli (Essays*, v. 1).

A. D. 1348.—The Plague.—"In the year then of our Lord 1348, there happened at Florence, the finest city in all Italy, a most terrible plague; which, whether owing to the influence of the planets, or that it was sent from God as a just punishment for our sins, had broken out some years before in the Levant, and after passing from place to place, and making incredible havoc all the way, had now reached the west. There, spite of all the means that art and human foresight could suggest, such as keeping the city clear from filth, the exclusion of all suspected persons, and the publication of copious instructions for the preservation of health; and notwithstanding manifold humble supplications offered to God in processions and otherwise; it began to show itself in the spring of the aforesaid year, in

a sad and wonderful manner. Unlike what had been seen in the east, where bleeding from the nose is the fatal prognostic, here there appeared certain tumours in the groin or under the armpits, some as big as a small apple, others as an egg; and afterwards purple spots in most parts of the body; in some cases large and but few in number, in others smaller and more numerous—both sorts the usual messengers of death. To the cure of this malady, neither medical knowledge nor the power of drugs was of any effect. . . . Nearly all died the third day from the first appearance of the symptoms, some sooner, some later, without any fever or other accessory symptoms. What gave the more virulence to this plague, was that, by being communicated from the sick to the hale, it spread daily, like fire when it comes in contact with large masses of combustibles. Nor was it caught only by conversing with, or coming near the sick, but even by touching their clothes, or anything that they had before touched. . . . These facts, and others of the like sort, occasioned various fears and devices amongst those who survived, all tending to the same uncharitable and cruel end; which was, to avoid the sick, and everything that had been near them, expecting by that means to save themselves. And some holding it best to live temperately, and to avoid excesses of all kinds, made parties, and shut themselves up from the rest of the world. . . . Others maintained free living to be a better preservative, and would baulk no passion or appetite they wished to gratify, drinking and revelling incessantly from tavern to tavern, or in private houses (which were frequently found deserted by the owners, and therefore common to every one), yet strenuously avoiding, with all this brutal indulgence, to come near the infected. And such, at that time, was the public distress, that the laws, human and divine, were no more regarded; for the officers to put them in force being either dead, sick, or in want of persons to assist them, every one did just as he pleased. . . . I pass over the little regard that citizens and relations showed to each other; for their terror was such that a brother even fled from a brother, a wife from her husband, and, what is more uncommon, a parent from his own child. . . . Such was the cruelty of Heaven, and perhaps of men, that between March and July following, according to authentic reckonings, upwards of 100,000 souls perished in the city only; whereas, before that calamity, it was not supposed to have contained so many inhabitants. What magnificent dwellings, what noble palaces, were then depopulated to the last inhabitant!"—G. Boccaccio, *The Decameron*, introd.—See, also, **BLACK DEATH**.

A. D. 1358.—The captains of the Guelph Party and the "Ammoniti."—"The magistracy called the 'Capitani di Parte Gueffa,'—the Captains of the Guelph party,—was instituted in the year 1267; and it was remarked, when the institution of it was recorded, that the conception of a magistracy avowedly formed to govern a community, not only by the authority of, but in the interest of one section only of its members, was an extraordinary proof of the unfitness of the Florentines for self-government, and a forewarning of the infallible certainty that the attempt to rule the Commonwealth on such principles would come to a bad ending. In the year 1358, a little less than a century after the first establishment of this strange magistracy, it began to develop the

mischievous capabilities inherent in the nature of it, in a very alarming manner. . . . In 1358 this magistracy consisted of four members. . . . These men, 'born,' says Ammirato, 'for the public ruin, under pretext of zeal for the Guelph cause' . . . caused a law to be passed, according to which any citizen or Florentine subject who had ever held, or should thereafter hold, any office in the Commonwealth, might be either openly or secretly accused before the tribunal of the Captains of the Guelph Party of being Ghibelline, or not genuine Guelph. If the accusation was supported by six witnesses worthy of belief, the accused might be condemned to death or to fine at the discretion of the Captains. . . . It will be readily conceived that the passing of such a law, in a city bristling with party hatreds and feuds, was the signal for the commencement of a reign of terror." The citizens proscribed were "said to be 'admonished'; and the condemnations were called 'admonitions'; and henceforward for many years the 'ammonizioni' [or 'ammoniti'] play a large part in the domestic history and political struggles of Florence."—T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence*, bk. 3, ch. 7 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: H. E. Napier, *Florentine History*, ch. 23 (v. 2).

A. D. 1359-1391.—The Free Company of Sir John Hawkwood and the wars with Pisa, with Milan, and with the Pope. See ITALY: A. D. 1343-1393.

A. D. 1375-1378.—War with the Pope in support of the oppressed States of the Church.—The Eight Saints of War.—A terrible excommunication.—In 1375, the Florentines became engaged in war with Pope Gregory XI., supporting a revolt of the States of the Church, which were heavily oppressed by the representatives of their papal sovereign (see PAPACY: A. D. 1352-1378). "Nevertheless, so profoundly revered was the church that even the sound of war against a pope appeared to many little less than blasphemy: numbers opposed on this pretence, but really from party motives alone." But "a general council assembled and declared the cause of liberty paramount to every other consideration; the war was affirmed to be rather against the injustice and tyranny of foreign governors than the church itself. . . . All the ecclesiastical cities then groaning under French oppression were to be invited to revolt and boldly achieve their independence. These spirited resolutions were instantly executed, and on the 8th of August 1375 Alessandro de' Bardi [and seven other citizens] . . . were formed into a supreme council of war called 'Gli Otto della Guerra'; and afterwards, from their able conduct, 'Gli Otto Santi della Guerra' [The Eight Saints of War]; armed with the concentrated power of the whole Florentine nation in what regarded war." A terrible sentence of excommunication was launched against the Florentines by the Pope. "Their souls were solemnly condemned to the pains of hell; fire and water were interdicted; their persons and property outlawed in every Christian land, and they were finally declared lawful prey for all who chose to sell, plunder, or kill them as though they were mere slaves or infidels."—H. E. Napier, *Florentine History*, bk. 1, ch. 26 (v. 2).

A. D. 1378-1427.—Completer democratizing of the commonwealth.—The Tumult of the

Ciompi.—First appearance of the Medici in Florentine history.—Though the reign of the Duke of Athens lasted rather less than a year, "it bore important fruits; for the tyrant, seeking to support himself upon the favour of the common people, gave political power to the Lesser Arts at the expense of the Greater, and confused the old State-system by enlarging the democracy. The net result of these events for Florence was, first, that the city became habituated to rancorous party-strife, involving exiles and proscriptions, and, secondly, that it lost its primitive social hierarchy of classes. . . . Civil strife now declared itself as a conflict between labour and capital. The members of the Lesser Arts, craftsmen who plied trades subordinate to those of the Greater Arts, rose up against their social and political superiors, demanding a larger share in the government, a more equal distribution of profits, higher wages, and privileges that should place them on an absolute equality with the wealthy merchants. It was in the year 1378 that the proletariat broke out into rebellion. Previous events had prepared the way for this revolt. First of all, the republic had been democratized through the destruction of the Grandi and through the popular policy pursued to gain his own ends by the Duke of Athens. Secondly, society had been shaken to its very foundation by the great plague of 1348 . . . nor had 30 years sufficed to restore their relative position to grades and ranks confounded by an overwhelming calamity. . . . Rising in a mass to claim their privileges, the artisans ejected the Signory from the Public Palace, and for awhile Florence was at the mercy of the mob. It is worthy of notice that the Medici, whose name is scarcely known before this epoch, now come for one moment to the front. Salvestro de' Medici was Gonfalonier of Justice at the time when the tumult first broke out. He followed the faction of the handicraftsmen, and became the hero of the day. I cannot discover that he did more than extend a sort of passive protection to their cause. Yet there is no doubt that the attachment of the working classes to the house of Medici dates from this period. The rebellion of 1378 is known in Florentine history as the Tumult of the Ciompi. The name Ciompi strictly means the Wool-Carders. One set of operatives in the city, and that the largest, gave its title to the whole body of the labourers. For some months these craftsmen governed the republic, appointing their own Signory and passing laws in their own interest; but, as is usual, the proletariat found itself incapable of sustained government. The ambition and discontent of the Ciompi foamed themselves away, and industrious workmen began to see that trade was languishing and credit on the wane. By their own act at last they restored the government to the Priors of the Greater Arti. Still the movement had not been without grave consequences. It completed the levelling of classes, which had been steadily advancing from the first in Florence. After the Ciompi riot there was no longer not only any distinction between noble and burgher, but the distinction between greater and lesser guilds was practically swept away. . . . The proper political conditions had been formed for unscrupulous adventurers. Florence had become a democracy without social organization. . . . The time was come for the Albizzi to attempt an oligarchy, and for the Medici to

begin the enslavement of the State. The Constitution of Florence offered many points of weakness to the attacks of such intriguers. In the first place it was in its origin not a political but an industrial organisation—a simple group of guilds invested with the sovereign authority. . . . It had no permanent head, like the Doge of Venice, no fixed senate like the Venetian Grand Council; its chief magistrates, the Signory, were elected for short periods of two months, and their mode of election was open to the gravest criticism. Supposed to be chosen by lot, they were really selected from lists drawn up by the factions in power from time to time. These factions contrived to exclude the names of all but their adherents from the bags, or 'horse,' in which the burghers eligible for election had to be inscribed. Furthermore, it was not possible for this shifting Signory to conduct affairs requiring sustained effort and secret deliberation; therefore recourse was being continually had to dictatorial Commissions. The people, summoned in parliament upon the Great Square, were asked to confer plenipotentiary authority upon a committee called *Balia* [see *BALIA OF FLORENCE*], who proceeded to do what they chose in the State; and who retained power after the emergency for which they were created passed away. . . . It was through these [and other specified] defects that the democracy merged gradually into a despotism. The art of the Medici consisted in a scientific comprehension of these very imperfections, a methodic use of them for their own purposes, and a steady opposition to any attempts made to substitute a stricter system. . . . Florence, in the middle of the 14th century, was a vast beehive of industry. Distinctions of rank among burghers, qualified to vote and hold office, were theoretically unknown. Highly educated men, of more than princely wealth, spent their time in shops and counting-houses, and trained their sons to follow trades. Military service at this period was abandoned by the citizens; they preferred to pay mercenary troops for the conduct of their wars. Nor was there, as in Venice, any outlet for their energies upon the seas. Florence had no navy, no great port—she only kept a small fleet for the protection of her commerce. Thus the vigour of the commonwealth was concentrated on itself; while the influence of citizens, through their affiliated trading-houses, correspondents, and agents, extended like a network over Europe. . . . Accordingly we find that out of the very bosom of the people a new plutocratic aristocracy begins to rise. . . . These nobles of the purse obtained the name of '*Popolani Nobili*'; and it was they who now began to play at high stakes for the supreme power. . . . The opening of the second half of the 14th century had been signalised by the feuds of two great houses, both risen from the people. These were the Albizzi and the Ricci." The Albizzi triumphed, in the conflict of the two houses, and became all-powerful for a time in Florence; but the wars with the Visconti, of Milan, in which they engaged the city, made necessary a heavy burden of taxation, which they rendered more grievous by distributing it unfairly. "This imprudent financial policy began the ruin of the Albizzi. It caused a clamour in the city for a new system of more just taxation, which was too powerful to be resisted. The voice of the people made itself loudly heard; and with the people on this occa-

sion sided Giovanni de' Medici. This was in 1427. It is here that the Medici appear upon that memorable scene where in the future they are to play the first part. Giovanni de' Medici did not belong to the same branch of his family as the Salvestro who favoured the people at the time of the Ciompi Tumult. But he adopted the same popular policy. To his sons Cosimo and Lorenzo he bequeathed on his death-bed the rule that they should invariably adhere to the cause of the multitude, found their influence on that, and avoid the arts of factious and ambitious leaders."—J. A. Symonds, *Florence and the Medici* (*Sketches and Studies in Italy*, ch. 5).

ALSO IN: A. von Reumont, *Lorenzo de' Medici*, bk. 1, ch. 2 (v. 1).—T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence*, bk. 4-5 (v. 2).

A. D. 1390-1402.—War with Gian Galeazzo Visconti, Duke of Milan.—"Already in 1386, the growing power of Giangaleazzo Visconti, the tenth duke of Milan of that family, began to give umbrage, not only to all the sovereign princes, his neighbours, but also to Florence [see *MILAN*: A. D. 1277-1447]. . . . Florence . . . had cause enough to feel uneasy at the progress of such a man in his career of successful invasion and usurpation;—Florence, no more specially than other of the free towns around her, save that Florence seems always to have thought that she had more to lose from the loss of her liberty than any of the other cities . . . and felt always called upon to take upon herself the duty of standing forward as the champion and supporter of the principles of republicanism and free government. . . . The Pope, Urban VI., added another element of disturbance to the condition of Italy. For in his anxiety to recover sundry cities mainly in Umbria and Romagna . . . he was exceedingly unscrupulous of means, and might at any moment be found allying himself with the enemies of free government and of the old Guelph cause in Italy. Venice, also, having most im providently and unwisely allied herself with Visconti, constituted another element of danger, and an additional cause of uneasiness and watchfulness to the Florentine government. In the spring of 1388, therefore, a board of ten, '*Dieci di Balia*,' was elected for the general management of 'all those measures concerning war and peace which should be adopted by the entire Florentine people.'" The first war with Visconti was declared by the republic in May, 1390, and was so successfully conducted for the Florentines by Sir John Hawkwood that it terminated in a treaty signed January 26, 1392, which bound the Duke of Milan not to meddle in any way with the affairs of Tuscany. For ten years this agreement seems to have been tolerably well adhered to; but in 1402 the rapacious Duke entered upon new encroachments, which forced the Florentines to take up arms again. Their only allies were Bologna and Padua (or Francesco Carrara of Padua), and the armies of the three states were defeated in a terribly bloody battle fought near Bologna on the 26th of June. "Bologna fell into the hands of Visconti. Great was the dismay and terror in Florence when the news . . . reached the city. It was neither more nor less than the fall, as the historian says, of the fortress which was the bulwark of Florence. Now she lay absolutely open to the invader." But the invader did not come. He was stricken with the plague and died, in September, and

Florence and Italy were saved from the tyranny which he had seemed able to extend over the whole.—T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence*, bk. 4, ch. 4-5 (v. 2).

14th-15th Centuries.—Commercial enterprise, industrial energy, wealth and culture of the city.—"During the 14th and 15th centuries Florentine wealth increased in an extraordinary degree. Earlier generations had compelled the powerful barons of the district to live in the city; and even yet the exercise of the rights of citizenship was dependent on having a residence there. The influx of outsiders was, however, much more owing to the attractions offered by the city, whether in business, profession, or pleasure, than to compulsion. . . . The situation of the city is not favorable to the natural growth of commerce, especially under the conditions which preceded the building of railroads. At a considerable distance from the sea, on a river navigable only for very small craft, and surrounded by hills which rendered difficult the construction of good roads,—the fact that the city did prosper so marvelously is in itself proof of the remarkable energy and ability of its people. They needed above all things a sea-port, and to obtain a good one they waged some of their most exhausting wars. Their principal wealth, however, came through their financial operations, which extended throughout Europe, and penetrated even to Morocco and the Orient. Their manufactures also, especially of wool and silk, brought in enormous returns, and made not only the fortunes but also, in one famous case at least, the name of the families engaged in them. Their superiority over the rest of Christendom in these pursuits was but one side of that remarkable, universal talent which is the most astonishing feature of the Florentine life of that age. With the hardihood of youth, they were not only ready but eager to engage in new enterprises, whether at home or abroad. . . . As a result of their energy and ability, riches poured into their coffers,—a mighty stream of gold, in the use of which they showed so much judgment, that the after world has feasted to our day, and for centuries to come, will probably continue to feast without satiety on the good things which they caused to be made, and left behind them. Of all the legacies for which we have to thank Florence, none are so well known and so universally recognized as the treasures of art created by her sons, many of which yet remain within her walls, the marvel and delight of all who behold them. As the Florentines were ready to try experiments in politics, manufactures, and commerce, so also in all branches of the fine arts they tried experiments, left the old, beaten paths of their forefathers, and created something original, useful, and beautiful for themselves. Christian art from the time of the Roman Empire to Cimabue had made comparatively little progress; but a son of the Florentine fields was to start a revolution which should lead to the production of some of the most marvellous works which have proceeded from the hand of man. The idea that the fine arts are more successfully cultivated under the patronage of princes than under republican rule is very widespread, and is occasionally accepted almost as a dogma; but the history of Athens and of Florence teaches us without any doubt that the two most artistic epochs in the history of the world have had their rise in republics. . . . Some

writers, dazzled by the splendors of the Medici, entirely lose sight of the fact that both Dante and Petrarch were dead before the Medici were even heard of, and that the greatest works, at least in architecture, were all begun long before they were leaders in Florentine affairs. That family did much, yes very much, for the advancement of art and letters; but they did not do all or nearly all that was done in Florence. . . . Though civil discord and foreign war were very frequent, Florentine life is nevertheless an illustration rather of what Herbert Spencer calls the commercial stage of civilization, than of the warlike period. Her citizens were above all things merchants, and were generally much more willing to pay to avoid a war than to conduct one. They strove for glory, not in feats of arms, but in literary contests and in peaceful emulation in the encouragement of learning and the fine arts."—W. B. Scaife, *Florentine Life*, pp. 16-19. See, also, TRADE, and MONEY and BANKING.

A. D. 1405-1406.—Purchase and conquest of Pisa. See ITALY: A. D. 1402-1406.

A. D. 1409-1411.—League against and war with Ladislas, King of Naples. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1386-1414.

A. D. 1423-1447.—War with the Duke of Milan.—League with Venice, Naples, and other States. See ITALY: A. D. 1412-1447.

A. D. 1433-1464.—The ascendancy of Cosimo de' Medici.—In 1433, Cosmo, or Cosimo de' Medici, the son of Giovanni de' Medici, was the recognized leader of the opposition to the oligarchy controlled by Rinaldo de' Albizzi. Cosmo inherited from his father a large fortune and a business as a merchant and banker which he maintained and increased. "He lived splendidly; he was a great supporter of all literary men, and spent and distributed his great wealth amongst his fellow citizens. He was courteous and liberal, and was looked upon with almost unbounded respect and affection by a large party in the state. Rinaldo was bent upon his ruin, and in 1433, when he had a Signoria devoted to his party, he cited Cosmo before the Council, and shut him up in a tower of the Public Palace. Great excitement was caused by this violent step, and two days after the Signoria held a parliament of the people. The great bell of the city was tolled, and the people gathered round the Palace. Then the gates of the Palace were thrown open, and the Signoria, the Colleges of Arts, and the Gonfaloniere came forth, and asked the people if they would have a Balìa. So a Balìa was appointed, the names being proposed by the Signoria, to decide on the fate of Cosmo. At first it was proposed to kill him, but he was only banished, much against the will of Rinaldo, who knew that, if he lived, he would some day come back again. The next year the Signoria was favourable to him; another Balìa was appointed; the party of the Albizzi was banished, and Cosmo was recalled. He was received with a greeting such as men give to a conqueror, and was hailed as the 'Father of his Country.' This triumphant return gave the Medici a power in the Republic which they never afterwards lost. The banished party fled to the court of the Duke of Milan, and stirred him up to war against the city."—W. Hunt, *Hist. of Italy*, ch. 6, sect. 5.—"Cosimo de' Medici did not content himself with rendering his old opponents harmless; he took care also that none of his adherents should become

too powerful and dangerous to him. Therefore, remarks Francesco Guicciardini, he retained the Signoria, as well as the taxes, in his hand, in order to be able to promote or oppress individuals at will. In other things the citizens enjoyed greater freedom and acted more according to their own pleasure than later, in the days of his grandson, for he let the reins hang loose if he was only sure of his own position. It was just in this that his great art lay, to guide things according to his will, and yet to make his partisans believe that he shared his authority with them. . . . 'It is well known' remarks [Guicciardini] . . . 'how much nobility and wealth were destroyed by Cosimo and his descendants by taxation. The Medici never allowed a fixed method and legal distribution, but always reserved to themselves the power of bearing heavily upon individuals according to their pleasure. . . . He [Cosimo] maintained great reserve in his whole manner of life. For a quarter of a century he was the almost absolute director of the State, but he never assumed the show of his dignity. . . . The ruler of the Florentine State remained citizen, agriculturist, and merchant. In his appearance and bearing there was nothing which distinguished him from others. . . . He ruled the money market, not only in Italy, but throughout Europe. He had banks in all the western countries, and his experience and the excellent memory which never failed him, with his strong love of order, enabled him to guide everything from Florence, which he never quitted after 1433.' The death of Cosimo occurred on the 1st day of August, 1464.—A. von Reumont, *Lorenzo de' Medici*, bk. 1, ch. 6 and 8 (v. 1).—"The last troubled days of the Florentine democracy had not proved quite unproductive of art. It was the time of Giotto's undisputed sway. Many works of which the 15th century gets the glory because it finished them were ordered and begun amidst the confusion and terrible agitation of the demagogy. . . . Under the oligarchy, in the relative calm that came with oppression, a taste for art as well as for letters began to develop in Florence as elsewhere." But "Cosimo de' Medici had rare good fortune. In his time, and under his rule, capricious chance united at Florence talents as numerous as they were diverse—the universal Brunelleschi, the polished and elegant Ghiberti, the rough and powerful Donatello, the suave Angelico, the masculine Masaccio. . . . Cosimo lived long enough to see the collapse of the admirable talent which flourished upon the banks of the Arno, and soon spread throughout Italy, and to feel the void left by it. It is true his grandson saw a new harvest, but as inferior to that which preceded it, as it was to that which followed it."—F. T. Perrens, *Hist. of Florence*, 1434-1531, bk. 1, ch. 6.

A. D. 1450-1454.—Alliance with Francesco Sforza, of Milan, and war with Venice, Naples, Savoy, and other States. See MILAN: A. D. 1447-1454.

A. D. 1458-1469.—Lucas Pitti, and the building of the Pitti Palace.—Piero de' Medici and the five agents of his tyranny.—Until 1455, Cosmo de' Medici shared the government of Florence in some degree with Neri Capponi, an able statesman, who had taken an eminent part in public affairs for many years—during the domination of the Albizzi, as well as afterwards.

"When Neri Capponi died, the council refused to call a new parliament to replace the *balia*, whose power expired on the 1st of July, 1455. . . . The election of the signoria was again made fairly by lot, . . . the contributions were again equitably apportioned,—the tribunals ceased to listen to the recommendations of those who, till then, had made a traffic of distributive justice." This recovery of freedom in Florence was enjoyed for about three years; but when, in 1458, Lucas Pitti, "rich, powerful, and bold," was named gonfalonier, Cosmo conspired with him to reimpose the yoke. "Pitti assembled the parliament; but not till he had filled all the avenues of the public square with soldiers or armed peasants. The people, menaced and trembling within this circle, consented to name a new *balia*, more violent and tyrannical than any of the preceding. It was composed of 352 persons, to whom was delegated all the power of the republic. They exiled a great number of the citizens who had shown the most attachment to liberty, and they even put some to death." When, in 1463, Cosmo's second son, Giovanni, on whom his hopes were centered, died, Lucas Pitti "looked on himself henceforth as the only chief of the state. It was about this time that he undertook the building of that magnificent palace which now [1833] forms the residence of the grand-dukes. The republican equality was not only offended by the splendour of this regal dwelling; but the construction of it afforded Pitti an occasion for marking his contempt of liberty and the laws. He made of this building an asylum for all fugitives from justice, whom no public officer dared pursue when once he [they?] took part in the labour. At the same time individuals, as well as communities, who would obtain some favour from the republic, knew that the only means of being heard was to offer Lucas Pitti some precious wood or marble to be employed in the construction of his palace. When Cosmo de' Medici died, at his country-house of Careggi, on the 1st of August, 1464, Lucas Pitti felt himself released from the control imposed by the virtue and moderation of that great citizen. . . . His [Cosmo's] son, Pietro de' Medici, then 48 years of age, supposed that he should succeed to the administration of the republic, as he had succeeded to the wealth of his father, by hereditary right: but the state of his health did not admit of his attending regularly to business, or of his inspiring his rivals with much fear. To diminish the weight of affairs which oppressed him, he resolved on withdrawing a part of his immense fortune from commerce; recalling all his loans made in partnership with other merchants; and laying out this money in land. But this unexpected demand of considerable capital occasioned a fatal shock to the commerce of Florence; at the same time that it alienated all the debtors of the house of Medici, and deprived it of much of its popularity. The death of Sforza, also, which took place on the 8th of March, 1466, deprived the Medicean party of its firmest support abroad. . . . The friends of liberty at Florence soon perceived that Lucas Pitti and Pietro de' Medici no longer agreed together; and they recovered courage when the latter proposed to the council the calling of a parliament, in order to renew the *balia*, the power of which expired on the 1st of September, 1465; his proposition was rejected. The

magistracy began again to be drawn by lot from among the members of the party victorious in 1434. This return of liberty, however, was but of short duration. Pitti and Medici were reconciled: they agreed to call a parliament, and to direct it in concert; to intimidate it, they surrounded it with foreign troops. But Medici, on the nomination of the *balia*, on the 2d of September, 1466, found means of admitting his own partisans only, and excluding all those of Lucas Pitti. The citizens who had shown any zeal for liberty were all exiled. . . . Lucas Pitti ruined himself in building his palace. His talents were judged to bear no proportion to his ambition: the friends of liberty, as well as those of Medici, equally detested him; and he remained deprived of all power in a city which he had so largely contributed to enslave. Italy became filled with Florentine emigrants: every revolution, even every convocation of parliament, was followed by the exile of many citizens. . . . At Florence, the citizens who escaped proscription trembled to see despotism established in their republic; but the lower orders were in general contented, and made no attempt to second Bartolomeo Coleoni, when he entered Tuscany, in 1467, at the head of the Florentine emigrants, who had taken him into their pay. Commerce prospered; manufactures were carried on with great activity; high wages supported in comfort all who lived by their labour; and the Medici entertained them with shows and festivals, keeping them in a sort of perpetual carnival, amidst which the people soon lost all thought of liberty. Pietro de' Medici was always in too bad a state of health to exercise in person the sovereignty he had usurped over his country; he left it to five or six citizens, who reigned in his name. . . . They not only transacted all business, but appropriated to themselves all the profit; they sold their influence and credit; they gratified their cupidity or their vengeance; but they took care not to act in their own names, or to pledge their own responsibility; they left that to the house of Medici. Pietro, during the latter months of his life, perceived the disorder and corruption of his agents. He was afflicted to see his memory thus stained, and he addressed them the severest reprimands; he even entered into correspondence with the emigrants, whom he thought of recalling, when he died, on the 2d of December, 1469. His two sons, Lorenzo and Giuliano, the elder of whom was not 21 years of age, . . . given up to all the pleasures of their age, had yet no ambition. The power of the state remained in the hands of the five citizens who had exercised it under Pietro."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Italian Republics*, ch. 11.

A. D. 1469-1492.—The conspiracy of the Pazzi.—The government of Lorenzo the Magnificent.—The death of liberty.—The golden age of letters and art.—"Lorenzo inherited his grandfather's political sagacity and far surpassed him in talent and literary culture. In many respects too he was a very different man. Cosimo never left his business office; Lorenzo neglected it, and had so little commercial aptitude that he was obliged to retire from business, in order not to lose his abundant patrimony. Cosimo was frugal in his personal expenses and lent freely to others; Lorenzo loved splendid living, and thus gained the title of the Magnificent; he spent immoderately for the advancement of literary men;

he gave himself up to dissipation which ruined his health and shortened his days. His manner of living reduced him to such straits, that he had to sell some of his possessions and obtain money from his friends. Nor did this suffice; for he even meddled with the public money, a thing that had never happened in Cosimo's time. Very often, in his greed of unlawful gain, he had the Florentine armies paid by his own bank; he also appropriated the sums collected in the Monte Comune or treasury of the public debt, and those in the Monte delle Fanciulle where were marriage portions accumulated by private savings—money hitherto held sacred by all. Stimulated by the same greed, he, in the year 1472 joined the Florentine contractors for the wealthy alum mines of Volterra, at the moment in which that city was on the verge of rebellion in order to free itself from a contract which it deemed unjust. And Lorenzo, with the weight of his authority, pushed matters to such a point that war broke out, soon to be followed by a most cruel sack of the unhappy city, a very unusual event in Tuscany. For all this he was universally blamed. But he was excessively haughty and cared for no man; he would tolerate no equals, would be first in everything—even in games. He interfered in all matters, even in private concerns and in marriages: nothing could take place without his consent. In overthrowing the powerful and exalting men of low condition, he showed none of the care and precaution so uniformly observed by Cosimo. It is not then surprising if his enemies increased so fast that the formidable conspiracy of the Pazzi broke out on the 26th April 1478. In this plot, hatched in the Vatican itself where Sixtus IV. was Lorenzo's determined enemy, many of the mightiest Florentine families took part. In the cathedral, at the moment of the elevation of the Host, the conspirators' daggers were unsheathed. Giuliano dei Medici was stabbed to death, but Lorenzo defended himself with his sword and saved his own life. The tumult was so great that it seemed as though the walls of the church were shaken. The populace rose to the cry of 'Palle! Palle!' the Medici watchword, and the enemies of the Medici were slaughtered in the streets or hung from the windows of the Palazzo Vecchio. There, among others, were seen the dangling corpses of Archbishop Salviati and of Francesco Pazzi, who in their last struggles had gripped each other with their teeth and remained thus for some time. More than seventy persons perished on that day, and Lorenzo, taking advantage of the opportunity, pushed matters to extremity by his confiscations, banishments, and sentences of death. Thereby his power would have been infinitely increased if Pope Sixtus IV., blinded by rage, had not been induced to excommunicate Florence, and make war against it, in conjunction with Ferdinand of Aragon. On this Lorenzo, without losing a moment, went straight to Naples, and made the king understand how much better it served his interests that Florence should have but one ruler instead of a republican government, always liable to change and certainly never friendly to Naples. So he returned with peace re-established and boundless authority and popularity. Now indeed he might have called himself lord of the city, and it must have seemed easy to him to destroy the republican government altogether. With his pride and ambition it is certain that he

had an intense desire to stand on the same level with the other princes and tyrants of Italy, the more so as at that moment success seemed entirely within his grasp. But Lorenzo showed that his political shrewdness was not to be blinded by prosperity, and knowing Florence well, he remained firm to the traditional policy of his house, that of dominating the Republic, while apparently respecting it. He was well determined to render his power solid and durable; but to that end he had recourse to a most ingenious reform, by means of which, without abandoning the old road, he thoroughly succeeded in his object. In place of the usual five-yearly *Balia*, he instituted, in 1480, the Council of Seventy, which renewed itself and was like a permanent *Balia* with still wider power. This, composed of men entirely devoted to his cause, secured the government to him forever. By this Council, say the chroniclers of the time, liberty was wholly buried and undone, but certainly the most important affairs of the State were carried on in it by intelligent and cultivated men, who largely promoted its material prosperity. Florence still called itself a republic, nominally the old institutions were still in existence, but all this seemed and was nothing but an empty mockery. Lorenzo, absolute lord of all, might certainly be called a tyrant, surrounded by lackeys and courtiers. . . . Yet he dazzled all men by the splendour of his rule, so that [Guicciardini] observes, that though Lorenzo was a tyrant, 'it would be impossible to imagine a better and more pleasing tyrant.' Industry, commerce, public works had all received a mighty impulse. In no city in the world had the civil equality of modern States reached the degree to which it had attained not merely in Florence itself, but in its whole territory and throughout all Tuscany. Administration and secular justice proceeded regularly enough in ordinary cases, crime was diminished, and, above all, literary culture had become a substantial element of the new State. Learned men were employed in public offices, and from Florence spread a light that illuminated the world. . . . But Lorenzo's policy could found nothing that was permanent. Unrivalled as a model of sagacity and prudence, it promoted in Florence the development of all the new elements of which modern society was to be the outcome, without succeeding in fusing them together; for his was a policy of equivocation and deceit, directed by a man of much genius, who had no higher aim than his own interest and that of his family, to which he never hesitated to sacrifice the interests of his people."—P. Villari, *Machiavelli and his Times*, ch. 2, sect. 2 (v. 1).—"The state of Florence at this period was very remarkable. The most independent and tumultuous of towns was spellbound under the sway of Lorenzo de' Medici, the grandson of Cosimo who built San Marco; and scarcely seemed even to recollect its freedom, so absorbed was it in the present advantages conferred by 'a strong government,' and solaced by shows, entertainments, festivals, pomp, and display of all kinds. It was the very height of that classic revival so famous in the later history of the world, and the higher classes of society, having shaken themselves apart with graceful contempt from the lower, had begun to frame their lives according to a pagan model, leaving the other and much bigger half of the world to pursue its superstitious

undisturbed. Florence was as near a pagan city as it was possible for its rulers to make it. Its intellectual existence was entirely given up to the past; its days were spent in that worship of antiquity which has no power of discrimination, and deifies not only the wisdom but the trivialities of its golden epoch. Lorenzo reigned in the midst of a lettered crowd of classic parasites and flatterers, writing poems which his courtiers found better than Alighieri's, and surrounding himself with those eloquent slaves who make a prince's name more famous than arms or victories, and who have still left a prejudice in the minds of all literature-loving people in favour of their patron. A man of superb health and physical power, who can give himself up to debauch all night without interfering with his power of working all day, and whose mind is so versatile that he can sack a town one morning and discourse upon the beauties of Plato the next, and weave joyous ballads through both occupations—gives his flatterers reason when they applaud him. The few righteous men in the city, the citizens who still thought of Florence above all, kept apart, overwhelmed by the tide which ran in favour of that leading citizen of Florence who had gained the control of the once high-spirited and freedom-loving people. Society had never been more dissolute, more selfish, or more utterly deprived of any higher aim. Barren scholarship, busy over grammatical questions, and elegant philosophy, snipping and piecing its logical systems, formed the top dressing to that half-brutal, half-superstitious ignorance which in such communities is the general portion of the poor. The dilettante world dreamed hazily of a restoration of the worship of the pagan gods; Cardinal Bembo bade his friend beware of reading St. Paul's epistles, lest their barbarous style should corrupt his taste; and even such a man as Pico della Mirandola declared the '*Divina Commedia*' to be inferior to the '*Canti Carnascialeschi*' of Lorenzo de' Medici. . . . Thus limited intellectually, the age of Lorenzo was still more hopeless morally, full of debauchery, cruelty, and corruption, violating oaths, betraying trusts, believing in nothing but Greek manuscripts, coins, and statues, caring for nothing but pleasure. This was the world in which Savonarola found himself."—Mrs. Oliphant, *The Makers of Florence*, ch. 9.—"Terrible municipal enmities had produced so much evil as to relax ancient republican energy. After so much destruction repose was necessary. To antique sobriety and gravity succeed love of pleasure and the quest of luxury. The belligerent class of great nobles were expelled and the energetic class of artisans crushed. Bourgeois rulers were to rule, and to rule tranquilly. Like the Medici, their chiefs, they manufacture, trade, bank and make fortunes in order to expend them in intellectual fashion. War no longer fastens its cares upon them, as formerly, with a bitter and tragic grasp; they manage it through the paid bands of condottieri, and these as cunning traffickers, reduce it to cavalades; when they slaughter each other it is by mistake; historians cite battles in which three, and sometimes only one soldier remains on the field. Diplomacy takes the place of force, and the mind expands as character weakens. Through this mitigation of war and through the establishment of principalities or of local tyrannies, it seems that Italy,

like the great European monarchies, had just attained to its equilibrium. Peace is partially established and the useful arts germinate in all directions upon an improved social soil like a good harvest on a cleared and well-ploughed field. The peasant is no longer a serf of the glebe, but a metayer; he nominates his own municipal magistrates, possesses arms and a communal treasury; he lives in enclosed bourgs, the houses of which, built of stone and cement, are large, convenient, and often elegant. Near Florence he erects walls, and near Lucca he constructs turf terraces in order to favor cultivation. Lombardy has its irrigations and rotation of crops; entire districts, now so many deserts around Lombardy and Rome, are still inhabited and richly productive. In the upper class the bourgeois and the noble labor since the chiefs of Florence are hereditary bankers and commercial interests are not endangered. Marble quarries are worked at Carrara, and foundry fires are lighted in the Maremmes. We find in the cities manufactories of silk, glass, paper, books, flax, wool and hemp; Italy alone produces as much as all Europe and furnishes to it all its luxuries. Thus diffused commerce and industry are not servile occupations tending to narrow or debase the mind. A great merchant is a pacific general, whose mind expands in contact with men and things. Like a military chieftain he organizes expeditions and enterprises and makes discoveries. . . . The Medicis possess sixteen banking-houses in Europe; they bind together through their business Russia and Spain, Scotland and Syria; they possess mines of alum throughout Italy, paying to the Pope for one of them a hundred thousand florins per annum; they entertain at their court representatives of all the powers of Europe and become the councillors and moderators of all Italy. In a small state like Florence, and in a country without a national army like Italy, such an influence becomes ascendant in and through itself; a control over private fortunes leads to a management of the public funds, and without striking a blow or using violence, a private individual finds himself director of the state. . . . These banking magistrates are liberal as well as capable. In thirty-seven years the ancestors of Lorenzo expend six hundred and sixty thousand florins in works of charity and of public utility. Lorenzo himself is a citizen of the antique stamp, almost a Pericles, capable of rushing into the arms of his enemy, the king of Naples, in order to avert, through personal seductions and eloquence, a war which menaces the safety of his country. His private fortune is a sort of public treasury, and his palace a second hotel-de-ville. He entertains the learned, aids them with his purse, makes friends of them, corresponds with them, defrays the expenses of editions of their works, purchases manuscripts, statues and medals, patronizes promising young artists, opens to them his gardens, his collections, his house and his table, and with that cordial familiarity and that openness, sincerity and simplicity of heart which place the protected on a footing of equality with the protector as man to man and not as an inferior in relation to a superior. This is the representative man whom his contemporaries all accept as the accomplished man of the century, no longer a Farinata or an Alighieri of ancient Florence, a spirit rigid, exalted and militant to its utmost capacity, but a balanced, moderate

and cultivated genius, one who, through the genial sway of his serene and beneficent intellect, binds up into one sheaf all talents and all beauties. It is a pleasure to see them expanding around him. On the one hand writers are restoring and, on the other, constructing. From the time of Petrarch Greek and Latin manuscripts are sought for, and now they are to be exhumed in the convents of Italy, Switzerland, Germany and France. They are deciphered and restored with the aid of the savants of Constantinople. A decade of Livy or a treatise by Cicero, is a precious gift solicited by princes; some learned man passes ten years of travel in ransacking distant libraries in order to find a lost book of Tacitus, while the sixteen authors rescued from oblivion by the Poggios are counted as so many titles to immortal fame. . . . Style again becomes noble and at the same time clear, and the health, joy and serenity diffused through antique life re-enters the human mind with the harmonious proportions of language and the measured graces of diction. From refined language they pass to vulgar language, and the Italian is born by the side of the Latin. . . . Here in the restored paganism, shines out epicurean gaiety, a determination to enjoy at any and all hours, and that instinct for pleasure which a grave philosophy and political sobriety had thus far tempered and restrained. With Pulci, Berni, Bibiena, Ariosto, Bandelli, Aretino, and so many others, we soon see the advent of voluptuous debauchery and open skepticism, and later a cynical unbounded licentiousness. These joyous and refined civilizations based on a worship of pleasure and intellectuality—Greece of the fourth century, Provence of the twelfth, and Italy of the sixteenth—were not enduring. Man in these lacks some checks. After sudden outbursts of genius and creativeness he wanders away in the direction of license and egotism; the degenerate artist and thinker makes room for the sophist and the dilettant. But in this transient brilliancy his beauty was charming. . . . It is in this world, again become pagan, that painting revives, and the new tastes she is to gratify show beforehand the road she is to follow; henceforth she is to decorate the houses of rich merchants who love antiquity and who desire to live daintily.”—H. A. Taine, *Italy, Florence and Venice*, bk. 3, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: A. von Reumont, *Lorenzo de' Medici*.—W. Roscoe, *Life of Lorenzo de' Medici*.—F.-T. Perrens, *Hist. of Florence*, 1434-1531, bk. 2, ch. 2-6.

A. D. 1490-1498.—The preaching of Savonarola.—The coming of Charles VIII. of France, and expulsion of the Medici.—The great religious revival and Christianization of the Commonwealth.—Conflict with the Church and fall of Savonarola.—Girolamo, or Jerome Savonarola, a Dominican monk, born at Ferrara in 1452, educated to be a physician, but led by early disgust with the world to renounce his intended profession and give himself to the religious life, was sent to the convent of St. Mark, in Florence, in 1490, when he had reached the age of 37. “He began his career as a reader and lecturer, and his lectures, though only intended for novices, drew a large audience. He then lectured in the garden of the cloister, under a large rosebush, where many intellectual men came from the city to hear him. At length he began to preach in the Church of St. Mark's, and

his subject was the Apocalypse, out of which he predicted the restoration of the Church in Italy, which he declared God would bring about by a severe visitation. Its influence upon his hearers was overpowering; there was no room in the church for the brethren; his fame spread abroad, and he was next appointed to preach the sermons in the cathedral. . . . Amid the luxurious, æsthetic, semi-pagan life of Florence, in the ears of the rich citizens, the licentious youth, the learned Platonists, he denounced the revival of paganism, the corruptions of the Church, the ignorance and consequent slavery of the people, and declared that God would visit Italy with some terrible punishment, and that it would soon come. He spoke severe words about the priests, declared to the people that the Scriptures were the only guides to salvation; that salvation did not come from external works, as the Church taught, but from faith in Christ, from giving up the heart to Him, and if He forgave sin, there was no need for any other absolution. Scarcely had he been a year in Florence when he was made prior of the monastery. There was a custom in vogue, a relic of the old times, for every new prior to go to the king or ruler and ask his favour. This homage was then due to Lorenzo di Medici, but Savonarola declared he would never submit to it, saying — 'From whom have I received my office, from God or Lorenzo? Let us pray for grace to the Highest.' Lorenzo passed over this slight, being anxious to acquire the friendship of one whom he clearly saw would exert great influence over the Florentines. Burlamachi, his contemporary biographer, tells us that Lorenzo tried all kinds of plans to win the friendship of Savonarola: he attended the church of St. Mark; listened to his sermons; gave large sums of money to him for the poor; loitered in the garden to attract his attention — but with little success. Savonarola treated him with respect, gave his money away to the poor, but avoided him and denounced him. Another plan was tried: five distinguished men waited on Savonarola, and begged him to spare such elevated persons in his sermons, to treat more of generalities, and not to foretell the future. They received a prophetic answer: 'Go tell your master, Lorenzo, to repent of his sins, or God will punish him and his. Does he threaten me with banishment? Well, I am but a stranger, and he is the first citizen in Florence, but let him know that I shall remain and he must soon depart!' What happened shortly after caused the people to begin to regard Savonarola as a prophet, and won him that terrible fame which caused his downfall. . . . Lorenzo died on the 8th April, 1492, and from that time Savonarola becomes more prominent. He directed his exertions to the accomplishment of three objects — the reformation of his monastery, the reformation of the Florentine State, and the reformation of the Church. He changed the whole character of his monastery. . . . Then he proceeded to State matters, and in this step we come to the problem of his life — was he a prophet or a fanatic? Let the facts speak for themselves. Lorenzo was succeeded by his son Pietro, who was vastly inferior to his father in learning and statesmanship. His only idea appears to have been a desire to unite Florence and Naples into one principality; this created for him many enemies, and men began to fancy that the great house of Medici would terminate with him. So, it appears,

thought Savonarola, and announced the fact at first privately amongst his friends; in a short time, however, he began to prophecy their downfall publicly. During the years 1492 and 1494, he was actively engaged in preaching. In Advent of the former year, he began his thirteen sermons upon Noah's Ark. In 1493 he preached the Lent sermons at Bologna, and upon his return he began preaching in the cathedral. In these sermons he predicted the approaching fall of the State to the astonishment of all his hearers, who had not the slightest apprehension of danger: 'The Lord has declared that His sword shall come upon the land swiftly and soon.' This was the burden of a sermon preached on Advent Sunday, 1492. At the close of 1493, and as the new year approached, he spoke out more plainly and definitely. He declared that one should come over the Alps who was called, like Cyrus, of whom Jeremiah wrote; and he should, sword in hand, wreak vengeance upon the tyrants of Italy. . . . His preaching had always exerted a marvellous influence upon people, as we shall hereafter note, but they could not understand the cause of these predictions. The city was at peace; gay and joyous as usual, and no fear was entertained; but towards the end of the year came the fulfilment. Charles VIII., King of France, called into Italy by Duke Ludovico of Milan, came over the Alps with an immense army, took Naples, and advanced on Florence. The expulsion of the Medici from Florence soon followed. Pietro, being captured, signed an agreement to deliver up all his strongholds to Charles VIII., and to pay him 200,000 ducats [see ITALY: A. D. 1494-1496]. The utmost indignation seized the Florentines when they heard of this treaty. The Signori sent heralds to Charles, to negotiate for milder terms, and their chief was Savonarola, who addressed the King like a prophet, begged him to take pity on Italy, and save her. His words had the desired effect. Charles made more easy terms, and left it to the Florentine people to settle their own State. In the meantime Pietro returned, but he found Florence in the greatest excitement — the royal palace was closed; stones were thrown at him; he summoned his guards, but the people took to arms, and he was compelled to fly to his brothers Giovanni and Giuliano. The Signori declared them to be traitors, and set a price upon their heads. Their palace and its treasures fell into the hands of the people. The friends of the Medici, however, were not all extinct; and as a discussion arose which was likely to lead to a struggle, Savonarola summoned the people to meet under the dome of St. Mark. . . . In fact, the formation of the new State fell upon Savonarola, for the people looked up to him as an inspired prophet. He proposed that 3,200 citizens should form themselves into a general council. Then they drew lots for a third part, who for six months were to act together as an executive body and represent the general council, another one-third for the next three months, and so on; so that every citizen had his turn in the council every eighteen months. They ultimately found it convenient to reduce the number to 80 — in fact, Savonarola's Democracy was rapidly becoming oligarchic. Each of these 80 representatives was to be 40 years of age; they voted with black and white beans, six being a legal majority. But the Chief of the State was

to be Christ; He was to be the new monarch. His next step was to induce them to proclaim a general amnesty, in which he succeeded only through vigorously preaching to them that forgiveness was sweeter than vengeance—that freedom and peace were more loving than strife and hatred. . . . He was now at the height of his power; his voice ruled the State; he is the only instance in Europe of a monk openly leading a republic. The people regarded him as something more than human: they knew of his nights spent in prayer; of his long fasts; of his unbounded charity. . . . Few preachers ever exerted such influence upon the minds of crowds, such a vitalizing influence; he changed the whole character of Florentine society. Libertines abandoned their vices; the theatres and taverns were empty; there was no card playing, nor dice throwing; the love of fasting grew so general, that meat could not be sold; the city of Florence was God's city, and its government a Theocracy. There was a custom in Florence, during Carnival time, for the children to go from house to house and bid people give up their cherished pleasures; and so great was the enthusiasm at this period that people gave up their cards, their dice and backgammon boards, the ladies their perfumed waters, veils, paint-pots, false hair, musical instruments, harps, lutes, licentious tales, especially those of Boccaccio, dream books, romances, and popular songs. All this booty was gathered together in a heap in the market place, the people assembled, the Signori took their places, and children clothed in white, with olive branches on their heads, received from them the burning torches, and set fire to the pile amid the blast of trumpets and chant of psalms, which were continued till the whole was consumed. . . . His fame had now reached other countries; foreigners visited Florence solely for the purpose of seeing and hearing him. The Sultan of Turkey allowed his sermons to be translated and circulated in his dominions. But in the midst of his prosperity his enemies were not idle: as he progressed their jealousy increased: his preaching displeased them, terrified them, and amongst these the most bitter and virulent were the young sons of the upper classes: they called his followers 'howlers' (Piagnoni), and so raged against him that they gained the name, now immortalised in history, of the Arrabbiati (the furies): this party was increased by the old friends of the Medici, who called him a rebel and leader of the lower classes. Dolfio Spini, a young man of position and wealth, commanded this party, and used every effort to destroy the reputation of Savonarola, to incite the people against him, and to ruin him. They bore the name of 'Compagnacci'; they wrote satires about the Piagnoni; they circulated slanders about the monk who was making Florence the laughing stock of Europe: but Savonarola went on his way indifferent to the signs already manifesting themselves amongst his countrymen, ever most sensitive to ridicule. He also strove to reform the Church: he delineated the Apostolic Church as a model upon which he would build up that of Florence. . . . By this time, the intelligence of his doings, and the gist of his preaching and writing, which had been carefully transmitted to Rome by his enemies, began to attract the attention of the Pope, Alexander VI., who tried what had frequently proved an infallible remedy, and offered Savona-

rola a Cardinal's hat, which he at once refused. He was then invited to Rome, but thought it prudent to excuse himself. When the controversy between him and the Pope appeared to approach a crisis, Savonarola took a step which somewhat hurried the catastrophe. He wrote to the Kings of France and Spain, and the Emperor of Germany, to call a General Council to take into consideration the Reform of the Church. One of these letters reached the Pope, through a spy of Duke Ludovico Moro, of Milan, whom Savonarola had denounced. The result was the issue of a Breve (October, 1496), which forbade him to preach. The Pope then ordered the Congregation of St. Mark to be broken up and amalgamated with another. For a time Savonarola, at the advice of his friends, remained quiet; but at this last step, to break up the institution he had established, he was aroused to action. He denounced Rome as the source of all the poison which was undermining the constitution of the Church; declared that its evil fame stunk in men's nostrils. The Pope then applied to the Signori to deliver up this enemy of the Church, but to no purpose. The Franciscans were ordered to preach against him, but they made no impression. Then came the last thunderbolt: a Bann was issued (12th May, 1497), which was announced by the Franciscans. During the time of his suspension and his excommunication, many things happened which tended to his downfall, although his friends gathered round him: the rapid change of ministry brought in turn friends of the Medici to the helm; they introduced the young Compagnacci into the Council, and gradually his enemies were increasing in the Government to a strong party." The fickle Florentine mob now took sides with them against the monk whom it had recently adored, and on the 7th of April, 1498, in the midst of a raging tumult, Savonarola was taken into custody by the Signori of the city. With the assent of the Pope, he was subjected seven times to torture upon the rack, to force from him a recantation of all that he had taught and preached, and on the 23d of May he was hanged and burned, in company with two of his disciples.—O. T. Hill, *Introd. to Savonarola's "Triumph of the Cross."*

ALSO IN: P. Villari, *Hist. of Savonarola and his Times*.—Mrs. Oliphant, *The Makers of Florence*.—H. H. Milman, *Savonarola, Erasmus, and other Essays*.—George Eliot, *Romola*.—H. Grimm, *Life of Michael Angelo*, v. 1, ch. 3-4.

A. D. 1494-1509.—The French deliverance of Pisa and the long war of reconquest. See PISA: A. D. 1494-1509.

A. D. 1498-1500.—Threatened by the Medici, on one side, and Cæsar Borgia on the other.—An new division of parties.—"After the death of Savonarola things changed with such a degree of rapidity that the Arrabbiati had not time to consider in what manner they could restrict the government; but they soon became convinced that the only salvation for the Republic was to adopt the course which had been recommended by the Friar. Piero and Giuliano dei Medici were in fact already in the neighbourhood of Florence, supported by a powerful Venetian army. It became, therefore, absolutely necessary for the Arrabbiati to unite with the Piagnoni, in order to defend themselves against so many dangers and so many enemies. By great good fortune,

the Duke of Milan, from jealousy of the Venetians, came to their assistance to ward off the danger; but who could trust to his friendship—who could place any reliance on his fidelity? As to Alexander Borgia, he who had held out such great hopes, and had made so many promises, in order to get Savonarola put to death, no sooner was his object attained than he gave full sway to his unbridled passions. It seemed as if the death of the poor Friar had released both the Pope and his son, Duke Valentino, from all restraints upon their lusts and ambition. The Pope formed intimate alliances with Turks and Jews, a thing hitherto unheard of. He, in one year, set up twelve cardinals' hats for sale. The history of the incests and murders of the family of Borgia is too well known to render it necessary for us to enter into any detailed account of them here. The great object of the Pope was to form a State for his son in the Romagna; and so great was the ambition of Duke Valentino, that he contemplated extending his power over the whole of Italy, Tuscany being the first part he meant to seize upon. With that view he was always endeavouring to create new dangers to the Republic; at one time he caused Arezzo to rise against it; at another time he threatened to bring back Piero de' Medici; and he was continually ravaging their territory. The consequence was, that the Florentines were obliged to grant him an annual subsidy of 36,000 ducats, under the name of *condotta* (military pay); but even that did not restrain him from every now and then, under various pretexts, overrunning and laying waste their territory. Thus did Alexander Borgia fulfil those promises to the Republic by which they had been induced to murder Savonarola. The Arrabbiati were at length convinced that to defend themselves against the Medici and Borgia, their only course was to cultivate the alliance with France, and unite in good faith with the Piagnoni. Thus they completely adopted the line of policy which Savonarola had advised; and the consequence was, that their affairs got order and their exertions were attended with a success far beyond what could have been anticipated."—P. Villari, *Hist. of Savonarola and of his Times*, v. 2, *conclusion*.—"A new division of parties may be said to have taken place under the three denominations of 'Palleschi' [a name derived from the watchword of the Mediceans, 'palle, palle,' which alluded to the well-known balls in the coat of arms of the Medici family], 'Ottimati,' and 'Popolani.' The first . . . were for the Medici and themselves. . . . The 'Ottimati' were in eager search for a sort of visionary government where a few of the noblest blood, the most illustrious connexions and the greatest riches, were to rule Florence without any regard to the Medici. . . . The Popolani, who formed the great majority, loved civic liberty, therefore were constantly watching the Medici and other potent and ambitious men."—H. E. Napier, *Florentine History*, bk. 2, ch. 8 (v. 4).

A. D. 1502-1569.—Ten years under Piero Soderini.—Restoration of the Medici and their second expulsion.—Siege of the city by the imperial army.—Final surrender to Medicean tyranny.—Creation of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany.—"In 1502, it was decreed that the Gonfalonier should hold office for life—should be in fact a Doge. To this important post of permanent president Piero Soderini was ap-

pointed; and in his hands were placed the chief affairs of the republic. . . . During the ten years which elapsed between 1502 and 1512, Piero Soderini administered Florence with an outward show of great prosperity. He regained Pisa, and maintained an honourable foreign policy in the midst of the wars stirred up by the League of Cambray. Meanwhile the young princes of the house of Medici had grown to manhood in exile. The Cardinal Giovanni was 37 in 1512. His brother Giuliano was 33. Both of these men were better fitted than their brother Piero to fight the battles of the family. Giovanni, in particular, had inherited no small portion of the Medicean craft. During the troubled reign of Julius II. he kept very quiet, cementing his connection with powerful men in Rome, but making no effort to regain his hold on Florence. Now the moment for striking a decisive blow had come. After the battle of Ravenna in 1512, the French were driven out of Italy, and the Sforzas returned to Milan [see ITALY: A. D. 1510-1513]; the Spanish troops, under the Viceroy Cardona, remained masters of the country. Following the camp of these Spaniards, Giovanni de' Medici entered Tuscany in August, and caused the restoration of the Medici to be announced in Florence. The people, assembled by Soderini, resolved to resist to the uttermost. . . . Yet their courage failed on August 29th, when news reached them of the capture and the sack of Prato. Prato is a sunny little city a few miles distant from the walls of Florence, famous for the beauty of its women, the richness of its gardens, and the grace of its buildings. Into this gem of cities the savage soldiery of Spain marched in the bright autumnal weather, and turned the paradise into a hell. It is even now impossible to read of what they did in Prato without shuddering. Cruelty and lust, sordid greed for gold, and cold delight in bloodshed, could go no further. Giovanni de' Medici, by nature mild and voluptuous, averse to violence of all kinds, had to smile approval, while the Spanish Viceroy knocked thus with mailed hand for him at the door of Florence. The Florentines were paralysed with terror. They deposed Soderini and received the Medici. Giovanni and Giuliano entered their devastated palace in the Via Larga, abolished the Grand Council, and dealt with the republic as they listed. . . . It is not likely that they would have succeeded in maintaining their authority—for they were poor and ill-supported by friends outside the city—except for one most lucky circumstance: that was the election of Giovanni de' Medici to the Papacy in 1513. The creation of Leo X. spread satisfaction throughout Italy. . . . Florence shared in the general rejoicing. . . . It seemed as though the Republic, swayed by him, might make herself the first city in Italy, and restore the glories of her Guelf ascendancy upon the platform of Renaissance statecraft. There was now no overt opposition to the Medici in Florence. How to govern the city from Rome, and how to advance the fortunes of his brother Giuliano and his nephew Lorenzo (Piero's son, a young man of 21), occupied the Pope's most serious attention. For Lorenzo, Leo obtained the Duchy of Urbino and the hand of a French princess. Giuliano was named Gonfalonier of the Church. He also received the French title of Duke of Nemours and the hand of Filiberta, Princess of Savoy. . . . Giulio, the Pope's

bastard cousin, was made cardinal. . . . To Lorenzo, Duke of Urbino, the titular head of the family, was committed the government of Florence. . . . Florence now for the first time saw a regular court established in her midst, with a prince, who, though he bore a foreign title, was in fact her master. The joyous days of Lorenzo the Magnificent returned. . . . But this prosperity was no less brief than it was brilliant. A few years sufficed to sweep off all the chiefs of the great house. Giuliano died in 1516, leaving only a bastard son, Ippolito. Lorenzo died in 1519, leaving a bastard son, Alessandro, and a daughter, six days old, who lived to be the Queen of France. Leo died in 1521. There remained now no legitimate male descendants from the stock of Cosimo. The honours and pretensions of the Medici devolved upon three bastards, —on the Cardinal Giulio, and the two boys, Alessandro and Ippolito. Of these, Alessandro was a mulatto, his mother having been a Moorish slave in the Palace of Urbino; and whether his father was Giulio, or Giuliano, or a base groom, was not known for certain. To such extremities were the Medici reduced. . . . Giulio de' Medici was left in 1521 to administer the State of Florence single-handed. He was archbishop, and he resided in the city, holding it with the grasp of an absolute ruler. . . . In 1523, the Pope, Adrian VI., expired after a short papacy, from which he gained no honour and Italy no profit. Giulio hurried to Rome, and, by the clever use of his large influence, caused himself to be elected with the title of Clement VII." Then followed the strife of France and Spain—of Francis I. and Charles V.—for the possession of Italy, and the barbarous sack of Rome in 1527 (see ITALY: A. D. 1523-1527, 1527, and 1527-1529). "When the Florentines knew what was happening in Rome, they rose and forced the Cardinal Passerini [whom the Pope had appointed to act as his vicegerent in the government of Florence] to depart with the Medicean bastards from the city. . . . The whole male population was enrolled in a militia. The Grand Council was reformed, and the republic was restored upon the basis of 1495. Niccolò Capponi was elected Gonfalonier. The name of Christ was again registered as chief of the commonwealth—to such an extent did the memory of Savonarola still sway the popular imagination. The new State hastened to form an alliance with France, and Malatesta Baglioni was chosen as military Commander-in-Chief. Meanwhile the city armed itself for siege—Michel Angelo Buonarroti and Francesco da San Gallo undertaking the construction of new forts

and ramparts. These measures were adopted with sudden decision, because it was soon known that Clement had made peace with the Emperor, and that the army which had sacked Rome was going to be marched on Florence. . . . On September 4 [1529], the Prince of Orange appeared before the walls, and opened the memorable siege. It lasted eight months, at the end of which time, betrayed by their generals, divided among themselves, and worn out with delays, the Florentines capitulated. . . . The long yoke of the Medici had undermined the character of the Florentines. This, their last glorious struggle for liberty, was but a flash in the pan—a final flare up of the dying lamp. . . . What remains of Florentine history may be briefly told. Clement, now the undisputed arbiter of power and honour in the city, chose Alessandro de' Medici to be prince. Alessandro was created Duke of Civitā di Penna, and married to a natural daughter of Charles V. Ippolito was made a cardinal." Ippolito was subsequently poisoned by Alessandro, and Alessandro was murdered by another kinsman, who suffered assassination in his turn. "When Alessandro was killed in 1539, Clement had himself been dead five years. Thus the whole posterity of Cosimo de' Medici, with the exception of Catherine, Queen of France [daughter of Lorenzo, Duke of Urbino, the son of Piero de' Medici], was utterly extinguished. But the Medici had struck root so firmly in the State, and had so remodelled it upon the type of tyranny, that the Florentines were no longer able to do without them. The chiefs of the Ottimati selected Cosimo," a descendant from Lorenzo, brother of the Cosimo who founded the power of the House. "He it was who obtained [1569] the title of Grand Duke of Tuscany from the Pope—a title confirmed by the Emperor, fortified by Austrian alliances, and transmitted through his heirs to the present century."—J. A. Symonds, *Sketches and studies in Italy*, ch. 5 (*Florence and the Medici*).

ALSO IN: H. Grimm, *Life of Michael Angelo*, ch. 8-15 (v. 1-2).—T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence*, bk. 9, ch. 10, bk. 10 (v. 4).—H. E. Napier, *Florentine History*, v. 4-5. —W. Roscoe, *Life and Pontificate of Leo X.*, ch. 9-23 (v. 1-2).—P. Villari, *Machiavelli and his Times*, v. 3-4.

A. D. 1803.—Becomes the capital of the kingdom of Etruria. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803.

A. D. 1865.—Made temporarily the capital of the kingdom of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1862-1866.

FLORES. See MALAY ARCHIPELAGO.

FLORIDA: The aboriginal inhabitants. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: APALACHES; MUSK-HOGGAN FAMILY; SEMINOLES; TIMUQUANAN FAMILY.

A. D. 1512.—Discovery and Naming by Ponce de Leon. See AMERICA: A. D. 1512.

A. D. 1528-1542.—The expeditions of Narvaez and Hernando de Soto.—Wide Spanish application of the name Florida.—"The voyages of Garay [1519-1523] and Vasquez de Ayllon [1520-1526] threw new light on the discoveries of Ponce, and the general outline of the coasts of Florida became known to the Spaniards. Meanwhile, Cortés had conquered Mexico, and the fame

of that iniquitous but magnificent exploit rang through all Spain. Many an impatient cavalier burned to achieve a kindred fortune. To the excited fancy of the Spaniards the unknown land of Florida seemed the seat of surpassing wealth, and Pamphilo de Narvaez essayed to possess himself of its fancied treasures. Landing on its shores [1528], and proclaiming destruction to the Indians unless they acknowledged the sovereignty of the Pope and the Emperor, he advanced into the forests with 300 men. Nothing could exceed their sufferings. Nowhere could they find the gold they came to seek. The village of Appalache, where they hoped to gain a rich booty, offered nothing but a few mean wigwams. The horses gave out and the famished soldiers fed

upon their flesh. The men sickened, and the Indians unceasingly harassed their march. At length, after 280 leagues of wandering, they found themselves on the northern shore of the Gulf of Mexico, and desperately put to sea in such crazy boats as their skill and means could construct. Cold, disease, famine, thirst, and the fury of the waves, melted them away. Narvaez himself perished, and of his wretched followers no more than four escaped, reaching by land, after years of vicissitude, the Christian settlements of New Spain. . . . Cabeça de Vaca was one of the four who escaped, and, after living for years among the tribes of Mississippi, crossed the River Mississippi near Memphis, journeyed westward by the waters of the Arkansas and Red River to New Mexico and Chihuahua, thence to Cinaloa on the Gulf of California, and thence to Mexico. The narrative is one of the most remarkable of the early relations. . . . The interior of the vast country then comprehended under the name of Florida still remained unexplored. . . . Hernando de Soto . . . companion of Pizarro in the conquest of Peru . . . asked and obtained permission [1537] to conquer Florida. While this design was in agitation, Cabeça de Vaca, one of those who had survived the expedition of Narvaez, appeared in Spain, and for purposes of his own spread abroad the mischievous falsehood that Florida was the richest country yet discovered. De Soto's plans were embraced with enthusiasm. Nobles and gentlemen contended for the privilege of joining his standard; and, setting sail with an ample armament, he landed [May, 1539] at the Bay of Espiritu Santo, now Tampa Bay, in Florida, with 620 chosen men, a band as gallant and well appointed, as eager in purpose and audacious in hope, as ever trod the shores of the New World. . . . The adventurers began their march. Their story has been often told. For month after month and year after year, the procession of priests and cavaliers, cross-bowmen, arquebusers, and Indian captives laden with the baggage, still wandered on through wild and boundless wastes, lured hither and thither by the ignis-fatuus of their hopes. They traversed great portions of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, everywhere inflicting and enduring misery, but never approaching their phantom El Dorado. At length, in the third year of their journeying, they reached the banks of the Mississippi, 132 years before its second [or third?] discovery by Marquette. . . . The Spaniards crossed over at a point above the mouth of the Arkansas. They advanced westward, but found no treasures,—nothing indeed but hardships, and an Indian enemy, furious, writes one of their officers, 'as mad dogs.' They heard of a country towards the north where maize could not be cultivated because the vast herds of wild cattle devoured it. They penetrated so far that they entered the range of the roving prairie-tribes. . . . Finding neither gold nor the South Sea, for both of which they had hoped, they returned to the banks of the Mississippi. De Soto . . . fell into deep dejection, followed by an attack of fever, and soon after died miserably [May 21, 1542]. To preserve his body from the Indians his followers sank it at midnight in the river, and the sullen waters of the Mississippi buried his ambition and his hopes. The adventurers were now, with few exceptions, disgusted with the enterprise, and

longed only to escape from the scene of their miseries. After a vain attempt to reach Mexico by land, they again turned back to the Mississippi, and labored, with all the resources which their desperate necessity could suggest, to construct vessels in which they might make their way to some Christian settlement. . . . Seven brigantines were finished and launched; and, trusting their lives on board these frail vessels, they descended the Mississippi, running the gauntlet between hostile tribes who fiercely attacked them. Reaching the Gulf, though not without the loss of eleven of their number, they made sail for the Spanish settlement on the River Panuco, where they arrived safely, and where the inhabitants met them with a cordial welcome. Three hundred and eleven men thus escaped with life, leaving behind them the bones of their comrades, strewn broadcast through the wilderness. De Soto's fate proved an insufficient warning, for those were still found who begged a fresh commission for the conquest of Florida; but the Emperor would not hear them. A more pacific enterprise was undertaken by Canello [or Cancer], a Dominican monk, who with several brother-ecclesiastics undertook to convert the natives to the true faith, but was murdered in the attempt. . . . Not a Spaniard had yet gained foothold in Florida. That name, as the Spaniards of that day understood it, comprehended the whole country extending from the Atlantic on the east to the longitude of New Mexico on the west, and from the Gulf of Mexico and the River of Palms indefinitely northward towards the polar Sea. This vast territory was claimed by Spain in right of the discoveries of Columbus, the grant of the Pope, and the various expeditions mentioned above. England claimed it in right of the discoveries of Cabot, while France could advance no better title than might be derived from the voyage of Verrazano and vague traditions of earlier visits of Breton adventurers." —F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: T. Irving, *Conquest of Florida by De Soto*.—*Discovery and Conquest of Terra Florida*; written by a Gentleman of Elvas (Hakluyt Soc.).—J. W. Monette, *Discovery and Settlement of the Mississippi Valley*, ch. 1-4.—J. G. Shea, *Ancient Florida (Narrative and Critical Hist. of Am., v. 2, ch. 4)*.

A. D. 1562-1563.—First colonizing attempt of the French Huguenots.—About the middle of the 16th century, certain of the Protestants of France began to turn their thoughts to the New World as a possible place of refuge from the persecutions they were suffering at home. "Some of the French sea-ports became strong-holds of the Huguenots. Their most prominent supporter, Coligny, was high admiral of France. These Huguenots looked toward the new countries as the proper field in which to secure a retreat from persecution, and to found a new religious commonwealth. Probably many of the French 'corsarios' following the track of the Portuguese and Spaniards to the West Indies and the coasts of Brazil, were Huguenots. . . . The first scheme for a Protestant colony in the new world was suggested by Admiral Coligny in 1554, and intended for the coast of Brazil, to which an expedition, under Durand de Villegagnon, was sent with ships and colonists. This expedition arrived at the Bay of Rio de Janeiro in 1555.

and founded there the first European settlement. It was followed the next year by another expedition. But the whole enterprise came to an end by divisions among the colonists, occasioned by the treacherous, despotic, and cruel proceedings of its commander, a reputed Catholic. The colony was finally subverted by the Portuguese, who, in 1560, sent out an armament against it, and took possession of the Bay of Rio de Janeiro. . . . After the unfortunate end of the French enterprise to South America, Admiral Coligny, who may be styled the Raleigh of France, turned his attention to the eastern shores of North America; the whole of which had become known in France from the voyage of Verrazano, and the French expeditions to Canada and the Banks of Newfoundland." In February, 1562, an expedition, fitted out by Coligny, sailed from Havre de Grace, under Jean Ribault, with René de Laudonnière forming one of the company. Ribault arrived on the Florida coast in the neighborhood of the present harbor of St. Augustine, and thence sailed north. "At last, in about 32° 30' N. he found an excellent broad and deep harbor, which he named Port Royal, which probably is the present Broad River, or Port Royal entrance. . . . He found this port and the surrounding country so advantageous and of such 'singular beauty,' that he resolved to leave here a part of his men in a small fort. . . . A pillar with the arms of France was therefore erected, and a fort constructed, furnished with cannon, ammunition, and provisions, and named 'Charlesfort.' Thirty volunteers were placed in it, and it became the second European settlement ever attempted upon the east coast of the United States. Its position was probably not far from the site of the present town of Beaufort, on Port Royal River. Having accomplished this, and made a certain captain, Albert de la Pieria, 'a soldier of great experience,' commander of Charlesfort, he took leave of his countrymen, and left Port Royal on the 11th day of June," arriving in France on the 20th of July. "On his arrival in France, Ribault found the country in a state of great commotion. The civil war between the Huguenots and the Catholics was raging, and neither the king nor the admiral had time to listen to Ribault's solicitations, to send relief to the settlers left in 'French Florida.' Those colonists remained, therefore, during the remainder of 1562, and the following winter, without assistance from France; and after many trials and sufferings, they were at last forced, in 1563, to abandon their settlement and the new country." Having constructed a ship, with great difficulty, they put to sea; but suffered horribly on the tedious voyage, from want of food and water, until they were rescued by an English vessel and taken to England.—J. G. Kohl, *Hist. of the Discovery of Maine (Maine Hist. Soc. Coll., 2d series, v. 1), ch. 11.*

ALSO IN: F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World*, ch. 3.—Father Charlevoix, *Hist. of New France*; trans. by J. G. Shea, bk. 3 (v. 1).—T. E. V. Smith, *Villegaignon (Am. Soc. of Ch. Hist., v. 3).*

A. D. 1564-1565.—The second Huguenot colony, and the cry in Spain against it.—"After the treacherous peace between Charles IX. and the Huguenots, Coligny renewed his solicitations for the colonization of Florida. The king gave consent; in 1564 three ships were conceded for the service; and Laudonnière, who, in

the former voyage, had been upon the American coast, a man of great intelligence, though a seaman rather than a soldier, was appointed to lead forth the colony. . . . A voyage of 60 days brought the fleet, by the way of the Canaries and the Antilles, to the shores of Florida in June. The harbor of Port Royal, rendered gloomy by recollections of misery, was avoided; and, after searching the coast, and discovering places which were so full of amenity that melancholy itself could not but change its humor as it gazed, the followers of Calvin planted themselves on the banks of the river May [now called the St. John's], near St. John's bluff. They sung a psalm of thanksgiving, and gathered courage from acts of devotion. The fort now erected was called Carolina. . . . The French were hospitably welcomed by the natives; a monument, bearing the arms of France, was crowned with laurels, and its base encircled with baskets of corn. What need is there of minutely relating the simple manners of the red men, the dissensions of rival tribes, the largesses offered to the strangers to secure their protection or their alliance, the improvident prodigality with which careless soldiers wasted the supplies of food; the certain approach of scarcity; the gifts and the tribute levied from the Indians by entreaty, menace or force? By degrees the confidence of the red men was exhausted; they had welcomed powerful guests, who promised to become their benefactors, and who now robbed their humble granaries. But the worst evil in the new settlement was the character of the emigrants. Though patriotism and religious enthusiasm had prompted the expedition, the inferior class of the colonists was a motley group of dissolute men. Mutinies were frequent. The men were mad with the passion for sudden wealth; and in December a party, under the pretence of desiring to escape from famine, compelled Laudonnière to sign an order permitting their embarkation for New Spain. No sooner were they possessed of this apparent sanction of the chief than they began a career of piracy against the Spaniards. The act of crime and temerity was soon avenged. The pirate vessel was taken, and most of the men disposed of as prisoners or slaves. The few that escaped in a boat sought shelter at Fort Carolina, where Laudonnière sentenced the ringleaders to death. During these events the scarcity became extreme; and the friendship of the natives was forfeited by unprofitable severity. March of 1565 was gone, and there were no supplies from France; April passed away, and the expected recruits had not arrived; May brought nothing to sustain the hopes of the exiles, and they resolved to attempt a return to Europe. In August, Sir John Hawkins, the slave merchant, arrived from the West Indies. He came fresh from the sale of a cargo of Africans, whom he had kidnapped with signal ruthlessness; and he now displayed the most generous sympathy, not only furnishing a liberal supply of provisions, but relinquishing a vessel from his own fleet. The colony was on the point of embarking when sails were desisted. Ribault had arrived to assume the command, bringing with him supplies of every kind, emigrants with their families, garden-seeds, implements of husbandry, and the various kinds of domestic animals. The French, now wild with joy, seemed about to acquire a home, and Calvinism to become fixed in the inviting regions of

Florida. But Spain had never abandoned her claim to that territory, where, if she had not planted colonies, she had buried many hundreds of her bravest sons. . . . There had appeared at the Spanish court a commander well fitted for reckless acts. Pedro Melendez [or Menendez] de Aviles . . . had acquired wealth in Spanish America, which was no school of benevolence, and his conduct there had provoked an inquiry, which, after a long arrest, ended in his conviction. . . . Philip II. suggested the conquest and colonization of Florida; and in May, 1565, a compact was framed and confirmed by which Melendez, who desired an opportunity to retrieve his honor, was constituted the hereditary governor of a territory of almost unlimited extent. On his part he stipulated, at his own cost, in the following May, to invade Florida with 500 men; to complete its conquest within three years; to explore its currents and channels, the dangers of its coasts, and the depth of its havens; to establish a colony of at least 500 persons, of whom 100 should be married men; with 12 ecclesiastics, besides four Jesuits. . . . Meantime, news arrived, as the French writers assert through the treachery of the court of France, that the Huguenots had made a plantation in Florida, and that Ribault was preparing to set sail with reinforcements. The cry was raised that the heretics must be extirpated; and Melendez readily obtained the forces which he required."—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (author's last rev.)*, pt. 1, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: G. R. Fairbanks, *Hist. of Florida*, ch. 7-8.—W. G. Simms, *Hist. of S. Carolina*, bk. 1.

A. D. 1565.—The Spanish capture of Fort Caroline and massacre of the Huguenots.—Founding of St. Augustine.—"The expedition under Menendez consisted of an army of 2,600 soldiers and officers. He sailed straight for Florida, intending to attack Fort Caroline with no delay. In fact he sighted the mouth of the port [Sept. 4, 1565] two months after starting; but, considering the position occupied by the French ships, he judged it prudent to defer the attack, and make it, if possible, from the land. A council of war was held in Fort Caroline, presided over by Ribaut. Laudonnière proposed that, while Ribaut held the fort with the ships, he, with his old soldiers, who knew the country well, aided by the Floridians as auxiliaries, should engage the Spaniards in the woods, and harass them by perpetual combats in labyrinths to which they were wholly unaccustomed. The advice was good, but it was not followed. Ribaut proposed to follow the Spanish fleet with his own—lighter and more easily handled—fall on the enemy when the soldiers were all disembarked, and, after taking and burning the ships, to attack the army. In the face of remonstrances from all the officers, he persisted in this project. Disaster followed the attempt. A violent gale arose. The French ships were wrecked upon the Floridan coast; the men lost their arms, their powder, and their clothes; they escaped with their bare lives. There was no longer the question of conquering the Spaniards, but of saving themselves. The garrison of Caroline consisted of 150 soldiers, of whom 40 were sick. The rest of the colony was composed of sick and wounded Protestant ministers, workmen, 'royal commissioners,' and so forth. Laudonnière was in command. They awaited the attack for several days, yet the

Spaniards came not. They were wading miserably through the marshes in the forests, under tropical rains, discouraged, and out of heart." But when, at length, the exhausted and despairing Spaniards, toiling through the marshes, from St. Augustine, where they had landed and established their settlement, reached the French fort (Sept. 20), "there was actually no watch on the ramparts. Three companies of Spaniards simultaneously rushed from the forest, and attacked the fortress on the south, the west and the south-west. There was but little resistance from the surprised garrison. There was hardly time to grasp a sword. About 20 escaped by flight, including the Captain, Laudonnière; the rest were every one massacred. None were spared except women and children under fifteen; and, in the first rage of the onslaught, even these were murdered with the rest. There still lay in the port three ships, commanded by Jacques Ribaut, brother [son] of the unfortunate Governor. One of these was quickly sent to the bottom by the cannon of the fort; the other two cut their cables, and slipped out of reach into the roadstead, where they lay, waiting for a favourable wind, for three days. They picked up the fugitives who had been wandering half-starved in the woods, and then set sail from this unlucky land. . . . There remained, however, the little army, under Ribaut, which had lost most of its arms in the wreck, and was now wandering along the Floridan shore." When Ribaut and his men reached Fort Caroline and saw the Spanish flag flying, they turned and retreated southward. Not many days later, they were intercepted by Menendez, near St. Augustine, to which post he had returned. The first party of the French who came up, 200 in number, and who were in a starving state, surrendered to the Spaniard, and laid down their arms. "They were brought across the river in small companies, and their hands tied behind their backs. On landing, they were asked if they were Catholics. Eight out of the 200 professed allegiance to that religion; the rest were all Protestants. Menendez traced out a line on the ground with his cane. The prisoners were marched up one by one to the line; on reaching it, they were stabbed. Next day, Ribaut arrived with the rest of the army. The same pourparlers began. But this time a blacker treachery was adopted." An officer, sent by Menendez, pledged his honor to the French that the lives of all should be spared if they laid down their arms. "It is not clear how many of the French accepted the conditions. A certain number refused them, and escaped into the woods. What is certain is, that Ribaut, with nearly all his men, were tied back to back, four together. Those who said they were Catholics, were set on one side; the rest were all massacred as they stood. . . . Outside the circle of the slaughtered and the slaughterers stood the priest, Mendoza, encouraging, approving, exhorting the butchers."—W. Besant, *Gaspard de Coligny*, ch. 7.—The long dispatch in which Menendez reported his fiendish work to the Spanish king has been brought to light in the archives at Seville, and there is this endorsement on it, in the handwriting of Philip II.: "Say to him that, as to those he has killed, he has done well; and as to those he has saved, they shall be sent to the galleys."—F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World*, ch. 7-8.

ALSO IN: C. W. Baird, *Hist. of the Huguenot Emigration to Am.*, v. 1, introd.

A. D. 1567-1568.—The vengeance of Dominic de Gourgues.—“As might have been expected, all attempts to rouse the French court into demanding redress were vain. Spain, above all other nations, knew the arts by which a corrupt court might be swayed, and the same intrigues which, fifty years later, sent Raleigh to the block and well-nigh ended the young colony of Virginia, now kept France quiet. But though the court refused to move, an avenger was not wanting. Dominic de Gourgues had already known as a prisoner of war the horrors of the Spanish galleys. Whether he was a Huguenot is uncertain. Happily in France, as the history of that and all later ages proved, the religion of the Catholic did not necessarily deaden the feelings of the patriot. Seldom has there been a deed of more reckless daring than that which Dominic de Gourgues now undertook. With the proceeds of his patrimony he bought three small ships, manned by eighty sailors and a hundred men-at-arms. He then obtained a commission as a slaver on the coast of Guinea, and in the summer of 1567 set sail. With these paltry resources he aimed at overthrowing a settlement which had already destroyed a force of twenty times his number, and which might have been strengthened in the interval. . . . To the mass of his followers he did not reveal the true secret of his voyage till he had reached the West Indies. Then he disclosed his real purpose. His men were of the same spirit as their leader. Desperate though the enterprise seemed, De Gourgues' only difficulty was to restrain his followers from undue haste. Happily for their attempt, they had allies on whom they had not reckoned. The fickle savages had at first welcomed the Spaniards, but the tyranny of the new comers soon wrought a change, and the Spaniards in Florida, like the Spaniards in every part of the New World, were looked on as hateful tyrants. So when De Gourgues landed he at once found a ready body of allies. . . . Three days were spent in making ready, and then De Gourgues, with a hundred and sixty of his own men and his Indian allies, marched against the enemy. In spite of the hostility of the Indians, the Spaniards seem to have taken no precaution against a sudden attack. Menendez himself had left the colony. The Spanish force was divided between three forts, and no proper precautions were taken for keeping up the communications between them. Each was successively seized, the garrison slain or made prisoners, and, as each fort fell, those in the next could only make vague guesses as to the extent of the danger. Even when divided into three the Spanish force outnumbered that of De Gourgues, and savages with bows and arrows would have counted for little against men with fire arms and behind walls. But after the downfall of the first fort a panic seemed to seize the Spaniards, and the French achieved an almost bloodless victory. After the death of Ribault and his followers nothing could be looked for but merciless retaliation, and De Gourgues copied the severity, though not the perfidy of his enemies. The very details of Menendez' act were imitated, and the trees on which the prisoners were hung bore the inscription: 'Not as Spaniards, but as traitors, robbers, and murderers.' Five weeks later De Gourgues anchored under the walls of Rochelle.

. . . His attack did not wholly extirpate the Spanish power in Florida. Menendez received the blessing of the Pope as a chosen instrument for the conversion of the Indians, returned to America and restored his settlement. As before, he soon made the Indians his deadly enemies. The Spanish settlement held on, but it was not till two centuries later that its existence made itself remembered by one brief but glorious episode in the history of the English colonies.”—J. A. Doyle, *The English in America: Virginia, &c.*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: W. W. Dewhurst, *Hist. of St. Augustine, Fla.*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1628.—Claimed by France, and placed, with New France, under the control of the Company of the Hundred Associates. See CANADA: A. D. 1616-1628.

A. D. 1629.—Claimed in part by England and embraced in the Carolina grant to Sir Robert Heath. See AMERICA: A. D. 1629.

A. D. 1680.—Attack on the English of Carolina. See SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1680.

A. D. 1702.—Adjustment of western boundary with the French of Louisiana. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1698-1712.

A. D. 1740.—Unsuccessful attack on St. Augustine by the English of Georgia and Carolina. See GEORGIA: A. D. 1738-1743.

A. D. 1763 (February).—Ceded to Great Britain by Spain in the Treaty of Paris. See SEVEN YEARS WAR.

A. D. 1763 (July).—Possession taken by the English.—“When, in July [1763], possession was taken of Florida, its inhabitants, of every age and sex, men, women, children, and servants, numbered but 3,000; and, of these, the men were nearly all in the pay of the Catholic king. The possession of it had cost him nearly \$230,000 annually; and now it was accepted by England as a compensation for Havana. Most of the people, receiving from the Spanish treasury indemnity for their losses, had migrated to Cuba, taking with them the bones of their saints and the ashes of their distinguished dead. The western province of Florida extended to the Mississippi, on the line of latitude of 31°. On the 20th of October, the French surrendered the post of Mobile, with its brick fort, which was fast crumbling to ruins. A month later, the slight stockade at Tombigbee, in the west of the Chocta country, was delivered up. In a congress of the Catawbas, Cherokees, Creeks, Chicasas, and Choctas, held on the 10th of November, at Augusta, the governors of Virginia and the colonies south of it were present, and the peace with the Indians of the South and South-west was ratified.”—G. Bancroft, *Hist. of the U. S. (Author's last rev.)*, v. 3, p. 64.

A. D. 1763 (October).—English provinces, East and West, constituted by the King's proclamation. See NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE U. S. OF AM.: A. D. 1763.

A. D. 1779-1781.—Reconquest of West Florida by the Spanish commander at New Orleans.—“In the summer of 1779 Spain had declared war against Great Britain. Galvez [the Spanish commander at New Orleans] discovered that the British were planning the surprise of New Orleans, and, under cover of preparations for defense, made haste to take the offensive. Four days before the time he had appointed to move, a hurricane destroyed a large number of

houses in the town, and spread ruin to crops and dwellings up and down the 'coast,' and sunk his gun flotilla. . . . Repairing his disasters as best he could, and hastening his ostensibly defensive preparations, he marched, on the 22d of August, 1779, against the British forts on the Mississippi. His . . . little army of 1,434 men was without tents, other military furniture, or a single engineer. The gun fleet followed in the river abreast of their line of march along its shores, carrying one 24-, five 18-, and four 4-pounders. With this force, in the space of about three weeks, Fort Bute on bayou Manchac, Baton Rouge and Fort Panmure, 8 vessels, 556 regulars, and a number of sailors, militia-men, and free blacks, fell into the hands of the Spaniards. The next year, 1780, re-enforced from Havana, Galvez again left New Orleans by way of the Balize with 2,000 men, regulars, militia, and free blacks, and on the 15th of March took Fort Charlotte on Mobile river. Galvez next conceived the much larger project of taking Pensacola. Failing to secure re-enforcements from Havana by writing for them, he sailed to that place in October, to make his application in person, intending to move with them directly on the enemy. After many delays and disappointments he succeeded, and early in March, 1781, appeared before Pensacola with a ship of the line, two frigates, and transports containing 1,400 soldiers well furnished with artillery and ammunition. Here he was joined by such troops as could be spared from Mobile, and by Don Estevan Miró from New Orleans, at the head of the Louisiana forces, and on the afternoon of the 16th of March, though practically unsupported by the naval fleet, until dishonor was staring its jealous commanders in the face, moved under hot fire, through a passage of great peril, and took up a besieging position. . . . It is only necessary to state that, on the 9th of May, 1781, Pensacola, with a garrison of 800 men, and the whole of West Florida, were surrendered to Galvez. Louisiana had heretofore been included under one domination with Cuba, but now one of the several rewards bestowed upon her governor was the captain-generalship of Louisiana and West Florida."—G. E. Waring, Jr., and G. W. Cable, *Hist. of New Orleans (U. S. Tenth Census, v. 19)*.

ALSO IN: C. Gayarré, *Hist. of Louisiana: Spanish Domination, ch. 3*.

A. D. 1783-1787.—The question of boundaries between Spain and the United States, and the question of the navigation of the Mississippi.—"By the treaty of 1783 between Great Britain on the one part and the United States and her allies, France and Spain, on the other, Great Britain acknowledged the independence of the colonies, and recognized as a part of their southern boundary a line drawn due east from a point in the Mississippi River, in latitude 31° north, to the middle of the Appalachicola; and at the same time she ceded to Spain by a separate agreement the two Floridas, but without defining their northern boundaries. This omission gave rise to a dispute between Spain and the United States as to their respective limits. On the part of Spain it was contended that by the act of Great Britain, of 1764, the northern boundary of West Florida had been fixed at the line running due east from the mouth of the Yazoo to the Chattahoochee, and that all south of that line had been ceded to her; whilst on the other hand, the United States

as strenuously maintained that the act fixing and enlarging the limits of West Florida was superseded by the recent treaty, which extended their southern boundary to the 31st degree of north latitude, a hundred and ten miles further south than the line claimed by Spain. Spain, however, had possession of the disputed territory by right of conquest, and evidently had no intention of giving it up. She strengthened her garrisons at Baton Rouge and Natchez, and built a fort at Vicksburg, and subsequently one at New Madrid, on the Missouri side of the Mississippi, just below the mouth of the Ohio; and of the latter she made a port of entry where vessels from the Ohio were obliged to land and declare their cargoes. She even denied the right of the United States to the region between the Mississippi and the Alleghany Mountains, which had been ceded to them by Great Britain, on the ground that the conquests made by Governor Galvez, of West Florida, and by Don Eugenio Pierre, of Fort St. Joseph, 'near the sources of the Illinois,' had vested the title to all this country in her; and she insisted that what she did not own was possessed by the Indians, and could not therefore belong to the United States. Even as late as 1795, she claimed to have bought from the Chickasaws the bluffs which bear their name, and which are situated on the east bank of the Mississippi some distance north of the most northerly boundary ever assigned by Great Britain to West Florida. Here, then, was cause for 'a very pretty quarrel,' and to add to the ill feeling which grew out of it, Spain denied the right of the people of the United States to the 'free navigation of the Mississippi,'—a right which had been conceded to them by Great Britain with all the formalities with which she had received it from France. . . . What was needed to make the right of any value to the people of the Ohio valley was the additional right to take their produce into a Spanish port, New Orleans, and either sell it then and there, or else store it, subject to certain conditions, until such time as it suited them to transfer it to sea-going vessels. This right Spain would not concede; and as the people of the Ohio valley were determined to have it, cost what it might, it brought on a series of intrigues between the Spanish governors of Louisiana and certain influential citizens west of the Alleghanies which threatened the stability of the American Union almost before it was formed."—L. Carr, *Missouri, ch. 4*.

ALSO IN: E. Schuyler, *American Diplomacy, ch. 6*.

A. D. 1810-1813.—Continued occupation of West Florida by the Spaniards.—Revolt of the inhabitants.—Possession taken by the Americans from the Mississippi to the Perdido.—"The success of the French in Spain, and the probability of that kingdom being obliged to succumb, had given occasion to revolutionary movements in several of the Spanish American provinces. This example . . . had been followed also in that portion of the Spanish province of West Florida bordering on the Mississippi. The inhabitants, most of whom were of British or American birth, had seized the fort at Baton Rouge, had met in convention, and had proclaimed themselves independent, adopting a single star for their flag, the same symbol afterward assumed by the republic of Texas. Some struggles took place between the adherents of the Spanish

connection and these revolutionists, who were also threatened with attack from Mobile, still held by a Spanish garrison. In this emergency they applied, through Holmes, governor of the Mississippi Territory, for aid and recognition by the United States. . . . The president, however, preferred to issue a proclamation, taking possession of the east bank of the Mississippi, occupation of which, under the Louisiana treaty, had been so long delayed, not, it was said, from any defect of title, but out of conciliatory views toward Spain. . . . Claiborne, governor of the Orleans Territory, then at Washington, was dispatched post-haste to take possession." The following January Congress passed an act in secret session "authorizing the president to take possession as well of East as of West Florida, under any arrangement which had been or might be entered into with the local authorities; or, in case of any attempted occupation by any foreign government, to take and to maintain possession by force. Previously to the passage of this act, the occupation of the east bank of the Mississippi had been already completed by Governor Claiborne; not, however, without some show of resistance. . . . Captain Gaines presently appeared before Mobile with a small detachment of American regulars, and demanded its surrender. Colonel Cushing soon arrived from New Orleans with several gunboats, artillery, and a body of troops. The boats were permitted to ascend the river toward Fort Stoddard without opposition. But the Spanish commandant refused to give up Mobile, and no attempt was made to compel him." By an act of Congress passed in April, 1812, "that part of Florida recently taken possession of, as far east as Pearl River, was annexed to the new state [of Louisiana]. The remaining territory, as far as the Perdido, though Mobile still remained in the hands of the Spaniards, was annexed, by another act, to the Mississippi Territory." A year later, in April, 1813, General Wilkinson was instructed to take possession of Mobile, and to occupy all the territory claimed, to the Perdido, which he accordingly did, without bloodshed.—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S., 2d series, ch. 23, 24, 26 (v. 3).*

A. D. 1816-1818.—The fugitive negroes and the first Seminole War.—Jackson's campaign.—"The tranquillity of Monroe's administration was soon seriously threatened by the renewal of trouble with the Southern Indians [the Seminoles, and the refugee Creeks]. . . . The origin of the difficulty was twofold: first, the injustice which has always marked the treatment of Indian tribes whose lands were coveted by the whites; and secondly, the revival of the old grievance, that Florida was a refuge for the fugitive slaves of Georgia and South Carolina. . . . The Seminoles had never withheld a welcome to the Georgia negro who preferred their wild freedom to the lash of an overseer on a cotton or rice plantation. The Georgians could never forget that the grandchildren of their grandfathers' fugitive slaves were roaming about the Everglades of Florida. . . . So long as there were Seminoles in Florida, and so long as Florida belonged to Spain, just so long would the negroes of Georgia find an asylum in Florida with the Seminoles. . . . A war with the Indians of Florida, therefore, was always literally and emphatically a slave-hunt. A reclamation for fugitives was always repulsed by the Seminoles and the Spaniards, and, as they

could be redeemed in no other way, Georgia was always urging the Federal Government to war."—W. C. Bryant and S. H. Gay, *Popular Hist. of the U. S., v. 4, ch. 10.*—During the War of 1812-14, the English, who were permitted by Spain to make use of Florida with considerable freedom, and who received no little assistance from the refugee negroes and Creek Indians, "had built a fort on the Appalachicola River, about 15 miles from its mouth, and had collected there an immense amount of arms and ammunition. . . . When the war ended, the English left the arms and ammunition in the fort. The negroes seized the fort, and it became known as the 'Negro Fort.' The authorities of the United States sent General Gaines to the Florida frontier with troops, to establish peace on the border. The Negro Fort was a source of anxiety both to the military authorities and to the slave-owners of Georgia," and a pretext was soon found—whether valid or not seems uncertain—for attacking it. "A hot shot penetrated one of the magazines, and the whole fort was blown to pieces, July 27, 1816. There were 300 negro men, women and children, and 20 Choctaws in the fort; 270 were killed. Only three came out unhurt, and these were killed by the allied Indians. . . . During 1817 there were frequent collisions on the frontiers between Whites and Indians. . . . On the 20th of November, General Gaines sent a force of 250 men to Fowltown, the headquarters of the chief of the 'Redsticks,' or hostile Creeks. They approached the town in the early morning, and were fired on. An engagement followed. The town was taken and burned. . . . The Indians of that section, after this, began general hostilities, attacked the boats which were ascending the Appalachicola, and massacred the persons in them. . . . In December, on receipt of intelligence of the battle at Fowltown and the attack on the boats, Jackson was ordered to take command in Georgia. He wrote to President Monroe: 'Let it be signified to me through any channel (say Mr. J. Rhea) that the possession of the Floridas would be desirable to the United States, and in sixty days it will be accomplished.' Much was afterwards made to depend on this letter. Monroe was ill when it reached Washington, and he did not see or read it until a year afterwards, when some reference was made to it. Jackson construed the orders which he received from Calhoun with reference to this letter. . . . He certainly supposed, however, that he had the secret concurrence of the administration in conquering Florida. . . . He advanced through Georgia with great haste and was on the Florida frontier in March, 1818. He . . . immediately advanced to St. Mark's, which place he captured. On his way down the Appalachicola he found the Indians and negroes at work in the fields, and unconscious of any impending attack. Some of them fled to St. Mark's. His theory, in which he supposed that he was supported by the administration, was that he was to pursue the Indians until he caught them, wherever they might go; that he was to respect Spanish rights as far as he could consistently with that purpose; and that the excuse for his proceedings was that Spain could not police her own territory, or restrain the Indians. Jackson's proceedings were based on two positive but arbitrary assumptions: (1) That the Indians got aid and encouragement from St. Mark's and Pensacola. (This the

Spaniards always denied, but perhaps a third assumption of Jackson might be mentioned: that the word of a Spanish official was of no value.) (2) That Great Britain kept paid emissaries employed in Florida to stir up trouble for the United States. This latter assumption was a matter of profound belief generally in the United States." Acting upon it with no hesitation, Jackson caused a Scotch trader named Arbuthnot, whom he found at St. Mark's, and an English ex-lieutenant of marines, Ambrister by name, who was taken prisoner among the Seminoles, to be condemned by court martial and executed, although no substantial evidence of their being in any way answerable for Indian hostilities was adduced. "It was as a mere incident of his homeward march that Jackson turned aside and captured Pensacola, May 24, 1818, because he was told that some Indians had taken refuge there. He deposed the Spanish government, set up a new one, and established a garrison. He then continued his march homewards." Jackson's performances in Florida were the cause of grave perplexities to his government, which finally determined "that Pensacola and St. Mark's should be restored to Spain, but that Jackson's course should be approved and defended on the grounds that he pursued his enemy to his refuge, and that Spain could not do the duty which devolved on her."—W. G. Sumner, *Andrew Jackson as a public man*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: J. Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson*, v. 2, ch. 31-39.—J. R. Giddings, *The Exiles of Florida*, ch. 1-4.

A. D. 1819-1821.—Cession by Spain to the United States.—"Jackson's vigorous proceedings in Florida would seem not to have been without effect. Pending the discussion in Congress on his conduct, the Spanish minister, under new instructions from home, signed a treaty for the cession of Florida, in extinction of the various American claims, for the satisfaction of which the United States agreed to pay to the claimants \$5,000,000. The Louisiana boundary, as fixed by this treaty, was a compromise between the respective offers heretofore made, though leaning a good deal to the American side: the Sabine to the 32d degree of north latitude; thence a north meridian line to the Red River; the course of that river to the 100th degree of longitude east [? west] from Greenwich; thence north by that meridian to the Arkansas; up that river to its head, and to the 42d degree of north latitude; and along that degree to the Pacific. This treaty was immediately ratified by the Senate," but it was not until February, 1821, that the ratification of the Spanish government was received.—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, 2d series, ch. 31-32 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: J. T. Morse, *John Quincy Adams*, pp. 109-125.—*Treaties and Conventions bet. the U. S. and other countries* (ed. of 1889), pp. 1016-1022.

A. D. 1835-1843.—The Second Seminole War.—"The conflict with the Seminoles was one of the legacies left by Jackson to Van Buren; it lasted as long as the Revolutionary War, cost thirty millions of dollars, and baffled the efforts of several generals and numerous troops, who had previously shown themselves equal to any in the world. . . . As is usually the case in Indian wars there had been wrong done by each side; but in this instance we were the more to

blame, although the Indians themselves were far from being merely harmless and suffering innocents. The Seminoles were being deprived of their lands in pursuance of the general policy of removing all the Indians west of the Mississippi. They had agreed to go, under pressure, and influenced, probably, by fraudulent representations; but they declined to fulfill their agreement. If they had been treated wisely and firmly they might probably have been allowed to remain without serious injury to the surrounding whites. But no such treatment was attempted, and as a result we were plunged in one of the most harassing Indian wars we ever waged. In their gloomy, tangled swamps, and among the unknown and untrodden recesses of the everglades, the Indians found a secure asylum; and they issued from their haunts to burn and ravage almost all the settled parts of Florida, fairly depopulating five counties. . . . The great Seminole leader, Osceola, was captured only by deliberate treachery and breach of faith on our part, and the Indians were worn out rather than conquered. This was partly owing to their remarkable capacities as bush-fighters, but infinitely more to the nature of their territory. Our troops generally fought with great bravery; but there is very little else in the struggle, either as regards its origin or the manner in which it was carried on, to which an American can look back with any satisfaction."—T. Roosevelt, *Life of Thomas H. Benton*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: J. R. Giddings, *The Exiles of Florida*, ch. 7-21.—J. T. Sprague, *The Florida War*.—See, also, AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SEMINOLES.

A. D. 1845.—Admission into the Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1845.

A. D. 1861 (January).—Secession from the Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1862 (February—April).—Temporary Union conquests and occupation.—Discouragement of Unionists. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: GEORGIA—FLORIDA).

A. D. 1864.—Unsuccessful National attempt to occupy the State.—Battle of Olustee. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY: FLORIDA).

A. D. 1865 (July).—Provisional government set up under President Johnson's plan of Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY).

A. D. 1865-1868.—Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY), and after, to 1868-1870.

FLORIN, The.—"The Republic of Florence, in the year 1252, coined its golden florin, of 24 carats fine, and of the weight of one drachm. It placed the value under the guarantee of publicity, and of commercial good faith; and that coin remained unaltered, as the standard for all other values, as long as the republic itself endured."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Italian Republics*, ch. 4.

FLOTA, The. See PERU: A. D. 1550-1816.

FLOYD, JOHN B., Treachery of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1860 (DECEMBER).

FLUSHING: A. D. 1807.—Ceded to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1807-1808 (NOVEMBER—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1809.—Taken and abandoned by the English. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1809 (JULY—DECEMBER).

FOCKSHANI, Battle of (1789). See TURKS: A. D. 1776–1792.

FODHLA. See IRELAND: THE NAME.

FEDERATI.—The bodies of barbarians taken into the military service of the Roman empire, during the period of its decline, serving under their hereditary chiefs, were designated by the name of *federati* (confederates or allies). —T. Hodgkin, *The dynasty of Theodosius*, ch. 4.

FOIX, Rise of the Counts of. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1032.

The house in Navarre. See NAVARRE: A. D. 1442–1521.

FOLCLAND.—**FOLKLAND.**—Public land, among the early English. "It comprised the whole area that was not at the original allotment assigned to individuals or communities, and that was not subsequently divided into estates of bookland [hocland]. The folkland was the standing treasury of the country; no alienation of any part of it could be made without the consent of the national council; but it might be allowed to individuals to hold portions of it subject to rents and other services to the state." —W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 5, sect. 36. —The theory here stated is questioned by Prof. Vinogradoff, who says: "I venture to suggest that folkland need not mean the land owned by the people. Bookland is land that is held by bookright; folkland is land that is held by folkright. The folkland is what our scholars have called ethel, and aloed, and family-land, and yrfeland; it is land held under the old restrictive common-law, the law which keeps land in families, as contrasted with land which is held under a book, under a 'privilegium,' modelled on Roman precedents, expressed in Latin words, armed with ecclesiastical sanctions, and making for free alienation and individualism." —P. Vinogradoff, *Folkland (English Hist. Rev., Jan., 1893)*.

Also in: J. M. Kemble, *The Saxons in Eng.*, bk. 1, ch. 11.—See, also, ALON.

FOLIGNO, Truce of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1800–1801 (JUNE—FEBRUARY).

FOLKLAND. See FOLCLAND.

FOLKMOT. See HUNDRED; also SHIRE; also WITENAGMOT; also TOWNSHIP AND TOWN-MEETING, THE NEW ENGLAND.

FOLKTHING.—**FOLKETING,** The. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK—ICELAND): A. D. 1849–1874.

FOLKUNGAS, The. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1018–1397.

FOMORIANS, OR FORMORIANS, The.—A people mentioned in Irish legends as sea-rovers. See IRELAND: THE PRIMITIVE INHABITANTS; also, NEMEDIANS.

FONTAINE FRANÇAISE, Battle of (1595). See FRANCE: A. D. 1593–1598.

FONTAINEBLEAU: A. D. 1812–1814.—Residence of the captive Pope. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808–1814.

FONTAINEBLEAU, Treaties of (1807). See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1807, and SPAIN: A. D. 1807–1808. . . . (1814). See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (MARCH—APRIL).

FONTAINEBLEAU DECREE, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1806–1810.

FONTARABIA, Siege and Battle (1638). See SPAIN: A. D. 1637–1640.

FONTENAILLES, OR FONTENAY, Battle of, A. D. 841.—In the civil war between the three grandsons of Charlemagne, which resulted in the partition of his empire and the definite separation of Germany and France, the decisive battle was fought, June 25, 841, at Fontenailles, or Fontenay (Fontanetum), near Auxerre.

FONTENOY, Battle of (1745). See NETHERLANDS (AUSTRIAN PROVINCES): A. D. 1745.

FOOT, The Roman.—"The unit of lineal measure [with the Romans] was the Pes, which occupied the same place in the Roman system as the Foot does in our own. According to the most accurate researches, the Pes was equal to about 11.64 inches imperial measure, or .97 of an English foot. The Pes being supposed to represent the length of the foot in a well proportioned man, various divisions and multiples of the Pes were named after standards derived from the human frame. Thus: Pes = 16 Digiti, i. e. finger-breadths, [or] 4 Palmi, i. e. hand-breadths; Sesquipes = 1 cubitus, i. e. length from elbow to extremity of middle finger. The Pes was also divided into 12 Pollices, i. e. thumb-joint-lengths, otherwise called Unciæ (whence our word 'inch')." —W. Ramsay, *Manual of Roman Antiq.*, ch. 13.

FOOTE, Commodore.—Gun-boat campaign on the western rivers. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY: KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE); (MARCH—APRIL: ON THE MISSISSIPPI).

FORBACH, OR SPICHERN, Battle of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY—AUGUST).

FORCE BILL, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1871 (APRIL).

FORESTERS, Order of. See INSURANCE.

FORESTS, Charter of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1216–1274.

FORLI, Battle of (1423). See ITALY: A. D. 1412–1447.

FORMOSA.—"Formosa, or Taiwan, as it is called by the Chinese, is about 400 miles south of the mouth of the Yang-tse, and 100 from the mainland of China. It lies between 25° 20' and 21° 50' north latitude, is nearly 240 miles long, by an average of 75 miles wide, and has an area of about 12,000 square miles. It is remarkable for its beauty and fertility, and also for the variety of its products. It was formerly attached to the province of Fokkien, and governed by a resident commissioner; but since the Franco-Chinese War, during which the French, under Admiral Courbet, were foiled in their efforts to take possession of it, it has been erected into an independent province by imperial decree, and is now [1887] governed by Liu Ming-Ch'uan, an able and progressive man, with the title and almost unlimited authority of governor-general. The island was once in the possession of the Spaniards, who called it Formosa (beautiful), but did not colonize it. It then passed into the hands of the Dutch, who built Fort Zeelandia, and established a trading-post on the southwest coast, near the present city of Taiwan-fu, and another known as the Red Fort, at Tamsui, on the northwest coast. But the Dutch in turn abandoned the island about the year 1660, im-

mediately after which it was occupied and colonized by the Chinese from Amoy and other points on the coast of Fohkien. The population is now estimated by the governor-general at 4,000,000 Chinese and 60,000 savages, but the first figures are doubtless much too large. The savages are a fine race of men of the Malay or Polynesian type, who hold nearly all the east coast and the mountain-region, covering over one half the island. They live mostly by hunting and fishing, or upon the natural products of the forest, and cultivate but little land."—J. H. Wilson, *China*, ch. 18.—In 1874, in order to obtain redress for a murder of Japanese sailors by savages on the eastern coast of Formosa, the Japanese Government undertook to take possession of the southern part of Formosa, asserting that it did not belong to China because she either would not or could not govern its savage inhabitants. By the intervention of the British minister, Sir T. F. Wade, war was prevented, the Japanese withdrawing and the Chinese remaining in control; but the former still coveted the island, and finally secured it, as one of the results of their war with China, in 1894-5.—S. W. Williams, *The Middle Kingdom*, ch. 26, v. 2.

FORNUOVA. Battle of (1495). See ITALY: A. D. 1494-1496.

FORREST, GENERAL, Cavalry Operations of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862-1863 (DEC.—JAN.: TENN.); 1863 (FEB.—APR.: TENN.); 1863-1864 (DEC.—APR.: TENN.: MISS.); 1864 (APR.: TENN.); 1864 (SEPT.—OCT.: GA.).

FORT EDWARD.—FORT ERIE.—FORT FISHER, ETC. See EDWARD, FORT; ERIE, FORT, ETC.

FORTRENN, Men of.—A Pictish people in early Scottish history.

FORTY FORT. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JULY).

FORTUNATE ISLANDS. See CANARY ISLANDS, DISCOVERY OF.

FORTY-FIVE, The.—The Jacobite rebellion of 1745 is often referred to as "the Forty-five." See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1745.

FORTY-SHILLING FREEHOLDERS. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1884-1885.

FORUM, The Julian, and its extensions.—"From the entrance of the Suburra branched out the long streets which penetrated the hollows between the Quirinal, Viminal, and Esquiline to the gates pierced in the mound of Servius. It was in this direction that Cæsar effected the first extension of the Forum, by converting the site of certain streets into an open space which he surrounded with arcades, and in the centre of which he erected his temple of Venus. By the side of the Julian Forum, or perhaps in its rear, Augustus constructed a still ampler inclosure, which he adorned with the temple of Mars the Avenger. Succeeding emperors . . . continued to work out the same idea, till the Argiletum on the one hand, and the saddle of the Capitoline and Quirinal, excavated for the purpose, on the other, were both occupied by these constructions, the dwellings of the populace being swept away before them; and a space running nearly parallel to the length of the Roman Forum, and exceeding it in size, was thus devoted to public use, extending from the pillar of Trajan to the basilica of Constantine."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 40.

FORUM BOARIUM AND VELABRUM OF ANCIENT ROME, The.—

"The Velabrum, the Forum Boarium, the Vicus Tuscus, and the Circus Maximus are names rich in reminiscences of the romantic youth and warlike manhood of the Roman people. The earliest dawn of Roman history begins with the union of the Capitoline and Palatine hills into one city. In those far-distant times, however, no population was settled in the Velabrum or Circus valley; for, as we have seen, until the drainage was permanently provided for by the cloacæ, these districts were uninhabited swamps; and the name Velabrum itself is said to have been derived from the boats used in crossing from one hill to the other. Perhaps such may not have been the case with the Forum Boarium, which lay between the Velabrum and the river. . . . The limits of the Forum Boarium can be clearly defined. It was separated from the Velabrum at the Arch of the Goldsmiths. . . . On the south-eastern side the Carceres of the Circus, and the adjoining temple on the site of S. Maria in Cosmedin, bounded the district, on the western the Tiber, and on the northwestern the wall of Servius. . . . The immediate neighbourhood of the river, the Forum, the Campus Martius, and the Palace of the Cæsars would naturally render this quarter one of the most crowded thoroughfares of Rome. . . . The Forum itself, which gave the name to the district, was probably an open space surrounded by shops and public buildings, like the Forum Romanum, but on a smaller scale. In the centre stood the bronze figure of a bull, brought from Ægina, either as a symbol of the trade in cattle to which the place owed its name, or, as Tacitus observes, to mark the supposed spot whence the plough of Romulus, drawn by a bull and a cow, first started in tracing out the Palatine pomerium."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, ch. 12.

FORUM GALLORUM, Battle of (B. C. 43). See ROME: B. C. 44-42.

FORUM JULII.—A Roman colony and naval station (modern Frejus) founded on the Mediterranean coast of Gaul by Augustus.

FORUM ROMANUM, The.—"The older Forum, or Forum Romanum, as it was called to distinguish it from the later Fora, which were named after their respective builders [Forum of Julius Cæsar, of Augustus, of Nerva, of Vespasian, of Trajan, etc.], was an open space of an oblong shape, which extended in a south-easterly direction from near the depression or intermontium between the two summits of the Capitoline Hill to a point opposite the still extant temple of Antoninus and Faustina. . . . Round this confined space were grouped the most important buildings of Republican Rome."—R. Burn, *Rome and the Campagna*, ch. 6, pt. 1.—"Forum, in the literal sense of the word merely a market-place, derives its name 'a ferendo,' (from bringing, getting, purchasing). . . . Narrow is the arena on which so great a drama was enacted in the Republican and Imperial City! the ascertainable measurements of this region, according to good authorities, being 671 English feet in the extreme length, 202 in the extreme breadth, and 117 feet at the narrower, the south-eastern, side. . . . The Forum, as an enclosed public place amidst buildings, and surrounded by graceful porticos, may be said to have owed its origin to Tarquinius Priscus, between the years 616 and

578 B. C."—C. I. Hemans, *Historic and Monumental Rome*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: R. Lanciani, *Ancient Rome*, pp. 75-82.

FORUM TREBONII, Battle of (A. D. 251). See **GOths**, FIRST INVASIONS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

FOSI, The. See **CHAUCI**.

FOSSA. See **CASTRA**.

FOSSE, The.—One of the great Roman roads in Britain, which ran from Lincoln south-westwardly into Cornwall. See **ROMAN ROADS IN BRITAIN**.

FOSTAT.—The original name of Cairo, Egypt, signifying "the Encampment." See **MAHOMETAN CONQUEST**: A. D. 640-646.

FOTHERINGAY CASTLE, Mary Stuart's execution at. See **SCOTLAND**: A. D. 1561-1568; and **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1585-1587.

FOUNTAIN OF YOUTH, Ponce de Leon's quest of the. See **AMERICA**: A. D. 1512.

FOUR HUNDRED AND FIVE THOUSAND AT ATHENS. See **ATHENS**: B. C. 413-411.

FOUR HUNDRED AT ATHENS, The. See **ATHENS**: B. C. 594.

FOUR MASTERS, The.—Four Irish antiquaries of the 17th century, who compiled the mixed collection of legend and history called the "Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland," are commonly known as the Four Masters. They were Michael O'Clery, a lay brother of the order of St. Francis; Conaire O'Clery, brother of Michael; Cucogry or Peregrine O'Clery, head of the Tircconnell sept of the O'Clerys, to which Michael and Conaire belonged; and Ferfeasa O'Mulcounry,

of whom nothing is known, except that he was a native of the county of Roscommon. The "Annals" of the Four Masters have been translated into English from the Irish tongue by John O'Donovan.—J. O'Donovan, *Introd. to Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters*.

FOUR MILE STRIP, Cession of the. See **PONTIAC'S WAR**.

FOURIERISM. See **SOCIAL MOVEMENTS**: A. D. 1832-1847, and 1841-1847.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1865-1866 (DECEMBER—APRIL); 1866 (JUNE); 1866-1867 (OCTOBER—MARCH).

The enforcement of. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1871 (APRIL).

FOURTH OF JULY.—The anniversary of the adoption of the American Declaration of Independence. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1776 (JULY).

FOWEY, Essex's surrender at. See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1644 (AUGUST—SEPTEMBER).

FOWLTOWN, Battle of (1817). See **FLORIDA**: A. D. 1816-1818.

FOX AND NORTH COALITION, The. See **ENGLAND**: A. D. 1782; 1783; and 1783-1787.

FOX INDIANS, The. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES**: **ALGONQUIAN FAMILY**, and **SACS**, &c.—For an account of the massacre of Fox Indians at Detroit in 1712, see **CANADA**: A. D. 1711-1713.—For an account of the Black Hawk War, see **ILLINOIS**: A. D. 1832.

FRANCE.

Galic and Roman. See **GAUL**; and **TRADE**: **ANCIENT**.

A. D. 481-843.—Under the Franks.—Division of Charlemagne's Empire. See **FRANKS**.

A. D. 841-911.—Ravages and settlements of the Northmen. See **NORMANS**: A. D. 841 to 876-911.

9th Century.—Introduction of the modern name.—At the time of the division of the empire of Charlemagne between his three grand-sons, which was made a definite and lasting political separation by the Treaty of Verdun, A. D. 843, "the people of the West [western Europe] had come to be divided, with more and more distinctness, into two classes, those composed of Franks and Germans, who still adhered to the Teutonic dialects, and those, composed of Franks, Gallo-Romans, and Aquitanians, who used the Romance dialects, or the patois which had grown out of a corrupted Latin. The former clung to the name of Germans, while the latter, not to lose all share in the glory of the Frankish name, began to call themselves Franci, and their country Francia Nova, or New France. . . . Francia was the Latin name of Frankenland, and had long before been applied to the dominions of the Franks on both sides of the Rhine. Their country was then divided into East and West Francia; but in the time of Karl the Great [Charlemagne] and Ludwig Pious, we find the monk of St. Gall using the terms Francia Nova, in opposition to the Francia, 'quæ dicitur antiqua.'"—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, ch. 18, with note.—"As for the mere name of Francia, like other names of the kind, it shifted its geographical

use according to the wanderings of the people from whom it was derived. After many such changes of meaning, it gradually settled down as the name for those parts of Germany and Gaul where it still abides. There are the Teutonic or Austrian [or Austrasian] Francia, part of which still keeps the name of Franken or Franconia, and the Romance or Neustrian Francia, which by various annexations has grown into modern France."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, v. 1, p. 121.—"As late as the reign of Frederick Barbarossa, the name of Frank was still used, and used too with an air of triumph, as equivalent to the name of German. The Kings and kingdoms of this age had indeed no fixed titles, because all were still looked on as mere portions of the great Frankish realm. Another step has now been taken towards the creation of modern France; but the older state of things has not yet wholly passed away. Germany has no definite name; for a long time it is 'Francia Orientalis,' 'Francia Teutonica'; then it becomes 'Regnum Teutonicum,' 'Regnum Teutonicorum.' But it is equally clear that, within the limits of that Western or Latin France, Francia and Francus were fast getting their modern meanings of France and Frenchmen, as distinguished from Frank or German."—E. A. Freeman, *The Franks and the Gauls (Historical Essays, 1st series, no. 7)*.

A. D. 843.—The kingdom of Charles the Bald.—The first actual kingdom of France (Francia Nova—Francia Occidentalis), was formed in the partition of the empire of Charlemagne between his three grandsons, by the Treaty of Verdun, A. D. 843. It was assigned to Charles,


called "the Bald," and comprised the Neustria of the older Frank divisions, together with Aquitaine. It "had for its eastern boundary, the Meuse, the Saône and the Rhone; which, nevertheless, can only be understood of the Upper Meuse, since Brabant was certainly not comprised in it"; and it extended southwards beyond the Pyrenees to the Ebro.—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, pt. 1, foot-note.—"Charles and his successors have some claim to be accounted French. They rule over a large part of France, and are cut away from their older connexion with Germany. Still, in reality they are Germans and Franks. They speak German, they yearn after the old imperial name, they have no national feeling at all. On the other hand, the great lords of Neustria, as it used to be called, are ready to move in that direction, and to take the first steps towards a new national life. They cease to look back to the Rhine, and occupy themselves in a continual struggle with their kings. Feudal power is founded, and with it the claims of the bishops rise to their highest point. But we have not yet come to a kingdom of France. . . . It was no proper French kingdom; but a dying branch of the Empire of Charles the Great. . . . Charles the Bald, entering on his part of the Caroling Empire, found three large districts which refused to recognise him. These were Aquitaine, whose king was Pippin II.; Septimania, in the hands of Bernard; and Brittany under Nominot. He attempted to reduce them; but Brittany and Septimania defied him, while over Aquitaine he was little more than a nominal suzerain."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, bk. 2, pt. 2, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: E. A. Freeman, *Hist. Geog. of Europe*, ch. 6, sect. 1.—See, also, FRANKS (CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE): A. D. 814-962.

A. D. 861.—Origin of the duchy and of the house of Capet.—In 861, Charles the Bald, king of that part of the dismembered empire of Charlemagne which grew into the kingdom of France, was struggling with many difficulties: defending himself against the hostile ambition of his brother, Louis the German; striving to establish his authority in Brittany and Aquitaine; harried and harassed by Norse pirates; surrounded by domestic treachery and feudal restiveness. All of his many foes were more or less in league against him, and the soul of their combination appears to have been a certain bold adventurer—a stranger of uncertain origin, a Saxon, as some say—who bore the name of Robert the Strong. In this alien enemy, King Charles, who never lacked shrewdness, discovered a possible friend. He opened negotiations with Robert the Strong, and a bargain was soon made which transferred the sword and the energy of the potent mercenary to the service of the king. "Soon after, a Placitum or Great Council was held at Compiègne. In this assembly, and by the assent of the Optimates, the Seine and its islands, and that most important island Paris, and all the country between Seine and Loire, were granted to Robert, the Duchy of France, though not yet so called, moreover the Angevine Marches, or County of Outre-Maine, all to be held by Robert-le-Fort as barriers against Northmen and Bretons, and by which cessions the realm was to be defended. Only a portion of this dominion owned the obedience of Charles: the Bretons were in their own country, the Northmen in the country they were

making their own; the grant therefore was a license to Robert to win as much as he could, and to keep his acquisitions should he succeed. . . . Robert kept the Northmen in check, yet only by incessant exertion. He inured the future kings of France, his two young sons, Eudes and Robert, to the tug of war, making them his companions in his enterprises. The banks of the Loire were particularly guarded by him, for here the principal attacks were directed." Robert the Strong fought valiantly, as he had contracted to do, for five years, or more, and then, in an unlucky battle with the Danes, one summer day in 866, he fell. "Thus died the first of the Capets." All the honors and possessions which he had received from the king were then transferred, not to his sons, but to one Hugh, Count of Burgundy, who became also Duke or Marquis of France and Count of Anjou. Twenty years later, however, the older son of Robert, Eudes, turns up in history again as Count of Paris, and nothing is known of the means by which the family, soon to become royal, had recovered its footing and its importance.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, bk. 1, ch. 3 (v. 1).

A. D. 877-987.—The end of the Carolingian monarchy and the rise of the Capetian.—Charles the Bald died in 877 and was succeeded by his son Louis, called "the Stammerer," who reigned only two years. His two sons, Louis and Carloman, were joint kings for a short space, struggling with the Northmen and losing the provinces out of which Duke Boson of Provence, brother-in-law of Charles the Bald, formed the kingdom of Arles. Louis died in 882 and Carloman two years afterwards; thereupon Charles, surnamed "the Fat," king of Lombardy and Germany, and also emperor (nephew of Charles the Bald), became likewise king of France, and briefly reunited under his feebly handled sceptre the greater part of the old empire of Charlemagne. When he died, in 888, a party of the nobles, tired of his race, met and elected Count Eudes (or Odo), the valiant Count of Paris, who had just defended his city with obstinate courage against the Northmen, to be their king. The sovereignty of Eudes was not acknowledged by the nation at large. His opponents found a Carling to set up against him, in the person of the boy Charles,—youngest son of Louis "the Stammerer," born after his father's death,—who appears in history as Charles "the Simple." Eudes, after some years of war, gave up to Charles a small domain, between the Seine and the Meuse, acknowledged his feudal superiority and agreed that the whole kingdom should be surrendered to him on his (Eudes') death. In accordance with this agreement, Charles the Simple became sole king in 898, when Eudes died, and the country which acknowledged his nominal sovereignty fell into a more distracted state than ever. The Northmen established themselves in permanent occupation of the country on the lower Seine, and Charles, in 911, made a formal cession of it to their duke, Rollo, thus creating the great duchy of Normandy. In 922 the nobles grew once more disgusted with the feebleness of their king and crowned Duke Robert, brother of the late king Eudes, driving Charles into his stronghold of Laon. The Normans came to Charles' help and his rival Robert was killed in a battle. But Charles was defeated, was inveigled into the hands of one of the



A Logical Outline of French History

IN WHICH THE DOMINANT CONDITIONS AND

INFLUENCES ARE DISTINGUISHED BY COLORS.

Physical or material.
Ethnological.
Social and political.
Intellectual, moral and religious.
Foreign.

The country known anciently as Gaul, and in modern times as France, is distinguished by no physical characteristics that will go far towards explaining its history. Lying within the middle degrees of the northern temperate zone, greatly diversified in its superficial features, and varied in the qualities of its soil, it represents a fair average of the more favorable conditions of human life.

The inhabitants of the land when the Romans subdued it were a Celtic people, belonging to the race which has survived to the present day with least admixture or modification in the Bretons, the Welsh, the Celtic Irish and the Highland Scotch. The peculiar traits of the race in mind and temper are so visible in French history as to show that the nation has never ceased to be essentially Gallic in blood.

Under the control and the teaching of Rome for four centuries and a half, the Gauls were perfected in her civilization and corrupted by the vices of her decay.

When the invasion of Teutonic barbarism broke the barrier of the Rhine, they were easily but not quickly overwhelmed, and sank under a conquest more complete than that from Rome had been; since the whole body of the conquerors came to dwell within the land, and to be neighbors and masters, at once. For the most part, these invaders preferred country to town, and carved estates for themselves in all the districts that were fertile and fair. The Gallo-Romans, or Romanized Gauls, were left to more freedom in their cities than outside; but their cities were blighted in industry and in trade by the common ruin around them.

The form of society which the German conquerors brought with them into Gaul was broken by the change of circumstance, quite as much as the form of society which they overthrew. The camp gave place to the castle; the wandering warrior chief acquired the firmer superiority of a great land-proprietor and lord; his warriors slipped in station from free followers to dependents, in divers degrees; the greater chiefs won the title of kings; the fiercer kings destroyed their rivals; and four or five centuries shaped, by slow processes that are traceable, indistinctly, the military structure of society called Feudal, which organized lawlessness with picturesque and destructive effects.

All authority withered, except the spiritual authority of the Church, which steadily grew. The royalty that had thrived for a time upon the distribution of lands, dignities and powers, lost prestige when it had expended the domains at its disposal, and when offices and estates were clutched in hereditary possession. Before it actually expired, there arose a family of remarkable men — great in four successive generations — who put its crown upon their own heads and made it powerful again. The last and greatest of these expanded the Frank kingdom into a new Roman Empire; but the energy of the achievement was wholly his own, and his empire fell to pieces when he died.

In the part which became France, royalty dwindled once more; the great dukes and counts nominally subject to it, in the feudal sense, renewed and increased their power; until one of their number took the throne, and bequeathed it to his heirs.

This new line of kings won back by degrees the ascendancy of the crown. The small actual dominion, surrounding Paris, with which they began, was widened slowly by the strong, authoritative arm. They made themselves, in rude fashion, the observers of order and law. They took the people of the towns into alliance with them; for the towns were beginning to

The Gauls.

*B. C. 51 — A. D. 406.
Roman Gaul.*

*5th century.
Frank conquest.*

Feudalism.

*A. D. 481 — 752.
Merovingian monarchy.*

*A. D. 768 — 814.
Empire of Charlemagne.*

*A. D. 987.
Kingdom of Hugh Capet.*

catch the spirit of the free cities of Italy, and the sturdy temper of the French Huguenots, and to assume the name of *Communes*, or *communes*, casting off the feudal yoke that had been laid upon them. The kings lent their countenance to the *Communes*, and the *communes* strengthened the hands of the kings. Between them (and much helped by the stir of the Crusades), they loosened the roots of feudalism, until its decay set in. The king's courts and the king's officers pushed their jurisdiction into a widening realm, until the king's authority had become supreme, in fact as well as in name.

Even the measureless misery of a hundred years of war with English kings brought power, in the end, to the crown, by weakening the greater lords, and by bringing into existence a fixed military force.

Happy accidents, shrewd marriages, and cunning intrigues gathered the great dukedoms, one by one, into the royal domain, and the solidarity of modern France was attained.

But People and King stood no longer side by side. The league of King and Commons against the Lords had proved less happy than the alliance in England of Commons and Lords against the King. Royalty emerged from the patient struggle alone in possession of sovereign power. It had used the *communes* and then abused them, breaking their charters — their liberties — their courage — their hopes — and widening the distance between class and class. The "estates" of the realm became a memory and a name. During five hundred years, while the Parliament of England grew in majesty and might, the States-General of France were assembled but thirteen times.

When royalty, at last, invented the fatal enchantments of a "Court," then the blighting of all other powers was soon complete. It drew within its spell, from all the provinces of France, their nobles, their men of genius, their aspiring spirits, and assembled them to corrupt and debase them together — to make them its pensioners and hirelings, its sycophants, its jesters, its knaves.

Neither Renaissance nor Reformation could undo the spell. Ideas from the one and a great faith from the other joined in league for the liberty of both, and the thoughtful among the people were rallied to them with craving eagerness. But bigotry and frivolity ruled the Court, and the Court proved stronger than France. Freedom of conscience, and every species of freedom with it, were destroyed, by massacre, by civil war, by oppressive government, by banishment, by corrupting bribes.

And always the grandeur of the monarchy increased; its rule grew more absolute; its Court sucked the life-blood of the State more remorselessly. The People starved, that the King might be magnificent; they perished in a thousand battles, that his name might be "glorious;" they went into exile, carrying away the arts of France, that the piety of the King might not be shocked by their heresies. But always, too, there was growing in the world around France and in France, a knowledge,—an understanding,—a modern spirit,—that rebelled against these infamies.

In due time there came an end. Court, and King, and Church, and all that even seemed to be a part of the evil old regime, were whirled into a red gulf of Revolution and disappeared. The people, unused to Liberty, were made drunken by it, and went mad. In breaking the gyves of feudalism they broke every other restraint, and wrecked society in all its forms. Then, in the stupor of their debauch, they gave themselves to a new despot — mean, conscienceless, detestable, but transcendent in the genius and the energy of his selfishness — who devoured them like a dragon, in the hunger of his insatiate ambition, and persuaded them to be proud of their fate.

Europe suppressed the intolerable adventurer, and France, for three-fourths of a century since, has been under an apprenticeship of experience, slowly learning the art of self-government by constitutional modes. Two monarchies, one republic, and a sham empire are the spoiled samples of her work. A third republic, now in hand, is promising better success. It rests with seeming stability on the support of the great class of peasant landowners, which the very miseries of her misgoverned past have created for France. Trained to pinching frugality by the hard conditions of the old regime; unspoiled by any ruinous philanthropy, like that of the English poor-laws; stimulated to land-buying by opportunities which came, first, from the impoverishment of extravagant nobles, and, later, from revolutionary confiscations; encouraged to the same acquisition by favorable laws of transfer and equal inheritance,—the landowning peasants of France constitute a class powerful in numbers, invulnerable in conservatism, and profoundly interested in the preservation of social order.

*A. D. 1337 — 1453.
Hundred Years War.*

*16th — 17th centuries.
Aggrandisement of the
Monarchy.*

The Court.

*Suppression of the
Huguenots.*

*18th century.
The "Ancien Régime."*

*A. D. 1789 — 1799.
Revolution.*

*A. D. 1799 — 1815.
Napoleon.*

*A. D. 1815 — 1830.
Bourbon Restoration.*

*A. D. 1830 — 1848, Louis
Philippe.*

*A. D. 1848 — 1851.
Second Republic.*

*A. D. 1852 — 1870.
Second Empire.*

*A. D. 1870 — . Third
Republic.*

rebel Lords — Herbert of Vermandois — and kept a prisoner until he died, in 929. One Rodolf of Burgundy had been chosen king, meantime, and reigned until his death, in 936. Then legitimacy triumphed again, and a young son of Charles the Simple, who had been reared in England, was sent for and crowned. This king — Louis IV. — his son, Lothair, and his grandson, Louis V., kept possession of the shaking throne for half-a-century; but their actual kingdom was much of the time reduced to little more than the royal city of Laon and its immediate territories.

When Louis died, in 987, leaving no nearer heir than his uncle, Charles, Duke of Lorraine, there was no longer any serious attempt to keep up the Carolingian line. Hugh, Duke of France — whose grandfather Robert, and whose grand-uncle Eudes had been crowned kings, before him, and whose father, "Hugh the Great," had been the king-maker of the period since — was now called to the throne and settled himself firmly in the seat which a long line of his descendants would hold. He was known as Hugh Capet to his contemporaries, and it is thought that he got the name from his wearing of the hood, cap, or cape of St. Martin — he being the abbot of St. Martin at Tours, in addition to his other high dignities. — G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, bk. 2, pt. 2, ch. 5; bk. 3, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, bk. 1, ch. 5 (v. 1). — C. F. Keary, *The Vikings in Western Christendom*, ch. 11 and 13-15. — See, also, LAON.

A. D. 987. — Accession of Hugh Capet. — The kingdom of the early Capetians. — "On the accession of the third race [the Capetians], France, properly so called, only comprised the territory between the Somme and the Loire; it was bounded by the counties of Flanders and Vermandois on the north; by Normandy and Brittany on the west; by the Champagne on the east; by the duchy of Aquitaine on the south. The territory within these bounds was the duchy of France, the patrimonial possession of the Capets, and constituted the royal domain. The great fiefs of the crown, in addition to the duchy of France, were the duchy of Normandy, the duchy of Burgundy, nearly the whole of Flanders, formed into a county, the county of Champagne, the duchy of Aquitaine, and the county of Toulouse. . . . The sovereigns of these various states were the great vassals of the crown and peers of France; Lorraine and a portion of Flanders were dependent on the German crown, while Brittany was a fief of the duchy of Normandy. . . . The county of Barcelona beyond the Alps was also one of the great fiefs of the crown of France." — E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France: second epoch*, bk. 1, ch. 2. — "With the exception of the Spanish March and of part of Flanders, all these states have long been fully incorporated with the French monarchy. But we must remember that, under the earlier French Kings, the connexion of most of these provinces with their nominal suzerain was even looser than the connexion of the German princes after the Peace of Westphalia with the Viennese Emperors. A great French Duke was as independent within his own dominions as an Elector of Saxony or Bavaria, and there were no common institutions, no Diet or assembly of any kind, to bring him into contact either with his liege lord

or with his fellow-vassals. Aquitaine and Toulouse . . . seem almost to have forgotten that there was any King of the French at all, or at all events that they had anything to do with him. They did not often even pay him the compliment of waging war upon him, a mode of recognition of his existence which was constantly indulged in by their brethren of Normandy and Flanders." — E. A. Freeman, *The Franks and the Gauls (Historical Essays, 1st series, no. 7)*. — "When France was detached from the Empire in the ninth century, of all three imperial regions she was the one which seemed least likely to form a nation. There was no unity in the country west of the Scheldt, the Meuse, and the Rhone. Various principalities, duchies, or counties were here formed, but each of them was divided into secular fiefs and ecclesiastical territories. Over these fiefs and territories the authority of the duke or the count, which was supposed to represent that of the king, was exercised only in case these seigneurs had sufficient power, derived from their own personal estates. Destitute of domains and almost starving, the king, in official documents, asked what means he might find on which to live with some degree of decency. From time to time, amid this chaos, he discussed the theory of his authority. He was a lean and solemn phantom, straying about among living men who were very rude and energetic. The phantom kept constantly growing leaner, but royalty did not vanish. People were accustomed to its existence, and the men of those days could not conceive of a revolution. By the election of Hugh Capet, in 987, royalty became a reality, because the king, as Duke of Francia, had lands, money, and followers. It would be out of place to seek a plan of conduct and a methodical line of policy in the actions of the Capetians, for they employed simultaneously every sort of expedient. During more than three centuries they had male offspring; thus the chief merit of the dynasty was that it endured. As always happens, out of the practice developed a law; and this happy accident produced a lawful hereditary succession, which was a great element of strength. Moreover the king had a whole arsenal of rights: old rights of Carolingian royalty, preserving the remembrance of imperial power, which the study of the Roman law was soon to resuscitate, transforming these apparitions into formidable realities; old rights conferred by the coronation, which were impossible to define, and hence incontestable; and rights of suzerainty, newer and more real, which were definitely determined and codified as feudalism developed and which, joined to the other rights mentioned above, made the king proprietor of France. These are the elements that Capetian royalty contributed to the play of fortuitous circumstances." — E. Lavisse, *General View of the Political History of Europe*, ch. 3. — See, also, TWELVE PEERS OF FRANCE.

A. D. 987-1327. — The Feudal Period. — "The period in the history of France, of which we are about to write, began with the consecration of Hugues Capet, at Reims, the 3rd of July, 987, but it is a period which would but improperly take its name from the Capetians; for throughout this time royalty was, as it were, annihilated in France; the social bond was broken, and the country which extends from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, and from the English Channel to the

Gulf or Lyon, was governed by a confederation of princes rarely under the influence of a common will, and united only by the Feudal System. While France was confederated under feudal administration, the legislative power was suspended. Hugues Capet and his successors, until the accession of St. Louis, had not the right of making laws; the nation had no diet, no regularly constituted assemblies whose authority it acknowledged. The Feudal System, tacitly adopted, and developed by custom, was solely acknowledged by the numerous sovereigns who divided the provinces among themselves. It replaced the social bond, the monarch, and the legislator. . . . The period . . . is therefore like a long interregnum, during which the royal authority was suspended, although the name of king was always preserved. He who bore this title in the midst of a republic of princes was only distinguished from them by some honorary prerogative, and he exercised over them scarcely any authority. Until very near the end of the 11th century, these princes were scarcely less numerous than the castles which covered France. No authority was acknowledged at a distance, and every fortress gave its lord rank among the sovereigns. The conquest of England by the Normans broke the equilibrium between the feudal lords; one of the confederate princes, became a king in 1066, gradually extended, until 1179, his domination over more than half of France; and although it was not he who bore the title of king of the French, it may be imagined that in time the rest of the country would also pass under his yoke. Philip the August and his son, during the forty-six last years of the same period, reconquered almost all the fiefs which the English kings had united, brought the other great vassals back to obedience, and changed the feudal confederation which had ruled France into a monarchy, which incorporated the Feudal System in its constitution."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *France Under the Feudal System* (tr. by W. Bellingham), ch. 1.—"The feudal period, that is, the period when the feudal system was the dominant fact of our country, . . . is comprehended between Hugh Capet and Philippe de Valois, that is, it embraces the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries. . . . At the end of the 10th century, royalty and the commons were not visible, or at all events scarcely visible. At the commencement of the 14th century, royalty was the head of the state, the commons were the body of the nation. The two forces to which the feudal system was to succumb had then attained, not, indeed, their entire development, but a decided preponderance. . . . With the 14th century, the character of war changed. Then began the foreign wars; no longer a vassal against suzerain, or vassal against vassal, but nation against nation, government against government. On the accession of Philippe de Valois, the great wars between the French and the English broke out—the claims of the kings of England, not upon any particular fief, but upon the whole land, and upon the throne of France—and they continued up to Louis XI. They were no longer feudal, but national wars; a certain proof that the feudal period stopped at this limit, that another society had already commenced."—F. P. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization*, 2d course, lect. 1.

A. D. 996.—Accession of King Robert II.

A. D. 1031.—Accession of King Henry I.

A. D. 1060.—Accession of King Philip I.

A. D. 1096.—Departure of the First Crusaders. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1096-1099.

A. D. 1100.—The extent of the kingdom.—"When Louis [VI.] was adopted by his father in 1100, the crown had as its own domain only the county of Paris, Hurepoix, the Gatinais, the Orléanis, half the county of Sens, the French Vexin, and Bourges, together with some ill-defined rights over the episcopal cities of Rheims, Beauvais, Laon, Noyon, Soissons, Amiens. And even within these narrow limits the royal power was but thinly spread over the surface. The barons in their castles were in fact independent, and oppressed the merchants and poor folk as they would. The king had also acknowledged rights of suzerainty over Champagne, Burgundy, Normandy, Brittany, Flanders, and Boulogne; but, in most cases, the only obedience the feudal lords stooped to was that of duly performing the act of homage to the king on first succession to a fief. He also claimed suzerainty, which was not conceded, over the South of France; over Provence and Lorraine he did not even put forth a claim of lordship."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, bk. 3, ch. 5.

12-13th Centuries.—Rise of the Privileged Bourgeoisies and the Communes.—The double movement of Urban Emancipation.—"The 12th and 13th centuries saw the production of that marvelous movement of emancipation which gave liberty to serfs, created privileged bourgeoisies and independent communes, caused new cities and fortresses to issue from the earth, freed the corporations of merchants and artisans, in a word placed at the first stroke, beside royalty, feudality and the church, a fourth social force destined to absorb one day the three others. While the cultivator of the soil passed by enfranchisement from the category of things sold or given away into that of the free people (the only ambition permitted to the defenseless unfortunates who inhabited isolated farms or unwalled villages), the population grouped in the urban centers tried to limit or at least to regulate the intolerable exploitation of which it was the object. The bourgeois, that is to say the inhabitants of walled cities, born under the shelter of a donjon or an abbey, and the citoyens of the ancient episcopal cities, rivaled each other in efforts to obtain from the seigneurial power a condition more enduring in point of taxation, and the suppression of the most embarrassing hindrances to their commerce and manufactures. These inhabitants of towns and cities constituted, if only by being grouped together, a force with which feudality was very soon obliged to reckon. Divided, besides, into merchants' societies and companies of workmen, they found within themselves the germ of organization which permitted collective resistance. The seigneur, intimidated, won by an offer of money, or decided by the thought that his domination would be more lucrative if the city became more prosperous, made the concessions which were asked of him. Thanks to a favorable concurrence of circumstances, charters of franchises were multiplied in all parts of France. At the end of the 12th century, the national territory, in the north as well as the south, was covered with these privileged cities or bourgeoisies, which, while remaining administered, judicially and politically, by seigneurial officers, had acquired, in matters

financial, commercial and industrial, the liberties necessary to their free development. Feudality very soon found such an advantage in regulating thus the exploitation of the bourgeois, that it took the initiative itself in creating, in the uninhabited parts of its domains, privileged cities, complete in all their parts, designed to become so many centers of attraction for foreigners. It is the innumerable bourgeoisies and 'villes neuves' which represent the normal form of urban emancipation. Certain centers of population obtained at the first stroke the most extensive civil and financial liberties; but, in the majority of cases, the bourgeois could win their franchises only bit by bit, at the price of heavy pecuniary sacrifices, or as the result of an admirable perseverance in watching for opportunities and seizing them. The history of the privileged cities, whose principal virtue was a long patience, offers nothing moving or dramatic. . . . But the spectacle of these laborious masses persisting, in obscurity and silence, in the demand for their right to security and well-being, does not the less merit all our attention. What forces itself upon the meditations of the historian, in the domain of municipal institutions, is just the progress, slow and obscure, but certain, of the dependent bourgeoisie. . . . The development of the seigneurial cities offers such a variety of aspects, their progressive and regular conquests were so important in the constitution of our rights public and private, that too much care and effort cannot be devoted to retracing minutely their course. This history is more than any other that of the origin of our third estate. It was in the privileged cities, to which the great majority of the urban population belonged, that it began its political education. The city charters constituted the durable lower stratum of its first liberties. In other words the third estate did not issue suddenly from the more or less revolutionary movement which gave birth to the independent communes: it owes its formation and its progress above all to this double pacific evolution: the possessors of fiefs enfranchising their bourgeoisie and the latter passing little by little entirely from the seigneurial government under that of royalty. This was not the opinion which prevailed at the time when the founder of the science of municipal institutions, Augustin Thierry, published in the 'Courrier Français' his admirable 'Lettres' on the revolutions of the communes. The commune, a city dowered with judicial and political privileges, which conferred upon it a certain independence, administered by its elected magistrates, proud of its fortified inclosure, of its belfry, of its militia, — the commune passed at that time as the pre-eminent type of the free city of the middle ages. That great movement of urban and rural emancipation which stirred the France of the 12th century to its very depths was personified in it. So the commune concentrated historical interest upon itself, leaving in the shade all other forms of popular evolution. Guizot, who had the sense of truth rather than that of the picturesque, tried to combat this exclusive tendency. In the brilliant lessons that he gave at the Sorbonne on the history of the origins of the third estate, he showed, with his customary clearness, that the development of the bourgeois class was not accomplished by any single method; that the progress realized in the cities where the communal

régime had never succeeded in establishing itself must also be taken into account. The impression left by the highly colored and dramatic recitals of Augustin Thierry remained for a long time the stronger. . . . Contemporary science has not only assigned to itself the mission of completing the work of the historians of the Restoration: it has desired also to improve it by rectifying, upon many points, the exaggerated opinions and false judgments of which the history of our urban institutions was at first the victim. It has been perceived that the communal movement properly so called did not have, upon the destinies of the popular class, the decisive, preponderant influence which was attributed to it 'a priori.' The commune, a brilliant but ephemeral form of the emancipation of the bourgeoisie, has been set back little by little into its true place. It is now no longer regarded as an essential manifestation of our first democratic aspirations. One might be tempted to see on the contrary, in that collective seigneurie, often hostile to the other social elements, impregnated with the spirit of 'particularisme,' made for war and agitated without cessation by warlike passions, an original but tardy product of the feudal principle. . . . We must be resigned to a fact in regard to which nothing can be done: the absence of documents relative to the municipal constitution of cities and towns during four hundred years, from the 7th century to the 11th. From all appearances, this enormous hiatus will never be overcome. . . . Facts being lacking, scholars have had recourse to conjecture. Some among them have supposed that the principal characteristics of the Gallo-Roman municipalities were perpetuated during this period. At bottom, their hypothesis rests principally upon analogies of names. . . . From the point of view of positive science, the Germanic origin of the communes is not more easy of demonstration. . . . It is even doubtful whether the essential element of the communal institution, the confederation formed by the inhabitants, under the guaranty of the mutual oath, belongs exclusively to the customs of the Germans. The theory of Augustin Thierry, which made of the commune a special application of the Scandinavian gilde, has been judged too narrow by contemporary scholars. They have reproached him with reason for having localized an institution which belongs entirely to the Germanic race. But the principle of association, applied in the cities, is not a fact purely German. . . . Association is a fact which is neither Germanic nor Roman; it is universal, and is produced spontaneously among all peoples, in all social classes, when circumstances exact and favor its appearance. The communal revolution then is a national event. The commune was born, like other forms of popular emancipation, from the need which the inhabitants of the cities had of substituting a limited and regulated exploitation for the arbitrary exploitation of which they were the victims. Such is the point of departure of the institution. We must always return to the definition of it given by Guibert de Nogent. It is true as a basis, although it does not embrace all the characteristics of the object defined: 'Commune! new name, detestable name! By it the censitaires are freed from all service in consideration of a simple annual tax; by it they are condemned, for

the infraction of the law, only to a penalty legally determined; by it, they cease to be subjected to the other pecuniary charges by which the serfs are overwhelmed.' At certain points, this limitation of the seigneurial power was made amicably, by pacific transaction between the seigneur and his bourgeois. Elsewhere, an insurrection, more or less prolonged, was necessary in order to establish it. When this popular movement had as a result, not only the assuring to the people the most necessary liberties which were demanded, but besides that of abating to their advantage the political position of the master, by taking from him a part of his seigneurial prerogatives, there arose not only a free city, but a commune, a bourgeois seigneurie, invested with a certain political and judicial power. This definition of the commune implies that originally it was not possible to establish it otherwise than by a pressure exerted, more or less violently, upon the seigneurial authority. We have the direct proof of it for some of our free municipalities; but it is presumable that many other communes whose primitive history we do not know have owed equally to force the winning of their first liberties. . . . We do not mean that, in the first period of the history of urban emancipation, all the communes, without exception, were obliged to pass through the phase of insurrection or of open resistance. There were some which profited (as the cities of the Flemish region in 1127) by a combination of exceptional circumstances to attain political liberty without striking a blow. Among these circumstances must be mentioned in the first rank the prolonged vacancy of an episcopal see and the disappearance of a laic lord, dead without direct heir, leaving a succession disputed by numerous competitors. But ordinarily, the accession of the bourgeoisie to the rank of political power did not take place pacifically. Either the seigneur struggled against his rebellious subjects, or he feared the struggle and bent before the accomplished fact. In all cases it was necessary that the people were conscious of their power and imposed their will. This is proven by the dramatic episodes which the narrations of Augustin Thierry have forever rendered celebrated. . . . Later, in the decline of the 12th century, it must be recognized that the opinion of the dominant class ceased to be as hostile to the communes. When the conviction had been acquired that the popular movement was irresistible, it was tolerated; the best means even were sought to derive advantage from it. The Church always remained upon the defensive; but the king and the great feudal lords perceived that in certain respects the commune might be a useful instrument. They accepted then the communal organization, and they even came to create it where it was not spontaneously established. But it is easy to convince one's self that the communes of this category, those which owe their creation to the connivance or even to the initiative of the seigneur, did not possess the same degree of independence as the communes of the primitive epoch, founded by insurrection. On the whole, the communal revolution was only one of the aspects of the vast movement of political and social reaction which the excesses of the feudal régime engendered everywhere from the 11th to the 14th century. . . . One would like to possess the text of one of those oaths by which the bourgeois of the northern

communes bound themselves together, for the first time, with or without the consent of their seigneur, in the most ancient period of the communal evolution. It would be of the highest interest for the historian to know how they set about it, what words were pronounced to form what the contemporary writers called a 'conjururation,' a 'conspiration,' a 'confédération.' No document of this nature and of that primitive epoch has come down to us. . . . The sum total of the sworn bourgeois constituted the commune. The commune was most often called 'communia,' but also, with varying termination, 'communa,' 'communio,' 'communitas.' Properly speaking and especially with reference to the origin, the name commune was given not to the city, but to the association of the inhabitants who had taken oath. For this reason also the expression 'commune jurée' was used. Later the acceptance of the word was enlarged; it designated the city itself, considered as a geographical unit. . . . The members of the commune, those who formed part of the sworn association, were properly called 'the sworn of the commune,' 'jurati communie,' or, by abridgment, 'the sworn,' 'jurati.' They were designated also by the expression: 'the men of the commune,' or, 'those who belong to the commune,' 'qui sunt de communia.' They were also entitled 'bourgeois,' 'burgenses,' more rarely, 'bourgeois jurés'; sometimes also 'voisins,' 'vicini,' or even 'friends,' 'amici.' . . . We are far from having complete light on the question as to what conditions were exacted from those who entered the communal association, and to what classes of persons the access to the bourgeoisie was open or interdicted. The variety of local usages, and above all the impossibility of finding texts which apply to the most ancient period of urban emancipation, will always embarrass the historian. To find upon these matters clear documents, developed and precise, we must come down, generally, to the end of the 13th century or even to the century following, that is to say, to the epoch of the decadence of the communal régime. . . . The bourgeois could not be diseased, that is to say, undoubtedly, tainted with an incurable malady, and especially a contagious malady, as leprosy. . . . The communal law excluded also bastards. On this point it was in accord with the customary law of a very great number of French regions. . . . They refused also to receive into their number inhabitants encumbered with debts. The condition of debtor constituted in effect a kind of servitude. He no longer belonged to himself; his goods might become the property of the creditor, and he could be imprisoned. . . . With still more reason does it appear inadmissible that the serf should be called to benefit by the commune. The question of urban serfdom, in its relations with the communal institution, is extremely obscure, delicate and complex. There are however two facts in regard to which affirmation is allowable. It cannot be doubted that at the epoch of the formation of the communes, at the opening of the 12th century, there were no longer any serfs in many of the urban centers. It may be held also as certain that the desire to bring about the disappearance of this serfdom was one of the principal motives which urged the inhabitants to claim their independence. . . . The inhabitant who united all the conditions

legally required for admission to the bourgeoisie was besides obliged to pay a town-due ('droit d'entrée'). . . . If it was not always easy to enter a communal body, neither could one leave it as easily as might have been desired. The 'issue de commune' exacted the performance of a certain number of troublesome formalities. . . . So, it was necessary to pay to become a communist, and to pay yet more in order to cease to be one. The bourgeois was riveted to his bourgeoisie. . . . Up to this point we have examined only half the problem of the formation of the commune, approaching it on its general side. There remains the question whether all the popular element which existed in the city formed part of the body of bourgeoisie, and whether the privileged class, that of the nobles and clergy, was not excluded from it. . . . We shall have to admit as a general rule, that the nobles and the clergy while taking oath to the commune, did not in reality enter it. What must be rejected, is the sort of absolute, inviolable rule which has been formed on this opinion. In the middle ages especially there was no rule without exception. . . . The commune was an institution rather ephemeral. As a really independent seigneurie, it scarcely endured more than two centuries. The excesses of the communists, their bad financial administration, their intestine divisions, the hostility of the Church, the onerous patronage of the 'haut suzerain,' and especially of the king: such were the immediate causes of this rapid decadence. The communes perished victims of their own faults, but also of the hate of the numerous enemies interested in their downfall. . . . The principal cause of the premature downfall of the communal régime is without any doubt the considerable development of the monarchical power in France at the end of the 13th century. The same force which annihilated feudality, to the profit of the national unit, was also that which caused the prompt disappearance of the independence of the bourgeois seigneuries. With its privileges and its autonomy, the commune impeded the action of the Capetians. Those quarrelsome and restless republics had no reason for existence, in the midst of the peaceful and obedient bourgeoisie upon which royalty had laid its hand. The commune then was sacrificed to the monarchical interest. In Italy and in Germany, the free cities enjoyed their independence much longer, by reason of the absence of the central power or of its weakness."—Achille Luchaire, *Les Communes Françaises à l'époque des Capétiens directs* (trans. from the French), pp. 1-16, 45-56, 65, and 288-290.

A. D. 1101.—Disastrous Crusade of French princes and knights. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1101-1102.

A. D. 1106-1119.—War with Henry I. of England and Normandy. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1087-1135.

A. D. 1108-1180.—The reigns of Louis VI., Louis VII. and accession of Philip II.—Gain and loss of Aquitaine.—"Louis VI., or 'the Fat' was the first able man whom the line of Hugh Capet had produced since it mounted the throne. He made the first attempt at curbing the nobles, assisted by Suger, the Abbot of St. Denis. The only possibility of doing this was to obtain the aid of one party of nobles against another; and when any unusually flagrant offence had been committed, Louis called together the

nobles, bishops, and abbots of his domain, and obtained their consent and assistance in making war on the guilty man, and overthrowing his castle, thus, in some degree, lessening the sense of utter impunity which had caused so many violences and such savage recklessness. He also permitted a few of the cities to purchase the right of self-government. . . . The royal authority had begun to be respected by 1137, when Louis VI. died, having just effected the marriage of his son, Louis VII., with Eleanor, the heiress of the Dukes of Aquitaine—thus hoping to make the crown really more powerful than the great princes who owed it homage. At this time lived the great St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, who had a wonderful influence over men's minds. . . . Bernard roused the young king Louis VII. to go on the second crusade [see CRUSADES: A. D. 1147-1149], which was undertaken by the Emperor and the other princes of Europe to relieve the distress of the kingdom of Palestine. . . . Though Louis did reach Palestine, it was with weakened forces; he could effect nothing by his campaign, and Eleanor, who had accompanied him, seems to have been entirely corrupted by the evil habits of the Franks settled in the East. Soon after his return, Louis dissolved his marriage; and Eleanor became the wife of Henry, Count of Anjou, who soon after inherited the kingdom of England as our Henry II., as well as the duchy of Normandy, and betrothed his third son to the heiress of Brittany [see AQUITAINE: A. D. 1137-1152]. Eleanor's marriage seemed to undo all that Louis VI. had done in raising the royal power; for Henry completely overshadowed Louis, whose only resource was in feeble endeavours to take part against him in his many family quarrels. The whole reign of Louis the Young, the title that adhered to him on account of his simple, childish nature, is only a record of weakness and disaster, till he died in 1180. . . . Powerful in fact as Henry II. was, it was his gathering so large a part of France under his rule which was, in the end, to build up the greatness of the French kings. What had held them in check was the existence of the great fiefs or provinces, each with its own line of dukes or counts, and all practically independent of the king. But now nearly all the provinces of southern and western France were gathered into the hand of a single ruler; and though he was a Frenchman in blood, yet, as he was King of England, this ruler seemed to his French subjects no Frenchman, but a foreigner. They began therefore to look to the French king to free them from a foreign ruler; and the son of Louis VII., called Philip Augustus, was ready to take advantage of their disposition."—C. M. Yonge, *Hist. of France* (Hist. Primers), ch. 1, sect. 6-7.

A. D. 1180-1224.—The kingdom extended by Philip Augustus.—Normandy, Maine and Anjou recovered from the English kings.—When the king of England became possessed of more than one-half of France, "one might venture perhaps to conjecture that the sceptre of France would eventually have passed from the Capets to the Plantagenets, if the vexatious quarrel with Becket at one time, and the successive rebellions fomented by Louis at a later period, had not embarrassed the great talents and ambitious spirit of Henry. But the scene quite changed when Philip Augustus, son of

Louis VII., came upon the stage [A. D. 1180]. No prince comparable to him in systematic ambition and military enterprise had reigned in France since Charlemagne. From his reign the French monarchy dates the recovery of its lustre. He wrested from the count of Flanders the Vermandois (that part of Picardy which borders on the Isle of France and Champagne), and subsequently, the County of Artois. But the most important conquests of Philip were obtained against the kings of England. Even Richard I., with all his prowess, lost ground in struggling against an adversary not less active, and more politic, than himself. But when John not only took possession of his brother's dominions, but confirmed his usurpation by the murder, as was very probably surmised, of the heir, Philip, artfully taking advantage of the general indignation, summoned him as his vassal to the court of his peers. John demanded a safe-conduct. Willingly, said Philip; let him come unmolested. And return? inquired the English envoy. If the judgment of his peers permit him, replied the king. By all the saints of France, he exclaimed, when further pressed, he shall not return unless acquitted. . . . John, not appearing at his summons, was declared guilty of felony, and his fiefs confiscated. The execution of this sentence was not intrusted to a dilatory arm. Philip poured his troops into Normandy, and took town after town, while the king of England, infatuated by his own wickedness and cowardice, made hardly an attempt at defence. In two years [A. D. 1203-1204] Normandy, Maine, and Anjou were irrecoverably lost. Poitou and Guienne resisted longer; but the conquest of the first was completed [A. D. 1224] by Louis VIII., successor of Philip."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, pt. 1.

ALSO IN: K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, v. 2, ch. 9.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1205; and ANJOU: A. D. 1206-1442.

A. D. 1188-1190.—Crusade of Philip Augustus. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1188-1192.

A. D. 1201-1203.—The Fifth Crusade, and its diversion against Constantinople. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1201-1203.

A. D. 1209-1229.—The Albigensian wars and their effects. See ALBIGENSES.

A. D. 1212.—The Children's Crusade. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1212.

A. D. 1214.—Nationalizing effects of the Battle of Bouvines. See BOUVINES.

A. D. 1223.—Accession of King Louis VIII.

A. D. 1226-1270.—Reign and character of Louis IX. (Saint Louis).—His great civilizing work and influence.—"Of the forty-four years of St. Louis' reign, nearly fifteen, with a long interval of separation, pertained to the government of Queen Blanche of Castille, rather than that of the king her son. Louis, at his accession in 1226, was only eleven; and he remained a minor up to the age of twenty-one, in 1236, for the time of majority in the case of royalty was not yet specially and rigorously fixed. During those ten years Queen Blanche governed France; not at all, as is commonly asserted, with the official title of regent, but simply as guardian of the king her son. . . . It was not until twenty-two years had passed, in 1248, that Louis, on starting for the crusade, officially delegated to his mother the kingly authority, and that Blanche, during her son's absence, really governed with the title of regent. . . . During the first period

of his government, and so long as her son's minority lasted, Queen Blanche had to grapple with intrigues, plots, insurrections, and open war; and, what was still worse for her, with the insults and calumnies of the crown's great vassals, burning to seize once more, under a woman's government, the independence and power which had been effectually disputed with them by Philip Augustus. Blanche resisted their attempts, at one time with open and persevering energy, at another dexterously with all the tact, address, and allurements of a woman. Though she was now forty years of age she was beautiful, elegant, attractive, full of resources and of grace. . . . The malcontents spread the most odious scandals about her. . . . Neither in the events nor in the writings of the period is it easy to find anything which can authorize the accusations made by the foes of Queen Blanche. . . . What St. Louis really owed to his mother, and it was a great deal, was the steady triumph which, whether by arms or by negotiation, Blanche gained over the great vassals, and the preponderance which, amidst the struggles of the feudal system, she secured for the kingship of her son in his minority. . . . When Louis reached his majority, his entrance upon personal exercise of the kingly power produced no change in the conduct of public affairs. . . . The kingship of the son was a continuance of the mother's government."—G. Masson, *St. Louis*, pp. 44-56.—"The fundamental institution upon which all the social edifice rested, in the time of Saint Louis, was royalty. But this royalty, from the double point of view of theory and practice, was very different from what it had been originally. In principle it was the divine right, that is, it was an emanation from the Most High, and the king held of no other seigneur. This is what the feudal maxim expressed after its fashion: 'The king holds only of God and his sword.' . . . Royalty was transmitted by heredity, from father to son, and by primogeniture. However, this heredity, which had formerly needed a sort of election to confirm it, or at least popular acclamation, needed now to be hallowed by the unction of the church. Consecration, joined to the privilege of being the eldest of the royal race, made the king. . . . It must not be thought however that the ideas of the time attributed to the hereditary principle a force absolute and superior to all interests. . . . The royal power, besides, had not yet a material force sufficiently great to dominate everywhere as absolute master. Under the two first lines, it was exercised in the same degree over all points of the territory; from the accession of the third, on the contrary, it was only a power of two degrees, having a very unequal action according to the territory and the locality. A part of France composed the royal domain; it was the patrimony of the Capetian house, increased by conquest or successive acquisitions. There, the king exercised an authority almost without limit; he was on his own ground. All the rest formed duchies, counties, or seigneuries of different sorts, possessed hereditarily by great vassals, more or less independent originally. Here the king was only the suzerain; he had scarcely any rights excepting to homage, to military service, to pecuniary assistance in certain stated cases, and to some privileges called royal, as that of coining money. The entire royal policy, from

Philip Augustus to Louis XI., consisted in skillfully increasing the first of these parts by absorbing little by little the second. . . . The possessions of the crown . . . formed two or three separate groups, cut up in the most fantastic fashion, and connected only as the result of long effort. All the rest of the kingdom was composed of great fiefs escaping the direct action of royalty, and themselves subdivided into lesser fiefs, which complicated infinitely the hierarchy of persons and lands. The principal were the counties of Flanders, Boulogne, Saint Pol, Ponthien, Aumale, Eu, Soissons, Dreux, Montford-l'Amaury; the bishoprics of Tournai, Beauvais, Noyon, Laon, Lisieux, Reims, Langres, Châlons, the titularies of which were at the same time counts or seigneurs; the vast county of Champagne, uniting those of Réthel, Grandpré, Roucy, Brienne, Joigny and the county Porcien; the duchy of Burgundy, so powerful and so extensive; the counties of Nevers, Tonnerre, Auxerre, Beaujeu, Forez, Auvergne; the seigneurie of Bourbon; the counties of Blois and of Chartres; the county or duchy of Brittany; Guienne, and, before 1271, the county of Toulouse; the bishoprics of Albi, Cahors, Mende, Lodève, Agde, Maguelonne, belonging temporally as well as spiritually to their respective bishops; finally the seigneurie of Montpellier, holding of the last of these bishoprics. To which must yet be added the appanages given by Louis VIII. to his younger sons, that is, the counties of Artois, Anjou, Poitiers, with their dependencies. . . . So when the government of the kingdom at this epoch is spoken of, it must be understood to mean that of only the least considerable part of the territory, — that is, of the part which was directly submitted to the authority of the king. In this part the sovereign himself exercised the power, assisted, as ordained by the theories examined above, by auxiliaries taken from the nation. There were neither ministers nor a deliberative corps, properly speaking; however there was very nearly the equivalent. On one side, the great officers of the crown and the royal council, on the other the parliament and the chamber of accounts (exchequer), or at least their primitive nucleus, constituted the principal machinery of the central government, and had, each, its special powers. The great officers, of whom there had at first been five, were only four from the reign of Philip Augustus, who had suppressed the *sénéchal* owing to the possibility of his becoming dangerous by reason of the progressive extension of his jurisdiction; they were the *bouteiller*, who had become the administrator of the royal expenditure; the *chambrier*, elevated to the care of the treasury; the *connétable*, a kind of military superintendent; and the *chancelier*, who had the disposition of the royal seal. These four personages represented in a certain degree, secretaries of state. The two latter had a preponderant influence, one in time of peace, the other in time of war. To the chancellor belonged the drawing up and the proper execution (legalization) of the royal diplomas; this power alone made him the arbiter of the interests of all private individuals. As to the constable, he had the chief direction of the army, and all those who composed it, barons, knights, paid troops, owed him obedience. The king, in person, had the supreme command; but he frequently allowed the constable to exercise it, and, in order

not to impose too heavy a burden upon him, or rather to prevent his taking a too exclusive authority, he had appointed as coadjutors two '*maréchaux de France*' who were second in command. . . . The king's council had not yet a very fixed form. Saint Louis submitted important questions to the persons about him, clerics, knights or men of the people; but he chose these advisers according to the nature of the questions, having temporary counsellors rather than a permanent council. Among these counsellors some were more especially occupied with justice, others with finance, others with political affairs. These three categories are the germ of the parliament, of the exchequer, and of the council of state; but they then formed an indistinct ensemble, called simply the king's court. They were not completely separated so as to form independent institutions until the time of Philippe le Bel. . . . The superior jurisdiction is represented by the parliament. The organization of this famous body was begun in the lifetime of Philip Augustus. Under the reign of this prince [Saint Louis], and notably as a result of his absence, the '*cour du roi*' had begun to render more and more frequent decisions. The section which was occupied with judicial affairs, appears to have taken on, in the time of Saint Louis, an individual and independent existence. Instead of following the sovereign and meeting when he thought it expedient, it became sedentary. . . . The date at which the series of the famous registers of the parliament, known under the name of Olim, begins may be considered that of the definitive creation of this great institution. It will be remarked that it coincides with the general reform of the administration of the kingdom undertaken by the good king on his return from Syria. . . . From its birth the parliament tended to become, in the hands of royalty, a means of domination over the great vassals. Not only were the seigneurs insensibly eliminated from it, to the advantage of the clergy, the lawyers, and the officers of the crown, but by a series of skilful victories, its action was extended little by little over all the fiefs situated outside the royal domain, that is, over all France. It is again Saint Louis who caused this great and decisive advance toward the authority of the suzerain. He brought it about especially by the abolition of the judicial duel and by the multiplication of appeals to the parliament. . . . As for the appeals, the interdiction of '*fausser jugement*' (refusal to submit to the sentence pronounced) was not the only cause of their multiplication. Many of the great vassals were led to bring their affairs before the king's court, either on account of the confidence inspired by the well known equity of Saint Louis, or by the skill of the royal agents, who neglected no opportunity to cause the acceptance of the arbitration of the crown; and those who did not resign themselves to it were sometimes compelled to do so. The appeals of their subjects naturally took the same route; however, they continued to employ the medium of the *sénéchal's* court or that of the *bailli*, while those of the barons and the princes of the blood went directly to Paris. No general law was promulgated in regard to the matter. Royalty was content to recover little by little, by partial measures, the superior jurisdiction formerly usurped by the feudality. . . . Above

and outside of the parliament justice was rendered by the king in person. . . . Saint Louis, always thoughtful of the interests of the lowly, had a liking for this expeditious manner of terminating suits. Nearly every morning, he sent two or three members of his council to inquire, at the palace gate, if there were not some private individuals there wishing to discuss their affairs before him; from this came the name 'plaids de la porte' given to this kind of audience. If his counsellors could not bring the parties to an agreement, he called the latter into his own room, examined their case with his scrupulous impartiality, and rendered the final sentence himself on the spot. Joinville, who took part more than once in these summary judgments, thus describes to us their very simple mechanism. 'The king had his work regulated in such a way, that monseigneur de Nesle and the good count de Soissons, and the rest of us who were about him, who had heard our masses, went to hear the "plaids de la porte," which are now called "requêtes" (petitions). And when he returned from the monastery, he sent for us, seated himself at the foot of his bed, made us all sit around him, and asked us if there were any cases to despatch which could not be disposed of without him; and we named them to him, and he sent for the parties and asked them: Why do you not take what our people offer you? And they said: Sire, because they offer us little. Then he said to them: You should take what they are willing to give you. And the saintly man labored in this way, with all his might to set them in a just and reasonable path.' Here the great peacemaker is clearly seen; private individuals as well as princes, he desired to reconcile all, make all agree. These patriarchal audiences often had for theater the garden of the palace or the wood of Vincennes."—A. Lecoyde la Marche, *La France sous Saint Louis et sous Philippe le Hardi*, *liv. 1, ch. 2, and liv. 2, ch. 1 and 3*.—"St. Louis struck at the spirit of the Middle Age, and therein insured the downfall of its forms and whole embodiment. He fought the last battles against feudalism, because, by a surer means than battling, he took, and unconsciously, the life-blood from the opposition to the royal authority. Unconsciously, we say; he did not look on the old order of things as evil, and try to introduce a better; he did not selfishly contend for the extension of his own power; he was neither a great reformer, nor a (so-called) wise king. He undermined feudalism, because he hated injustice; he warred with the Middle Age, because he could not tolerate its disregard of human rights; and he paved the way for Philippe-bel's struggle with the papacy, because he looked upon religion and the church as instruments for man's salvation, not as tools for worldly aggrandizement. He is, perhaps, the only monarch on record who failed in most of what he undertook of active enterprise, who was under the control of the prejudices of his age, who was a true conservative, whomever dreamed of effecting great social changes,—and who yet, by his mere virtues, his sense of duty, his power of conscience, made the mightiest and most vital reforms. One of these reforms was the abolition of the trial by combat. . . . It is not our purpose to follow Louis either in his first or second crusade." [See CRUSADES: A. D. 1248-1254.] On returning, in 1254, from his first crusade,

"scarce had he landed, before he began that course of legislation which continued until once more he embarked. . . . In his first legislative action, Louis proposed to himself these objects,—to put an end to judicial partiality, to prevent needless and oppressive imprisonment for debt, to stop unfounded criminal prosecutions, and to mitigate the horrors of legalized torture. In connection with these general topics, he made laws to bear oppressively upon the Jews, to punish prostitution and gambling, and to diminish intemperance. And it is worthy of remark, that this last point was to be attained by forbidding innkeepers to sell to any others than travellers,—a measure now (six hundred years later) under discussion in some parts of our Union, with a view to the same end. But the wish which this rare monarch had to recompense all who had been wronged by himself and forefathers was the uppermost wish of his soul. . . . Commissioners were sent into every province of the kingdom to examine each alleged case of royal injustice, and with power in most instances to make instant restitution. He himself went forth to hear and judge in the neighborhood of his capital, and as far north as Normandy. . . . As he grew yet older, the spirit of generosity grew stronger daily in his bosom. He would have no hand in the affairs of Europe, save to act, wherever he could, as peacemaker. Many occasions occurred where all urged him to profit by power and a show of right, a naked legal title, to possess himself of valuable fiefs; but Louis shook his head sorrowfully and sternly, and did as his inmost soul told him the law of God directed. . . . There had been for some reigns back a growing disposition to refer certain questions to the king's tribunals, as being regal, not baronial questions. Louis the Ninth gave to this disposition distinct form and value, and, under the influence of the baron-hating legists, he so ordained, in conformity with the Roman law, that, under given circumstances, almost any case might be referred to his tribunal. This, of course, gave to the king's judgment-seat and to him more of influence than any other step ever taken had done. . . . It . . . threw at once the balance of power into the royal hands. . . . It became necessary to make the occasional sitting of the king's council or parliament, which exercised certain judicial functions, permanent; and to change its composition, by diminishing the feudal and increasing the legal or legist element. Thus everywhere, in the barons' courts, the king's court, and the central parliament, the Roman, legal, organized element began to predominate over the German, feudal, barbaric tendencies, and the foundation-stones of modern society were laid. But the just soul of Louis and the prejudices of his Romanized counsellors were not arrayed against the old Teutonic barbarism alone, with its endless private wars and judicial duels; they stood equally opposed to the extravagant claims of the Roman hierarchy. . . . The first calm, deliberate, consistent opposition to the centralizing power of the great see was that offered by its truest friend and most honest ally, Louis of France. From 1260 to 1268, step by step was taken by the defender of the liberties of the Gallican church, until, in the year last named, he published his 'Pragmatic Sanction' [see below]."—*Saint Louis of France* (*North American Review*, April, 1846).—See, also, PARLIAMENT OF PARIS.

A. D. 1252.—The Crusading movement of the Pastors. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1252.

A. D. 1266.—Acquisition of the kingdom of Naples or the Two Sicilies by Charles of Anjou, the king's brother. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1250-1268.

A. D. 1268.—The Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis.—Assertion of the rights of the Gallican Church.—“The continual usurpations of the popes produced the celebrated Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis [about A. D. 1268]. This edict, the authority of which, though probably without cause, has been sometimes disputed, contains three important provisions; namely, that all prelates and other patrons shall enjoy their full rights as to the collation of benefices, according to the canons; that churches shall possess freely their rights of election; and that no tax or pecuniary exaction shall be levied by the pope, without consent of the king and of the national church. We do not find, however, that the French government acted up to the spirit of this ordinance.”—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 7, pt. 2.—“This Edict appeared either during the last year of Clement IV., . . . or during the vacancy in the Pontificate. . . . It became the barrier against which the encroachments of the ecclesiastical power were destined to break; nor was it swept away till a stronger barrier had arisen in the unlimited power of the French crown.” It “became a great Charter of Independence to the Gallican Church.”—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, bk. 11, ch. 4 (c. 5).

A. D. 1270-1285.—The sons of St. Louis.—Origin of the Houses of Valois and Bourbon.—St. Louis left several sons, the elder of whom succeeded him as Philippe III., and his youngest son was Robert, Count of Clermont and Lord of Bourbon, the ancestor of all the branches of the House of Bourbon. Philippe III. died in 1285, when he was succeeded by his son, Philippe IV. A younger son, Charles, Count of Valois, was the ancestor of the Valois branch of the royal family.

A. D. 1285-1314.—Reign of Philip IV.—His conflict with the Pope and his destruction of the Templars.—Philippe IV., called “le Bel” (the Handsome), came to the throne on the death of his father, Philippe “le Hardi,” in 1285. He was presently involved in war with Edward I. of England, who crossed to Flanders in 1297, intending to invade France, but was recalled by the revolt in Scotland, under Wallace, and peace was made in 1303. The Flemings, who had provoked Philippe by their alliance with the English, were thus left to suffer his resentment. They bore themselves valiantly in a war which lasted several years, and inflicted upon the knights of France a fearful defeat at Courtrai, in 1302. In the end, the French king substantially failed in his designs upon Flanders (see FLANDERS: A. D. 1299-1304). “It is probable that this long struggle would have been still protracted, but for a general quarrel which had sprung up some time before its close, between the French king and Pope Boniface VIII., concerning the [taxation of the clergy and the] right of nomination to vacant bishoprics within the dominions of Philippe. The latter, on seeing Bernard Saissetti thrust into the Bishopric of Pamiers by the pontiff's sole authority, caused the Bishop to be arrested by night, and, after subjecting him to

various indignities, consigned him to prison on a charge of treason, heresy, and blasphemy. Boniface remonstrated against this outrage and violence in a bull known in history, by its opening words ‘Ausculta, fili,’ in which he asserted his power ‘over nations and kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant,’ and concluded by informing Philippe that he had summoned all the superior clergy of France to an assembly at Rome on the 1st of the following November, in order to deliberate on the remedies for such abuses as those of which the king had been guilty. Philippe, by no means intimidated by this measure, convoked a full and early assembly of the three estates of his kingdom, to decide upon the conduct of him whom the orthodox, up to that time, had been in the habit of deeming infallible. This (10th April 1302) was the first meeting of a Parliament, properly so called, in France. . . . The chambers unanimously approved and applauded the conduct of the king, and resolved to maintain the honour of the crown and the nation from foreign insult or domination; and to mark their decision more conclusively, they concurred with the sovereign in prohibiting the clergy from attending the Pope's summons to Rome. The papal bull was burned as publicly as possible. . . . The Pope, alarmed at these novel and bold proceedings, sought instantly to avert their consequences by soothing explanations; but Philippe would not now be turned aside from his course. He summoned a convocation of the Gallican prelates, in which by the mouth of William de Nogaret, his chancellor, he represented the occupier of St. Peter's chair as the father of lies and an evil-doer; and he demanded the seizure of this pseudo-pope, and his imprisonment until he could be brought before a legitimate tribunal to receive the punishment due to his numerous crimes. Boniface now declared that the French king was excommunicated, and cited him by his confessor to appear in the papal court at Rome within three months, to make submission and atonement for his contumacy. . . . While this unseemly quarrel . . . seemed to be growing interminable in its complexities, the daring of a few men opened a shorter path to its end than could have been anticipated. William of Nogaret associating to him Sciarra Colonna, a noble Roman, who, having been driven from his native city by Boniface and subjected to various hardships, had found refuge in Paris, passed, with a train of three hundred horsemen, and a much larger body of picked infantry, secretly into Italy, with the intention of surprising the Pope at his summer residence in his native town of Anagni. . . . The papal palace was captured after a feeble resistance, and the cardinals and personal attendants of the Pontiff fled for their lives. . . . The Condottieri . . . dragged the Pope from his throne, and conveying him into the street, mounted him upon a lean horse without saddle or bridle, with his head to the animal's tail, and thus conducted him in a sort of pilgrimage through the town. He was then consigned prisoner to one of the chambers of his palace and placed under guard; while the body of his captors dispersed themselves through the splendid apartments in eager pursuit of plunder. Three days were thus occupied; but at the end of that time the . . . people of Anagni . . . took arms in behalf of their fellow-townsmen and spiritual father, and falling

upon the French while still indulging in the licence of the sack, drove Nogaret and Colonna from their quarters, and either expelled or massacred the whole of their followers." The Pope returned to Rome in so great a rage that his reason gave way, and soon afterwards he was found dead in his bed. "The scandal of these proceedings throughout Christendom was immense; and Philippe adopted every precaution to avert evil consequences from himself by paying court to Benedict XI. who succeeded to the tiara. This Pope, however, though he for some time temporised, could not be long deaf to the loud voices of the clergy which called for punishment upon the oppressors of the church. Ere he had reigned nine months he found himself compelled to excommunicate the plunderers of Anagni; and a few days afterwards he perished, under circumstances which leave little doubt of his having been poisoned. . . . The king of France profitted largely by the crime; since, besides gaining time for the subsidence of excitement, he was subsequently enabled, by his intrigues, to procure the election of a person pledged not only to grant him absolution for all past offences, but to stigmatise the memory of Boniface, to restore the deposed Colonna to his honours and estates, to nominate several French ecclesiastics to the college of cardinals, and to grant to the king the tenths of the Gallican church for a term of five years. The pontiff who thus seems to have been the first of his race to lower the pretensions of his office, was Bertrand de Goth, originally a private gentleman of Bazardors, and subsequently promoted to the Archiepiscopal See of Bordeaux. He assumed the title of Clement V., and after receiving investiture at Lyons, fixed the apostolic residence at Avignon, where it continued, under successive occupants, for a period, the length of which caused it to be denominated by the Italians the Babylonian captivity. This quarrel settled, Philippe engaged in another undertaking, the safe-conduct of which required all his skill and unscrupulousness. This important enterprise was no less than the destruction and plunder of the military order of Knights Templars. . . . Public discontent . . . had, by a variety of circumstances, been excited throughout the realm. Among the number of exactions, the coin had been debased to meet the exigencies of the state, and this obstructing the operations of commerce, and inflicting wrongs to a greater or less extent upon all classes, every one loudly complained of injustice, robbery and oppression, and in the end several tumults occurred, in which the residence of the king himself was attacked, and the whole population were with difficulty restrained from insurrection. In Burgundy, Champagne, Artois and Forez, indeed, the nobles, and burgess class having for the first time made common cause of their grievances, spoke openly of revolt against the royal authority, unless the administration should be reformed, and equity be substituted in the king's courts for the frauds, extortions and malversations, which prevailed. The sudden death of Philippe—owing to a fall from his horse while hunting the wild boar in the forest of Fontainebleau—on the 29th of November, 1314, delivered the people from their tyrant, and the crown from the consequences of a general rebellion. Pope Clement, the king's firm friend, had gone to his last account on the 20th of the preceding

April. Louis X., le Hutin (the Quarrelsome), ascended the throne at the mature age of twenty-five."—G. M. Bussey and T. Gaspey, *Pictorial Hist. of France*, v. 1, ch. 4.—See, also, PAPACY: A.D. 1294-1348, and TEMPLARS: A.D. 1307-1314.

A. D. 1314-1328.—Louis X., Philip V., Charles IV.—Feudal reaction.—Philip-le-Bel died in 1314. "With the accession of his son, Louis X., so well surnamed Hutin (disorder, tumult), comes a violent reaction of the feudal, local, provincial spirit, which seeks to dash in pieces the still feeble fabric of unity, demands dismemberment, and claims chaos. The Duke of Brittany arrogates the right of judgment without appeal; so does the exchequer of Rouen. Amiens will not have the king's sergeants subpoena before the barons, or his provosts remove any prisoner from the town's jurisdiction. Burgundy and Nevers require the king to respect the privileges of feudal justice. . . . The common demand of the barons is that the king shall renounce all intermeddling with their men. . . . The young monarch grants and signs all; there are only three points to which he demurs, and which he seeks to defer. The Burgundian barons contest with him the jurisdiction over the rivers, roads, and consecrated places. The nobles of Champagne doubt the king's right to lead them to war out of their own province. Those of Amiens, with true Picard impetuosity, require without any circumlocution, that all gentlemen may war upon each other, and not enter into securities, but ride, go, come, and be armed for war, and pay forfeit to one another. . . . The king's reply to these absurd and insolent demands is merely: 'We will order examination of the registers of my lord St. Louis, and give to the said nobles two trustworthy persons, to be nominated by our council, to verify and inquire diligently into the truth of the said article.' The reply was adroit enough. The general cry was for a return to the good customs of St. Louis: it being forgotten that St. Louis had done his utmost to put a stop to private wars. But by thus invoking the name of St. Louis, they meant to express their wish for the old feudal independence—for the opposite of the quasi-legal, the venal, and pettifogging government of Philippe-le-Bel. The barons set about destroying, bit by bit, all the changes introduced by the late king. But they could not believe him dead so long as there survived his Alter Ego, his mayor of the palace, Enguerrand de Marigny, who, in the latter years of his reign, had been coadjutor and rector of the kingdom, and who had allowed his statue to be raised in the palace by the side of the king's. His real name was Le Portier; but along with the estates he bought the name of Marigny. . . . It was in the Temple, in the very spot where Marigny had installed his master for the spoliation of the Templars, that the young king Louis repaired to hear the solemn accusation brought against him. His accuser was Philippe-le-Bel's brother, the violent Charles of Valois, a busy man, of mediocre abilities, who put himself at the head of the barons. . . . To effect his destruction, Charles of Valois had recourse to the grand accusation of the day, which none could surmount. It was discovered, or presumed, that Marigny's wife or sister, in order to effect his acquittal, or bewitch the king, had caused one Jacques de Lor to make certain small figures: 'The said Jacques, thrown into prison, hangs

himself in despair, and then his wife, and Enguerand's sisters are thrown into prison, and Enguerand himself, condemned before the knights . . . is hung at Paris on the thieves' gibbet. . . . Marigny's best vengeance was that the crown, so strong in his care, sank after him into the most deplorable weakness. Louis-le-Hutin, needing money for the Flemish war, treated as equal with equal, with the city of Paris. The nobles of Champagne and Picardy hastened to take advantage of the right of private war which they had just reacquired, and made war on the countess of Artois, without troubling themselves about the judgment rendered by the king, who had awarded this fief to her. All the barons had resumed the privilege of coining; Charles of Valois, the king's uncle, setting them the example. But instead of coining for their own domains only, conformably to the ordinances of Philippe-le-Hardi and Philippe-le-Bel, they minted coin by wholesale, and gave it currency throughout the kingdom. On this, the king had perforce to arouse himself, and return to the administration of Marigny and of Philippe-le-Bel. He denounced the coinage of the barons, (November the 19th, 1315;) ordained that it should pass current on their own lands only; and fixed the value of the royal coin relatively to thirteen different coinages, which thirty-one bishops or barons had the right of minting on their own territories. In St. Louis's time, eighty nobles had enjoyed this right. The young feudal king, humanized by the want of money, did not disdain to treat with serfs and with Jews. . . . It is curious to see the son of Philippe-le-Bel admitting serfs to liberty [see SLAVERY, MEDIEVAL: FRANCE]; but it is trouble lost. The merchant vainly swells his voice and enlarges on the worth of his merchandise; the poor serfs will have none of it. Had they buried in the ground some bad piece of money, they took care not to dig it up to buy a bit of parchment. In vain does the king wax wroth at seeing them dull to the value of the boon offered. At last, he directs the commissioners deputed to superintend the enfranchisement, to value the property of such serfs as preferred 'remaining in the sorriness (*chétiveté*) of slavery,' and to tax them 'as sufficiently and to such extent as the condition and wealth of the individuals may conveniently allow, and as the necessity of our war requires.' But with all this it is a grand spectacle to see proclamation made from the throne itself of the imprescriptible right of every man to liberty. The serfs do not buy this right, but they will remember both the royal lesson, and the dangerous appeal to which it instigates against the barons. The short and obscure reign of Philippe-le-Long [Philip V., 1316-1322] is scarcely less important as regards the public law of France, than even that of Philippe-le-Bel. In the first place, his accession to the throne decides a great question. As Louis Hutin left his queen pregnant, his brother Philippe is regent and guardian of the future infant. This child dies soon after its birth, and Philippe proclaims himself king to the prejudice of a daughter of his brother's; a step which was the more surprising from the fact that Philippe-le-Bel had maintained the right of female succession in regard to Franche-Comté and Artois. The barons were desirous that daughters should be excluded from inheriting fiefs, but that they should succeed to the throne of France; and

their chief, Charles of Valois, favored his grand-niece against his nephew Philippe. Philippe assembled the States, and gained his cause, which, at bottom, was good, by absurd reasons. He alleged in his favor the old German law of the Franks, which excluded daughters from the Salic land; and maintained that the crown of France was too noble a fief to fall into hands used to the distaff ('pour tomber en quenouille')—a feudal argument, the effect of which was to ruin feudality. . . . By thus rejecting the right of the daughters at the very moment it was gradually triumphing over the fiefs, the crown acquired its character of receiving always without ever giving; and a bold revocation, at this time, of all donations made since St. Louis's day, seems to contain the principle of the inalienableness of the royal domain. Unfortunately, the feudal spirit which resumed strength under the Valois in favor of private wars, led to fatal creations of appanages, and founded, to the advantage of the different branches of the royal family, a princely feudality as embarrassing to Charles VI. and Louis XI., as the other had been to Philippe-le-Bel. This contested succession and disaffection of the barons force Philippe-le-Long into the paths of Philippe-le-Bel. He flatters the cities, Paris, and, above all, the University,—the grand power of Paris. He causes his barons to take the oath of fidelity to him, in presence of the masters of the university, and with their approval. He wishes his good cities to be provided with armories; their citizens to keep their arms in a sure place; and appoints them a captain in each bailiwick or district, (March the 12th, 1316). . . . Praiseworthy beginnings of order and of government brought no relief to the sufferings of the people. During the reign of Louis Hutin, a horrible mortality had swept off, it was said, the third of the population of the North. The Flemish war had exhausted the last resources of the country. . . . Men's imaginations becoming excited, a great movement took place among the people. As in the days of St. Louis, a multitude of poor people, of peasants, of shepherds or *pastoureux*, as they were called, flock together and say that they seek to go beyond the sea, that they are destined to recover the Holy Land. . . . They wended their way towards the South, everywhere massacring the Jews; whom the king's officers vainly tried to protect. At last, troops were got together at Toulouse, who fell upon the *Pastoureux*, and hanging them up by twenties and thirties the rest dispersed. . . . Philippe-le-Long . . . was seized with fever in the course of the same year, (A. D. 1321,) in the month of August, without his physicians being able to guess its cause. He languished five months, and died. . . . His brother Charles [Charles IV., 1322-1328] succeeded him, without bestowing a thought more on the rights of Philippe's daughter, than Philippe had done to those of Louis's daughter. The period of Charles's reign is as barren of facts with regard to France, as it is rich in them respecting Germany, England, and Flanders. The Flemings imprison their count. The Germans are divided between Frederiek of Austria and Lewis of Bavaria, who takes his rival prisoner at Muhldorf. In the midst of the universal divisions, France seems strong from the circumstance of its being one. Charles-le-Bel interferes in favor of the count of Flanders. He attempts,

with the pope's aid, to make himself emperor; and his sister, Isabella, makes herself actual queen of England by the murder of Edward II. . . . Charles-le-Bel . . . died almost at the same time as Edward, leaving only a daughter; so that he was succeeded by a cousin of his. All that fine family of princes who had sat near their father at the Council of Vienne was extinct. In the popular belief, the curses of Boniface had taken effect. . . . This memorable epoch, which depresses England so low, and in proportion, raises France so high, presents, nevertheless, in the two countries two analogous events. In England, the barons have overthrown Edward II. In France, the feudal party places on the throne the feudal branch of the Valois."—J. Michelet, *History of France*, bk. 5-6 (v. 1).—See, also, VALOIS, THE HOUSE OF.

A. D. 1314-1347.—The king's control of the Papacy in its contest with the emperor. See GERMANY: A. D. 1314-1347.


A. D. 1328.—The extent of the royal domain.—The great vassals.—The possessions of foreign princes in France.—On the accession of the House of Valois to the French throne, in the person of Philip VI. (A. D. 1328), the royal domain had acquired a great increase of extent. In the two centuries since Philip I. it had gained, "by conquest, by confiscation, or by inheritance, Berry, or the Viscounty of Bourges, Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Poitou, Valois, Vermandois, the counties of Auvergne, and Boulogne, a part of Champagne and Brie, Lyonnais, Angoumois, Marche, nearly the whole of Languedoc, and, lastly, the kingdom of Navarre, which belonging in her own right to queen Jeanne, mother of the last three Capetians [Jeanne, heiress of the kingdom of Navarre and of the counties of Champagne and Brie, was married to Philip IV., and was the mother of Louis X., Philip V. and Charles IV.], Charles IV. united with the crown. But the custom among the kings of giving apanages or estates to the princes of their house detached afresh from the domain a great part of the reunited territories, and created powerful princely houses, of which the chiefs often made themselves formidable to the monarchs. Among these great houses of the Capetian race, the most formidable were: the house of Burgundy, which traced back to king Robert; the house of Dreux, issue of a son of Louis the Big, and which added by a marriage the duchy of Brittany to the county of that name; the house of Anjou, issue of Charles, brother of Saint Louis, which was united in 1200 with that of Valois; the house of Bourbon, descending from Robert, Count of Clermont, sixth son of Saint Louis; and the house of Alençon, which traced back to Philip III., and possessed the duchy of Alençon and Perche. Besides these great princely houses of Capetian stock, which owed their grandeur and their origin to their apanages, there were many others which held considerable rank in France, and of which the possessions were transmissible to women; while the apanages were all masculine fiefs. The most powerful of these houses were those of Flanders, Penthièvre, Châtillon, Montmorency, Brienne, Coucy, Vendôme, Auvergne, Foix, and Armagnac. The vast possessions of the two last houses were in the country of the Langue d'Oc. The counts of Foix were also masters of Bearn, and those of Armagnac possessed Fezensac, Rouergue, and other large seigniories. Many


foreign princes, besides, had possessions in France at the accession of the Valois. The king of England was lord of Ponthieu, of Aunis, of Saintonge, and of the duchy of Aquitaine; the king of Navarre was count of Evreux, and possessor of many other towns in Normandy; the king of Majorca was proprietor of the seigniorship of Montpellier; the duke of Lorraine, vassal of the German empire, paid homage to the king of France for many fiefs that he held in Champagne; and, lastly, the Pope possessed the county Venaisin, detached from Provence."—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, p. 224.



A. D. 1328.—Accession of King Philip VI.

A. D. 1328.—The splendor of the Monarchy on the eve of the calamitous wars.—"Indisputably, the king of France [Philip VI., or Philip de Valois] was at this moment [A. D. 1328] a great king. He had just reinstated Flanders in its state of dependence on him. The king of England had done him homage for his French provinces. His cousins reigned at Naples and in Hungary. He was protector of the king of Scotland. He was surrounded by a court of kings—by those of Navarre, Majorca, Bohemia; and the Scottish monarch was often one of the circle. The famous John of Bohemia, of the house of Luxembourg, and father to the emperor Charles IV., declared that he could not live out of Paris, 'the most chivalrous residence in the world.' He fluttered over all Europe, but ever returned to the court of the great king of France—where was kept up one constant festival, where jousts and tournaments ever went on, and the romances of chivalry, king Arthur and the round table, were realized."—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 6, ch. 1.

A. D. 1328-1339.—The claim of Edward III. of England to the French crown.—"History tells us that Philip, king of France, surnamed the Fair, had three sons, beside his beautiful daughter Isabella, married to the king of England [Edward II.]. These three sons were very handsome. The eldest, Lewis, king of Navarre during the lifetime of his father, was called Lewis Hutin [Louis X.]; the second was named Philip the Great, or the Long [Philip V.]; and the third, Charles [Charles IV.]. All these were kings of France, after their father Philip, by legitimate succession, one after the other, without having by marriage any male heirs; yet, on the death of the last king, Charles, the twelve peers and barons of France did not give the kingdom to Isabella, the sister, who was queen of England, because they said and maintained, and still do insist, that the kingdom of France is so noble that it ought not to go to a woman; consequently neither to Isabella, nor to her son, the king of England [Edward III.]; for they hold that the son of a woman cannot claim any right of succession, where that woman has none herself. For these reasons the twelve peers and barons of France unanimously gave the kingdom of France to the lord Philip of Valois, nephew to king Philip, and thus put aside the queen of England, who was sister to Charles, the late king of France, and her son. Thus, as it seemed to many people, the succession went out of the right line; which has been the occasion of the most destructive wars and devastations of countries, as well in France as elsewhere, as you will learn hereafter; the real object of this history being to relate the great enterprises and deeds of arms achieved in these wars, for from







the time of good Charlemagne, king of France, never were such feats performed."—J. Froissart, *Chronicles (Johnes')*, bk. 1, ch. 4.—"From the moment of Charles IV.'s death [A. D. 1328], Edward III. of England buoyed himself up with a notion of his title to the crown of France, in right of his mother Isabel, sister to the three last kings. We can have no hesitation in condemning the injustice of this pretension. Whether the Salic law were or were not valid, no advantage could be gained by Edward. Even if he could forget the express or tacit decision of all France, there stood in his way Jane, the daughter of Louis X., three [daughters] of Philip the Long, and one of Charles the Fair. Aware of this, Edward set up a distinction, that, although females were excluded from succession, the same rule did not apply to their male issue; and thus, though his mother Isabel could not herself become queen of France, she might transmit a title to him. But this was contrary to the commonest rules of inheritance; and if it could have been regarded at all, Jane had a son, afterwards the famous king of Navarre [Charles the Bad], who stood one degree nearer to the crown than Edward. It is asserted in some French authorities that Edward preferred a claim to the regency immediately after the decease of Charles the Fair, and that the States-General, or at least the peers of France, adjudged that dignity to Philip de Valois. Whether this be true or not, it is clear that he entertained projects of recovering his right as early, though his youth and the embarrassed circumstances of his government threw insuperable obstacles in the way of their execution. He did liege homage, therefore, to Philip for Guienne, and for several years, while the affairs of Scotland engrossed his attention, gave no signs of meditating a more magnificent enterprise. As he advanced in manhood, and felt the consciousness of his strength, his early designs grew mature, and produced a series of the most important and interesting revolutions in the fortunes of France."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, pt. 1.—See, also, SALIC LAW: APPLICATION TO THE REGAL SUCCESSION IN FRANCE.

A. D. 1337-1360.—The beginning of the "Hundred Years War."—It was not until 1337 that Edward III. felt prepared to assert formally his claim to the French crown and to assume the title of King of France. In July of the following year he began undertakings to enforce his pretended right, by crossing with a considerable force to the continent. He wintered at Antwerp, concerting measures with the Flemings, who had espoused his cause, and arranging an alliance with the emperor-king of Germany, whose name bore more weight than his arms. In 1339 a formal declaration of hostilities was made and the long war—the Hundred Years War, as it has been called—of English kings for the sovereignty of France, began. "This great war may well be divided into five periods. The first ends with the Peace of Bretigny in 1360 (A. D. 1337-1360), and includes the great days of Crécy [1346] and Poitiers [1356], as well as the taking of Calais: the second runs to the death of Charles the Wise in 1380; these are the days of Du Guesclin and the English reverses: the third begins with the renewal of the war under Henry V. of England, and ends with the Regency of the Duke of Bedford at Paris, including the field of Azincourt [1415] and the Treaty of Troyes (A. D.

1415-1422): the fourth is the epoch of Jeanne Darc and ends with the second establishment of the English at Paris (A. D. 1428-1431); and the fifth and last runs on to the final expulsion of the English after the Battle of Castillon in 1453. Thus, though it is not uncommonly called the Hundred Years War, the struggle really extended over a period of a hundred and sixteen years."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France*, bk. 4, ch. 1-7.—"No war had broken out in Europe, since the fall of the Roman Empire, so memorable as that of Edward III. and his successors against France, whether we consider its duration, its object, or the magnitude and variety of its events. It was a struggle of one hundred and twenty years, interrupted but once by a regular pacification, where the most ancient and extensive dominion in the civilised world was the prize, twice lost and twice recovered in the conflict. . . . There is, indeed, ample room for national exultation at the names of Crecy, Poitiers and Azincourt. So great was the disparity of numbers upon those famous days, that we cannot, with the French historians, attribute the discomfiture of their hosts merely to mistaken tactics and too impetuous valour. . . . These victories, and the qualities that secured them, must chiefly be ascribed to the freedom of our constitution, and to the superior condition of the people. Not the nobility of England, not the feudal tenants, won the battles of Crecy and Poitiers; for these were fully matched in the ranks of France; but the yeomen who drew the bow with strong and steady arms, accustomed to use it in their native fields, and rendered fearless by personal competence and civil freedom. . . . Yet the glorious termination to which Edward was enabled, at least for a time, to bring the contest, was rather the work of fortune than of valour and prudence. Until the battle of Poitiers [A. D. 1356] he had made no progress towards the conquest of France. That country was too vast, and his army too small, for such a revolution. The victory of Crecy gave him nothing but Calais. . . . But at Poitiers he obtained the greatest of prizes, by taking prisoner the king of France. Not only the love of freedom tempted that prince to ransom himself by the utmost sacrifices, but his captivity left France defenceless and seemed to annihilate the monarchy itself. . . . There is no affliction which did not fall upon France during this miserable period. . . . Subdued by these misfortunes, though Edward had made but slight progress towards the conquest of the country, the regent of France, afterwards Charles V., submitted to the peace of Bretigny [A. D. 1360]. By this treaty, not to mention less important articles, all Guienne, Gascony, Poitou, Saintonge, the Limousin, and the Angoumois, as well as Calais, and the county of Ponthieu, were ceded in full sovereignty to Edward; a price abundantly compensating his renunciation of the title of France, which was the sole concession stipulated in return."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, pt. 2.

ALSO IN: J. Froissart, *Chronicles (Johnes' trans.)*, bk. 1, ch. 1-212.—W. Longman, *Hist. of Edward III.*, v. 1, ch. 6-22.—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 20.—D. F. Jamison, *Life and Times of Bertrand du Guesclin*, v. 1, ch. 4-10.—See, also, POITIERS, BATTLE OF.

A. D. 1347-1348.—The Black Plague.—"Epochs of moral depression are those, too, of

great mortality. . . . In the last years of Philippe de Valois' reign, the depopulation was rapid. The misery and physical suffering which prevailed were insufficient to account for it; for they had not reached the extreme at which they subsequently arrived. Yet, to adduce but one instance, the population of a single town, Narbonne, fell off in the space of four or five years from the year 1399, by 500 families. Upon this too tardy diminution of the human race followed extermination,—the great black plague, or pestilence, which at once heaped up mountains of dead throughout Christendom. It began in Provence, in the year 1347, on All Saints' Day, continued sixteen months, and carried off two-thirds of the inhabitants. The same wholesale destruction befell Languedoc. At Montpellier, out of twelve consuls, ten died. At Narbonne, 30,000 persons perished. In several places, there remained only a tithe of the inhabitants. All that the careless Froissart says of this fearful visitation, and that only incidentally, is—'For at this time there prevailed throughout the world generally a disease called epidemic, which destroyed a third of its inhabitants.' This pestilence did not break out in the north of the kingdom until August, 1348, where it first showed itself at Paris and St. Denys. So fearful were its ravages at Paris, that, according to some, 800, according to others, 500, daily sank under it. . . . As there was neither famine at the time nor want of food, but, on the contrary great abundance, this plague was said to proceed from infection of the air and of the springs. The Jews were again charged with this, and the people cruelly fell upon them."—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 6, ch. 1.—See BLACK DEATH.

A. D. 1350.—Accession of King John II.

A. D. 1356-1358.—The States-General and Étienne Marcel.—"The disaster of Poitiers [1356] excited in the minds of the people a sentiment of national grief, mixed with indignation and scorn at the nobility who had fled before an army so inferior in number. Those nobles who passed through the cities and towns on their return from the battle were pursued with imprecations and outrages. The Parisian bourgeoisie, animated with enthusiasm and courage, took upon itself at all risks the charge of its own defense; whilst the eldest son of the king, a youth of only nineteen, who had been one of the first to fly, assumed the government as lieutenant of his father. It was at the summons of this prince that the states assembled again at Paris before the time which they had appointed. The same deputies returned to the number of 800, of whom 400 were of the bourgeoisie; and the work of reform, rudely sketched in the preceding session, was resumed under the same influence, with an enthusiasm which partook of the character of revolutionary impulse. The assembly commenced by concentrating its action in a committee of twenty-four members, deliberating, as far as appears, without distinction of orders; it then intimated its resolutions under the form of petitions, which were as follow: The authority of the states declared supreme in all affairs of administration and finance, the impeachment of all the counsellors of the king, the dismissal in a body of the officers of justice, and the creation of a council of reformers taken from the three orders; lastly, the prohibition to conclude any truce without the assent of the three states, and

the right on their part to re-assemble at their own will without a royal summons. The lieutenant of the king, Charles Duke of Normandy, exerted in vain the resources of a precocious ability to escape these imperious demands: he was compelled to yield everything. The States governed in his name; but dissension, springing from the mutual jealousy of the different orders, was soon introduced into their body. The preponderating influence of the bourgeois appeared intolerable to the nobles, who, in consequence, deserted the assembly and retired home. The deputies of the clergy remained longer at their posts, but they also withdrew at last; and, under the name of the States-General, none remained but the representatives of the cities, alone charged with all the responsibilities of the reform and the affairs of the kingdom. Bowing to a necessity of central action, they submitted of their own accord to the deputation of Paris; and soon, by the tendency of circumstances, and in consequence of the hostile attitude of the Regent, the question of supremacy of the states became a Parisian question, subject to the chances of a popular émeute and the guardianship of the municipal power. At this point appears a man whose character has grown into historical importance in our days from our greater facilities of understanding it, Étienne [Stephen] Marcel, 'prévôt des marchands'—that is to say, mayor of the municipality of Paris. This échevin of the 14th century, by a remarkable anticipation, designed and attempted things which seem to belong only to recent revolutions. Social unity, and administrative uniformity; political rights, co-extensive and equal with civil rights; the principle of public authority transferred from the crown to the nation; the States-General changed, under the influence of the third order, into a national representation; the will of the people admitted as sovereign in the presence of the depositary of the royal power; the influence of Paris over the provinces, as the head of opinion and centre of the general movement; the democratic dictatorship, and the influence of terror exercised in the name of the common weal; new colours assumed and carried as a sign of patriotic union and symbol of reform; the transference of royalty itself from one branch of the family to the other, with a view to the cause of reform and the interest of the people—such were the circumstances and the scenes which have given to our own as well as the preceding century their political character. It is strange to find the whole of it comprised in the three years over which the name of the Prévôt Marcel predominates. His short and stormy career was, as it were, a premature attempt at the grand designs of Providence, and the mirror of the bloody changes of fortune through which those designs were destined to advance to their accomplishment under the impulse of human passions. Marcel lived and died for an idea—that of hastening on, by the force of the masses, the work of gradual equalisation commenced by the kings themselves; but it was his misfortune and his crime to be unrelenting in carrying out his convictions. To the impetuosity of a tribune who did not shrink even from murder he added the talent of organization; he left in the grand city, which he had ruled with a stern and absolute sway, powerful institutions, noble works, and a name which two centuries afterwards his descendants bore with pride as a title

of nobility."—A. Thierry, *Formation and Progress of the Tiers Etat*, v. 1, ch. 2.—See, also, STATES-GENERAL OF FRANCE IN THE 14TH CENTURY.

A. D. 1358.—The insurrection of the Jacquerie.—"The miseries of France weighed more and more heavily on the peasantry; and none regarded them. They stood apart from the cities, knowing little of them; the nobles despised them and robbed them of their substance or their labour. . . . At last the peasantry (May, 1358), weary of their woes, rose up to work their own revenge and ruin. They began in the Beauvais country and there fell on the nobles, attacking and destroying castles, and slaying their inmates: it was the old unvarying story. They made themselves a kind of king, a man of Clermont in the Beauvoisin, named William Callet. Froissart imagines that the name 'Jacques Bonhomme' meant a particular person, a leader in these risings. Froissart however had no accurate knowledge of the peasant and his ways. Jacques Bonhomme was the common nickname, the 'Giles' or 'Hodge' of France, the name of the peasant generally; and from it such risings as this of 1358 came to be called the 'Jacquerie,' or the disturbances of the 'Jacques.' The nobles were soon out against them, and the whole land was full of anarchy. Princes and nobles, angry peasants with their 'iron shod sticks and knives,' free-lances, English bands of pillagers, all made up a scene of utter confusion: 'cultivation ceased, commerce ceased, security was at an end.' The burghers of Paris and Meaux sent a force to help the peasants, who were besieging the fortress at Meaux, held by the nobles; these were suddenly attacked and routed by the Captal de Buch and the Count de Foix, 'then on their return from Prussia.' The King of Navarre also fell on them, took by stratagem their leader Callet, tortured and hanged him. In six weeks the fire was quenched in blood."—G. W. Kitchin, *History of France*, ch. 2, sect. 3.—"Froissart relates the horrible details of the Jacquerie with the same placid interest which characterises his descriptions of battles, tournaments, and the pageantry of chivalry. The charm and brilliancy of his narrative have long popularised his injustice and his errors, which are self-apparent when compared with the authors and chroniclers of his time. . . . The chronicles contemporary of the Jacquerie confine themselves to a few words on the subject, although, with the exception of the Continuator of Nangis, they were all hostile to the cause of the peasants. The private and local documents on the subject say very little more. The Continuator of Nangis has drawn his information from various sources. He takes care to state that he has witnessed almost all he relates. After describing the sufferings of the peasants, he adds that the laws of justice authorised them to rise in revolt against the nobles of France. His respected testimony reduces the insurrection to comparatively small proportions. The hundred thousand Jacques of Froissard are reduced to something like five or six thousand men, a number much more probable when it is considered that the insurrection remained a purely local one, and that, in consequence of the ravages we have mentioned, the whole open country had lost about two-thirds of its inhabitants. He states very clearly that the peasants killed indiscriminately, and without pity, men and children, but he does

not say anything of those details of atrocity related by Froissard. He only alludes once to a report of some outrages offered to some noble ladies; he speaks of it as a vague rumour. He describes the insurgents, after the first explosion of their vindictive fury, as pausing—amazed at their own boldness, and terrified at their own crimes, and the nobles, recovering from their terror, taking immediate advantage of this sudden torpor and paralysis—assembling and slaughtering all, innocent and guilty, burning houses and villages. If we turn to other writers contemporary with the Jacquerie, we find that Louvet, author of the 'History of the District of Beauvais,' does not say much on the subject, and evinces also a sympathy for the peasants: the paucity of his remarks on a subject represented by Froissard as a gigantic, bloody tragedy, raises legitimate doubts as to the veracity of the latter. There is another authority on the events of that period, which may be considered as more weighty, in consequence of its ecclesiastical character; it is the 'cartulaire,' or journal of the Abbot of Beauvais. . . . There is no trace in it of the horror and indescribable terror . . . [the rising] must have inspired if the peasants had committed the atrocities attributed to them by the feudal historian, Froissard. On the contrary, the vengeance of the peasants falls into the shade, as it were, in contrast with the merciless reaction of the nobles, along with the sanguinary oppression of the English. The writer of the 'Abbey of Beauvais,' and the anonymous monk, 'Continuator of Nangis,' concur with each other in their account of the Jacquerie. Their judgments are similar, and they manifest the same moderation. Their opinions, moreover, are confirmed by a higher authority, a testimony that must be considered as indisputable, namely, the letters of amnesty of the Regent of France, which are all preserved; they bear the date of 10th August 1358, and refer to all the acts committed on the occasion of the Jacquerie. In these he proves himself more severe upon the reaction of the nobles than on the revolt of the peasants. . . . There is not the slightest allusion to the monstrosities related by Froissard, which the Regent could not have failed to stigmatise, as he is well known for having entertained an unscrupulous hatred to any popular movement, or any claims of the people. The manner, on the contrary, in which the Jacquerie are represented in this official document, is full of signification; it represents the men of the open country assembling spontaneously in various localities, in order to deliberate on the means of resisting the English, and suddenly, as with a mutual agreement, turning fiercely on the nobles, who were the real cause of their misery, and of the disgrace of France, on the days of Crecy and Poitiers. . . . It has also been forgotten that many citizens took an active part in the Jacquerie. The great chronicles of France state that the majority were peasants, labouring people, but that there were also among them citizens, and even gentlemen, who, no doubt, were impelled by personal hatred and vengeance. Many rich men joined the peasants, and became their leaders. The bourgeoisie, in its struggles with royalty, could not refuse to take advantage of such a diversion; and Beauvais, Senlis, Amiens, Paris, and Meaux accepted the Jacquerie. Moreover, almost all the poorer classes of the cities sympathised with the revolted

peasants. The Jacquerie broke out on the 21st of May 1358, and not in November 1357, as erroneously stated by Froissard, in the districts around Beauvais and Clermont-sur-Oise. The peasants, merely armed with pikes, sticks, fragments of their ploughs, rushed on their masters, murdered their families, and burned down their castles. The country comprised between Beauvais and Melun was the principal scene of this war of extermination. . . . The Jacquerie had commenced on the 21st of May. On the 9th of June . . . it was already terminated. It was, therefore, in reality, an insurrection of less than three weeks' duration. The reprisals of the nobles had already commenced on the 9th of June, and continued through the whole of July, and the greater part of August. Froissard states that the Jacquerie lasted over six weeks, thus comprising in his reckoning three weeks of the ferocious vengeance of the nobles, and casting on Jacques Bonhomme the responsibility of the massacres of which he had been the victim, as well as those he had committed in his furious despair."—Prof. De Vericour, *The Jacquerie* (*Royal Hist. Soc., Transactions*, v. 1).

ALSO IN: Sir J. Froissart, *Chronicles* (*Johnes' trans.*), bk. 1, ch. 181.

A. D. 1360-1380.—English conquests recovered.—The Peace of Bretigny brought little peace to France or little diminution of the troubles of the kingdom. In some respects there was a change for the worse introduced. The armies which had ravaged the country dissolved into plundering bands which afflicted it even more. Great numbers of mercenaries from both sides were set free, who gathered into Free Companies, as they were called, under leaders of fit recklessness and valor, and swarmed over the land, warring on all prosperity and all the peaceful industries of the time, seeking booty wherever it might be found [see ITALY: A. D. 1343-1393]. Civil war, too, was kept alive by the intrigues and conspiracies of the Navarrese king, Charles the Bad; and war in Brittany, over a disputed succession to the dukedom, was actually stipulated for, by French and English, in their treaty of general peace. But when the chivalric but hapless King John died, in 1364, the new king, Charles V., who had been regent during his captivity, developed an unexpected capacity for government. He brought to the front the famous Breton warrior Du Guesclin—rough, ignorant, unchivalric—but a fighter of the first order in his hard-fighting day. He contrived with adroitness to rid France, mostly, of the Free Companies, by sending them, with Du Guesclin at their head, into Spain, where they drove Peter the Cruel from the throne of Castile, and fought the English, who undertook, wickedly and foolishly, to sustain him. The Black Prince won a great battle, at Najara or Navarrete (A. D. 1367), took Du Guesclin prisoner and restored the cruel Pedro to his throne. But it was a victory fatal to English interests in France. Half the army of the English prince perished of a pestilent fever before he led it back to Aquitaine, and he himself was marked for early death by the same malady. He had been made duke of Aquitaine, or Guienne, and held the government of the country. The war in Spain proved expensive; he taxed his Gascon and Aquitanian subjects heavily. He was ill, irritable, and treated them harshly. Discontent became widely spread, and

the king of France subtly stirred it up until he felt prepared to make use of it in actual war. At last, in 1368, he challenged a rupture of the Peace of Bretigny by summoning King Edward, as his vassal, to answer complaints from Aquitaine. In April of the next year he formally declared war and opened hostilities the same day. His cunning policy was not to fight, but to waste and wear the enemy out. Its wisdom was well-proved by the result. Day by day the English lost ground; the footing they had gained in France was found to be everywhere insecure. The dying Black Prince achieved one hideous triumph at Limoges, where he slew 3,000 people to punish a revolt; then he was carried home to end his days in England. In 1376 he died, and one year later his father, King Edward, followed him to the grave, and a child of eleven (Richard II.) came to the English throne. But the same calamity befell France in 1380, when Charles the Wise died, leaving an heir to the throne only twelve years of age. In both kingdoms the minority of the sovereign gave rise to factious intrigues and distracting feuds. The war went on at intervals, with frequent truces and armistices, and with little result beyond the animosities which it kept alive. But the English possessions, by this time, had been reduced to Calais and Guines, with some small parts of Aquitaine adjoining the cities of Bordeaux and Bayonne. And thus, it may be said, the situation was prolonged through a generation, until Henry V. of England resumed afresh the undertaking of Edward III.—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 22.

ALSO IN: J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 6, ch. 4.—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, bk. 2, ch. 6.—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, ch. 9.—D. F. Jamison, *Life and Times of Du Guesclin*.—Froissard, *Chronicles* (*Johnes' trans.*), bk. 1.—See SPAIN: A. D. 1366-1369.

A. D. 1364.—Accession of King Charles V.
A. D. 1378.—Acquisitions in the Rhone valley legally conferred by the Emperor. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1127-1378.

A. D. 1380.—Accession of King Charles VI.
A. D. 1380-1415.—The reign of the Dukes.—The civil war of Armagnacs and Burgundians.—"Charles VI. had arrived at the age of eleven years and some months when his father died [A. D. 1380]. His three paternal uncles, the Dukes of Anjou, Berry, and Burgundy, and his maternal uncle, the Duke of Bourbon, disputed among themselves concerning his guardianship and the regency. They agreed to emancipate the young King immediately after his coronation, which was to take place during the year, and the regency was to remain until that period in the hands of the eldest, the Duke of Anjou." But the Duke of Anjou was soon afterwards lured into Italy by the fatal gift of a claim to the crown of Naples [see ITALY: A. D. 1343-1399], and perished in striving to realize it. The surviving uncles misgoverned the country between them until 1389, when the young king was persuaded to throw off their yoke. The nation rejoiced for three years in the experience and the prospect of administrative reforms; but suddenly, in July, 1392, the young king became demented, and "then commenced the third and fatal epoch of that disastrous reign. The faction of the dukes again seized power," but only to waste and afflict the kingdom by dissensions

among themselves. The number of the rival dukes was now increased by the addition of the Duke of Orleans, brother of the king, who showed himself as ruthless and rapacious as any. "Charles was still considered to be reigning; each one sought in turn to get possession of him, and each one watched his lucid moments in order to stand well in power. His flashes of reason were still more melancholy than his fits of delirium. Incapable of attending to his affairs, or of having a will of his own, always subservient to the dominant party, he appeared to employ his few glimmerings of reason only in sanctioning the most tyrannical acts and the most odious abuses. It was in this manner that the kingdom of France was governed during twenty-eight years." In 1404, the Duke of Burgundy, Philip the Bold, having died, the Duke of Orleans acquired supreme authority and exercised it most oppressively. But the new Duke of Burgundy, John the Fearless, made his appearance on the scene ere long, arriving from his county of Flanders with an army and threatening civil war. Terms of peace, however, were arranged between the two dukes and an apparent reconciliation took place. On the very next day the Duke of Orleans was assassinated (A. D. 1407), and the Duke of Burgundy openly proclaimed his instigation of the deed. Out of that treacherous murder sprang a war of factions so deadly that France was delivered by it to foreign conquest, and destroyed, we may say, for the time being, as a nation. The elder of the young princes of Orleans, sons of the murdered duke, had married a daughter of Count Bernard of Armagnac, and Count Bernard became the leader of the party which supported them and sought to avenge them, as against the Duke of Burgundy and his party. Hence the former acquired the name of Armagnacs; the latter were called Burgundians. Armagnac led an army of Gascons [A. D. 1410] and threatened Paris, "where John the Fearless caressed the vilest populace. Burgundy relied on the name of the king, whom he held in his power, and armed in the capital a corps of one hundred young butchers or horse-knackers, who, from John Caboché, their chief, took the name of Cabochiens. A frightful war, interrupted by truces violated on both sides, commenced between the party of Armagnac and that of Burgundy. Both sides appealed to the English, and sold France to them. The Armagnacs pillaged and ravaged the environs of Paris with un-heard-of cruelties, while the Cabochiens caused the capital they defended to tremble. The States-General, convoked for the first time for thirty years, were dumb—without courage and without strength. The Parliament was silent, the university made itself the organ of the populace, and the butchers made the laws. They pillaged, imprisoned and slaughtered with impunity, according to their savage fury, and found judges to condemn their victims. . . . The reaction broke out at last. Tired of so many atrocities, the bourgeoisie took up arms, and shook off the yoke of the horse-knackers. The Dauphin was delivered by them. He mounted on horseback, and, at the head of the militia, went to the Hôtel de Ville, from which place he drove out Caboché and his brigands. The counter revolution was established. Burgundy departed, and the power passed to the Armagnacs. The princes re-entered Paris,

and King Charles took up the oriflamme (the royal standard of France), to make war against John the Fearless, whose instrument he had been a short time before. His army was victorious. Burgundy submitted, and the treaty of Arras [A. D. 1415] suspended the war, but not the executions and the ravages. Henry V., King of England, judged this a propitious moment to descend upon France, which had not a vessel to oppose the invaders."—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, pp. 266-279.

ALSO IN: E. de Monstrelet, *Chronicles (Johnes' trans.)*, v. 1, bk. 1, ch. 1-140.—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, bk. 2, ch. 8-9.

A. D. 1383.—Pope Urban's Crusade against the Schismatics. See FLANDERS: A. D. 1383.

A. D. 1396.—The sovereignty of Genoa surrendered to the king. See GENOA: A. D. 1381-1422.

A. D. 1415.—The Hundred Years War renewed by Henry V. of England.—"When Henry V. resolved to recover what he claimed as the inheritance of his predecessors, he had to begin, it may be said, the work of conquest over again. Allies, however, he had, whose assistance he was to find very useful. The dynasty of De Montfort had been established in possession of the dukedom of Brittany in a great measure by English help, and though the relations between the two countries had not been invariably friendly since that time, the sense of this obligation, and, still more powerfully, a jealous fear of the French king, inclined Brittany to the English alliance. The Dukes of Burgundy, though they had no such motives of gratitude towards England, felt a far stronger hostility towards France. The feud between the rival factions which went by the names of Burgundians and Armagnacs had now been raging for several years; and though the attitude of the Burgundians varied—at the great struggle of Agincourt they were allies, though lukewarm and even doubtful allies, of the French—they ultimately ranked themselves decidedly on Henry's side. In 1414, then, Henry formally demanded, as the heir of Isabella, mother of his great-grandfather Edward, the crown of France. This claim the French princes wholly refused to consider. Henry then moderated his demands so far, at least, as to allow Charles to remain in nominal possession of his kingdom; but . . . France was to cede to England, no longer as a feudal superior making a grant to a vassal, but in full sovereignty, the provinces of Normandy, Maine, and Anjou, together with all that was comprised in the ancient duchy of Aquitaine. Half, too, of Provence was claimed, and the arrears of the ransom of King John, amounting to 1,200,000 crowns, were also to be paid. Finally, the French king was to give his youngest daughter, Katharine, in marriage to Henry, with a portion of 2,000,000 crowns. The French ministers offered, in answer, to yield the duchy of Aquitaine, comprising the provinces of Anjou, Gascony, Guienne, Poitou, and to give the hand of the princess Katharine with a dowry of 600,000 crowns." Negotiations went on through several months, with small chance of success, while Henry prepared for war. His preparations were completed in the summer of 1415, and on the 11th of August in that year he set sail from Southampton, with an army of 6,000 men-at-arms and 24,000 archers, very completely equipped, and accompanied with cannon and

other engines of war. Landing in the estuary of the Seine, the invaders first captured the important Norman seaport of Harfleur, after a siege of a month, and expelled the inhabitants from the town. It was an important acquisition; but it had cost the English heavily. They were ill-supplied with food; they had suffered from much rain; 2,000 had died of an epidemic of dysentery. The army was in no condition for a forward movement. "The safest course would now have been to return at once; and this seems to have been pressed upon the king by the majority of his counsellors. But this prudent advice did not approve itself to Henry's adventurous temper. . . . He determined . . . to make what may be called a military parade to Calais. This involved a march of not less than 150 miles through a hostile country, a dangerous, and, but that one who cherishes such designs as Henry's must make a reputation for daring, a useless operation; but the king's determined will overcame all opposition." Leaving a strong garrison at Harfleur, Henry set out upon his march. Arrived at the Somme, his further progress was disputed, and he was forced to make a long detour before he could effect a crossing of the river. On the 24th of October, he encountered the French army, strongly posted at the village of Azincour or Agincourt, barring the road to Calais; and there, on the morning of the 25th, after a night of drenching rain, the great battle, which shines with so dazzling a glory in English history, was fought. There seems to be no doubt that the English were greatly outnumbered by the French—according to Monstrelet they were but one to six; but the masses on the French side were unskilfully handled and no advantage was got from them. The deadly shafts of the terrible English archers built such a rampart of corpses in their front that it actually sheltered them from the charge of the French cavalry. "Everywhere the French were routed, slain, or taken. The victory of the English was complete. . . . The French loss was enormous. Monstrelet gives a long list of the chief princes and nobles who fell on that fatal field. . . . We are disposed to trust his estimate, which, including princes, knights and men-at-arms of every degree, he puts at 10,000. . . . Only 1,600 are said to have been 'of low degree.' . . . The number of knights and gentlemen taken prisoners was 1,500. Among them were Charles, Duke of Orleans, and the Duke of Bourbon, both princes of the blood-royal. . . . Brilliant as was the victory which Henry had won at Agincourt, it had, it may be said, no immediate results. . . . The army resumed its interrupted march to Calais, which was about forty miles distant. At Calais a council of war was held, and the resolution to return to England unanimously taken. A few days were allowed for refreshment, and about the middle of November the army embarked."—A. J. Church, *Henry the Fifth*, ch. 6-10.

ALSO IN: E. de Monstrelet, *Chronicles* (Johnes' trans.), v. 1, bk. 1, ch. 140-149.—J. E. Tyler, *Henry of Monmouth*, ch. 19-23.—G. M. Towle, *History of Henry V.*, ch. 7-8.—Lord Brougham, *Hist. of Eng. and France under the House of Lancaster*.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.: second series*, c. 24-26.

A. D. 1415-1419.—Massacre of Armagnacs.—The murder of the Duke of Burgundy.—"The captivity of so many princes of the blood

as had been taken prisoner at Agincourt might have seemed likely at least to remove some of the elements of discord; but it so happened that the captives were the most moderate and least ambitious men. The gentle, poetical Duke of Orleans, the good Duke of Bourbon, and the patriotic and gallant Arthur de Richemont, had been taken, while the savage Duke of Burgundy and the violent Gascon Count of Armagnac, Constable of France, remained at the head of their hostile factions. . . . The Count d'Armagnac now reigned supreme; no prince of the blood came to the councils, and the king and dauphin were absolutely in his hands. . . . The Duke of Burgundy was, however, advancing with his forces, and the Parisians were always far more inclined to him than to the other party. . . . For a whole day's ride round the environs of the city, every farmhouse had been sacked or burnt. Indeed, it was said in Paris a man had only to be called a Burgundian, or anywhere else in the Isle of France an Armagnac, to be instantly put to death. All the soldiers who had been posted to guard Normandy and Picardy against the English were recalled to defend Paris against the Duke of Burgundy; and Henry V. could have found no more favourable moment for a second expedition." The English king took advantage of his opportunity and landed in Normandy August 1, 1417, finding nobody to oppose him in the field. The factions were employed too busily in cutting each other's throats,—especially after the Burgundians had regained possession of Paris, which they did in the following spring. Thereupon the Parisian mob rose and ferociously massacred all the partisans of Armagnac, while the Burgundians looked on and approved. "The prison was forced; Armagnac himself was dragged out and slain in the court. . . . The court of each prison became a slaughterhouse; the prisoners were called down one by one, and there murdered, till the assassins were up to their ankles in blood. The women were as savage as the men, and dragged the corpses about the streets in derision. The prison slaughter had but given a passion for further carnage; and the murderers broke open the houses in search of Armagnacs, killing not only men, but women, children, and even new-born babes, to whom in their diabolical frenzy they refused baptism, as being little Armagnacs. The massacre lasted from four o'clock on Sunday morning to ten o'clock on Monday. Some say that 3,000 perished, others 1,600, and the Duke of Burgundy's servants reported the numbers as only 400." Meantime Henry V. was besieging Rouen, and starving Paris by cutting off the supplies for which it depended on the Seine. In August there was another rising of the Parisian mob and another massacre. In January, 1419, Rouen surrendered, and attempts at peace followed, both parties making a truce with the English invader. The imperious demands of King Henry finally impelled the two French factions to draw together and to make a common cause of the deliverance of the kingdom. At least that was the profession with which the Dauphin and the Duke of Burgundy met, in July, and went through the forms of a reconciliation. Perhaps there were treacherous intentions on both sides. On one side the treachery was consummated a month later (Sept. 10, 1419), when, a second meeting between Duke John the Fearless and

the Dauphin taking place at the Bridge of Montereau, the Duke was basely assassinated in the Dauphin's presence. This murder, by which the Armagnacs, who controlled the young Dauphin, hoped to break their rivals down, only kindled afresh the passions which were destroying France and delivering it an easy prey to foreign conquest.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, second series, c. 28-29.

ALSO IN: E. de Monstrelet, *Chronicles* (Johnes' trans.), v. 1, bk. 1, ch. 150-211.—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 9, ch. 2.

A. D. 1417-1422.—Burgundy's revenge.—Henry the Fifth's triumph.—Two kings in Paris.—The Treaty of Troyes.—Death of Henry.—“Whilst civil war was . . . penetrating to the very core of the kingship, foreign war was making its way again into the kingdom. Henry V., after the battle of Agincourt, had returned to London, and had left his army to repose and reorganize after its sufferings and its losses. It was not until eighteen months afterwards, on the 1st of August, 1417, that he landed at Touques, not far from Honfleur, with fresh troops, and resumed his campaign in France. Between 1417 and 1419 he successively laid siege to nearly all the towns of importance in Normandy, to Caen, Bayeux, Falaise, Evreux, Coutances, Laigle, St. Lô, Cherbourg, &c. &c. Some he occupied after a short resistance, others were sold to him by their governors; but when, in the month of July, 1418, he undertook the siege of Rouen, he encountered there a long and serious struggle. Rouen had at that time, it is said, a population of 150,000 souls, which was animated by ardent patriotism. The Rouennese, on the approach of the English, had repaired their gates, their ramparts, and their moats; had demanded reinforcements from the King of France and the Duke of Burgundy; and had ordered every person incapable of bearing arms or procuring provisions for ten months to leave the city. Twelve thousand old men, women and children were thus expelled, and died either round the place or whilst roving in misery over the neighbouring country. . . . Fifteen thousand men of city-militia, 4,000 regular soldiers, 300 spearmen and as many archers from Paris, and it is not quite known how many men-at-arms sent by the Duke of Burgundy, defended Rouen for more than five months amidst all the usual sufferings of strictly-besieged cities.” On the 13th of January, 1419, the town was surrendered. “It was 215 years since Philip Augustus had won Rouen by conquest from John Lackland, King of England.” After this great success there were truces brought about between all parties, and much negotiation, which came to nothing—except the treacherous murder of the Duke of Burgundy, as related above. Then the situation changed. The son and successor of the murdered duke, afterwards known as Philip the Good, took sides, at once, with the English king and committed himself to a war of revenge, indifferent to the fate of France. “On the 17th of October [1419] was opened at Arras a congress between the plenipotentiaries of England and those of Burgundy. On the 20th of November a special truce was granted to the Parisians, whilst Henry V., in concert with Duke Philip of Burgundy, was prosecuting the war against the dauphin. On the 2d of December the bases were laid of an agreement between the English and the

Burgundians. The preliminaries of the treaty, which was drawn up in accordance with these bases, were signed on the 9th of April, 1420, by King Charles VI. [now controlled by the Burgundians], and on the 20th communicated at Paris by the chancellor of France to the parliament.” On the 20th of May following, the treaty, definitive and complete, was signed by Henry V. and promulgated at Troyes. By this treaty of Troyes, Princess Catherine, daughter of the King of France, was given in marriage to King Henry; Charles VI. was guaranteed his possession of the French crown while he lived; on his death, “the crown and kingdom of France, with all their rights and appurtenances,” were solemnly conveyed to Henry V. of England and his heirs, forever. “The revulsion against the treaty of Troyes was real and serious, even in the very heart of the party attached to the Duke of Burgundy. He was obliged to lay upon several of his servants formal injunctions to swear to this peace, which seemed to them treason. . . . In the duchy of Burgundy the majority of the towns refused to take the oath to the King of England. The most decisive and the most helpful proof of this awakening of national feeling was the ease experienced by the dauphin, who was one day to be Charles VII., in maintaining the war which, after the treaty of Troyes, was, in his father's and his mother's name, made upon him by the King of England and the Duke of Burgundy. This war lasted more than three years. Several towns, amongst others, Melun, Crotoy, Meaux, and St. Riquier, offered an obstinate resistance to the attacks of the English and Burgundians. . . . It was in Perche, Anjou, Maine, on the banks of the Loire, and in Southern France, that the dauphin found most of his enterprising and devoted partisans. The sojourn made by Henry V. at Paris, in December, 1420, with his wife, Queen Catherine, King Charles VI., Queen Isabel, and the Duke of Burgundy, was not, in spite of galas and acclamations, a substantial and durable success for him. . . . Towards the end of August, 1422, Henry V. fell ill; and, too stout-hearted to delude himself as to his condition, he . . . had himself removed to Vincennes, called his councillors about him, and gave them his last royal instructions. . . . He expired on the 31st of August, 1422, at the age of thirty-four.”—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 23.—At Paris, “the two sovereigns [Henry V. and Charles VI.] kept distinct courts. That of Henry was by far the most splendidly equipped and numerously attended of the two. He was the rising sun, and all men looked to him. All offices of trust and profit were at his disposal, and the nobles and gentlemen of France flocked into his ante-chambers.”—A. J. Church, *Henry the Fifth*, ch. 15.

ALSO IN: E. de Monstrelet, *Chronicles* (Johnes' trans.), v. 1, bk. 1, ch. 171-264.—J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 9, ch. 2-3.

A. D. 1422.—Accession of King Charles VII.

A. D. 1429-1431.—The Mission of the Maid.—“France divided—two kings, two regencies, two armies, two governments, two nations, two nobilities, two systems of justice—met face to face: father, son, mother, uncles, nephews, citizens, and strangers, fought for the right, the soil, the throne, the cities, the spoil and the blood of the nation. The King of England died at Vincennes [August 31, 1422], and was shortly

followed [October 22] by Charles VI., father of the twelve children of Isabel, leaving the kingdom to the stranger and to ruin. The Duke of Bedford insolently took possession of the Regency in the name of England, pursued the handful of nobles who wished to remain French with the dauphin, defeated them at the battle of Verneuil [August 17, 1424], and exiled the queen, who had become a burden to the government after having been an instrument of usurpation. He then concentrated the armies of England, France and Burgundy round Orleans, which was defended by some thousands of the partisans of the dauphin, and which comprised almost all that remained of the kingdom of France. The land was everywhere ravaged by the passing and re-passing of these bands—sometimes friends, sometimes enemies—driving each other on, wave after wave, like the billows of the Atlantic; ravaging crops, burning towns, dispersing, robbing, and ill-treating the population. In this disorganization of the country, the young dauphin, sometimes awakened by the complaints of his people, at others absorbed in the pleasures natural to his age, was making love to Agnes Sorel in the castle of Loches. . . . Such was the state of the nation when Providence showed it a savior in a child.”—A. de Lamartine, *Memoirs of Celebrated Characters: Joan of Arc*.—The child was Jeanne D'Arc, or Joan of Arc, better known in history as the Maid of Orleans,—daughter of a husbandman who tilled his own few acres at the village of Domrémy, in Upper Lorraine. Research in recent years has brought to light more than was formerly known of the family and the circumstances of the heroic Maid. “Jacques d'Arc and Isabelle de Vouthon had three sons, Jacquemin, Jean, and Pierre, and two daughters, the elder named Catherine, the younger Jeanne or rather Jeannette, she who was by her heroism to immortalize her line. Two documents . . . prove with evidence that Jacques d'Arc figured in the first rank of the notables of Domrémy. In the first of these, dated Maxey-sur-Meuse, October 7, 1423, he is styled ‘doyen’ of that village, and by this title comes immediately after the mayor and aldermen. ‘In general,’ says M. Edward Bonvalot, speaking of the villages in the region of the Meuse governed by the famous charter of Beaumont in Argonne, ‘there is but one doyen or sergeant in each village, who convokes the bourgeois to the electoral assemblies and to the sittings of the court; it is he also who convokes the mayor, aldermen and the men of the commune to their reunions, either periodical or special; it is he who cries the municipal resolutions and ordinances; it is he who commands the day and night watch; it is he who has charge of prisoners. Among the privileges which he enjoys must be cited the exemption from the taxes (deniers) of the bourgeoisie. At Linger, he has the same territorial advantages as the clerk of the commune.’ It is seen by various documents that the doyens were also charged with the collection of the ‘tailles,’ ‘rentes’ and ‘redevances,’ and that they were appointed to supervise bread, wine and other commodities as well as to test weights and measures. In the second document, drawn up at Vaucouleurs March 31, 1427, Jacques d'Arc appears as the agent of the inhabitants of Domrémy in a suit of great importance which they then had to sustain before

Robert de Baudricourt, captain of Vaucouleurs. . . . Like the legendary beech of her native village, the childhood of the virgin of Domrémy sprang out of a soil full of vigor and was in the main haunted by beneficent fairies. Born in a fertile and smiling corner of the earth, the issue of an honest family, whose laborious mediocrity was elevated enough to touch nobility when ennobling itself by alms-giving, and humble enough to remain in contact with all the poor; endowed by nature with a robust body, a sound intelligence and an energetic spirit, the little Jeannette d'Arc became under these gentle influences all goodness and all love.”—S. Luce, *Jeanne d'Arc à Domrémy (tr. from the French)*, ch. 2-3.—Of the visions of the pious young maiden—of the voices she heard—of the conviction which came upon her that she was called by God to deliver her country—and of the enthusiasm of faith with which she went about her mission until all people bent to her as the messenger and minister of God—the story is a familiar one to all. In April, 1429, Joan was sent by the king, from Blois, with 10,000 or 12,000 men, to the succor of Orleans, where Dunois, the Bastard of Orleans, was in command. She reformed the army, purged it of all vile followers, and raised its confidence to that frenzied pitch which nothing can resist. On the 8th of May the English abandoned the siege and Orleans was saved. “Joan wasted no time in vain triumphs. She brought back the victorious army to the dauphin, to assist him in reconquering city after city of his kingdom. The dauphin and the queens received her as the messenger of God, who had found and recovered the lost keys of the kingdom. ‘I have only another year,’ she remarked, with a sad presentiment, which seemed to indicate that her victory led to the scaffold; ‘I must therefore set to work at once.’ She begged the dauphin to go and be crowned at Rheims, although that city and the intermediate provinces were still in the power of the Burgundians, Flemings, and English.” Counsellors and generals opposed; but the sublime faith of the Maid overcame all opposition and all difficulties. The king's route to Rheims was rapidly cleared of his enemies. At Patay (June 18, 1429) the English suffered a heavy defeat and their famous soldier, Lord Talbot, was taken prisoner. Troyes, Châlons and Rheims opened their gates. “The Duke of Bedford, the regent, remained trembling in Paris. ‘All our misfortunes,’ he wrote to the Cardinal of Winchester, ‘are owing to a young witch, who, by her sorcery, has restored the courage of the French.’ . . . The king was crowned [July 17, 1429], and Joan's mission was accomplished. ‘Noble king,’ said she, embracing his knees in the Cathedral after the coronation, ‘now is accomplished the will of God, which commanded me to bring you to this city of Rheims to receive your holy unction—now that you at last are king, and that the kingdom of France is yours.’ . . . From that moment a great depression, and a fatal hesitation seem to have come over her. The king, the people, and the army, to whom she had given victory, wished her to remain always their prophetess, their guide, and their enduring miracle. But she was now only a weak woman, lost amid courts and camps, and she felt her weakness beneath her armor. Her heart alone remained courageous, but had ceased to be inspired.” She urged an attack on Paris

(Sept. 8, 1429) and experienced her first failure, being grievously wounded in the assault. The following spring, Compiègne being besieged, she entered the town to take part in the defence. The same evening (May 24, 1430) she led a sortie which was repulsed, and she was taken prisoner in the retreat. Some think she was betrayed by the commandant of the town, who ordered the raising of the drawbridge just as her horse was being spurred upon it. Once in the hands of her enemies, the doom of the unfortunate Maid was sealed. Sir Lionel de Ligny, her captor, gave his prisoner to the count of Luxembourg, who yielded her to the Duke of Burgundy, who surrendered her to the English, who delivered her to the Inquisition, by which she was tried, condemned and burned to death, at Rouen, as a witch (May 30, 1431). "It was a complex crime, in which each party got rid of responsibility, but in which the accusation rests with Paris [the University of Paris was foremost among the pursuers of the wonderful Maid], the cowardice with Luxembourg, the sentence with the Inquisition, the blame and punishment with England, and the disgrace and ingratitude with France. This bartering about Joan by her enemies, of whom the fiercest were her countrymen, had lasted six months. . . . During these six months, the influence of this goddess of war upon the troops of Charles VII. — her spirit, which still guided the camp and council of the king — the patriotic, though superstitious, veneration of the people, which her captivity only doubled, — and, lastly, the absence of the Duke of Burgundy, . . . all these causes had brought reverse after reverse upon the English, and a series of successes to Charles VII. Joan, although absent, triumphed everywhere." — A. de Lamartine, *Memoirs of Celebrated Characters: Joan of Arc*. — "It seems natural to ask what steps the King of France had taken . . . to avert her doom. We hear nothing of any attempt at rescue, of any proposal for ransom; neither the most common protest against her trial . . . nay, not even after her death, one single expression of regret! Charles continued to slumber in his delicious retreats beyond the Loire, engrossed by dames of a very different character from Joan's. . . . Her memory on the other hand was long endeared to the French people, and long did they continue to cherish a romantic hope that she might still survive. So strong was this feeling, that in the year 1436 advantage was taken of it by a female impostor, who pretended to be Joan of Arc escaped from her captivity. . . . Of Joan's person no authentic resemblance now remains. A statue to her memory had been raised upon the bridge at Orleans, at the sole charge . . . of the matrons and maids of that city: this probably preserved some degree of likeness, but unfortunately perished, in the religious wars of the sixteenth century. There is no portrait extant: the two earliest engravings are of 1606 and 1612, and they greatly differ." — Lord Mahon, *Hist. Essays*, pp. 53-57. — "A few days before her death, when urged to resume her woman's dress, she said: 'When I shall have accomplished that for which I was sent from God, I will take the dress of a woman.' Yet, in one sense her mission did end at Rheims. The faith of the people still followed her, but her enemies — not the English, but those in the heart of the court of Charles — began to be too powerful for her. We may,

indeed, conceive what a hoard of envy and malice was gathering in the hearts of those hardened politicians at seeing themselves superseded by a peasant girl. They, accustomed to dark and tortuous ways, could not comprehend or coalesce with the divine simplicity of her designs and means. A successful intrigue was formed against her. It was resolved to keep her still in the camp as a name and a figure, but to take from her all power, all voice in the direction of affairs. So accordingly it was done. . . . Her ways and habits during the year she was in arms are attested by a multitude of witnesses. Dunois and the Duke of Alençon bear testimony to what they term her extraordinary talents for war, and to her perfect fearlessness in action; but in all other things she was the most simple of creatures. She wept when she first saw men slain in battle, to think that they should have died without confession. She wept at the abominable epithets which the English heaped upon her; but she was without a trace of vindictiveness. 'Ah, Glacidas, Glacidas!' she said to Sir William Glasdale at Orleans, 'you have called me foul names; but I have pity upon your soul and the souls of your men. Surrender to the King of Heaven!' And she was once seen, resting the head of a wounded Englishman on her lap, comforting and consoling him. In her diet she was abstemious in the extreme, rarely eating until evening, and then for the most part, only of bread and water sometimes mixed with wine. In the field she slept in her armour, but when she came into a city, she always sought out some honourable matron, under whose protection she placed herself, and there is wonderful evidence of the atmosphere of purity which she diffused around her, her very presence banishing from men's hearts all evil thoughts and wishes. Her conversation, when it was not of the war, was entirely of religion. She confessed often, and received communion twice in the week. 'And it was her custom,' says Dunois, 'at twilight every day, to retire to the church and make the bells be rung for half an hour, and she gathered the mendicant religious who followed the King's army, and made them sing an antiphon of the Blessed Mother of God.' From presumption, as from superstition, she was entirely free. When women brought her crosses and chaplets to bless, she said: 'How can I bless them? Your own blessing would be as good as mine.'" — J. O'Hagan, *Joan of Arc*, pp. 61-66. — "What is to be thought of her? What is to be thought of the poor shepherd girl from the hills and forests of Lorraine, that — like the Hebrew shepherd boy from the hills and forests of Judea — rose suddenly out of the quiet, out of the safety, out of the religious inspiration, rooted in deep pastoral solitudes, to a station in the van of armies, and to the more perilous station at the right hand of kings? The Hebrew boy inaugurated his patriotic mission by an act, by a victorious act, such as no man could deny. But so did the girl of Lorraine, if we read her story as it was read by those who saw her nearest. Adverse armies bore witness to the boy as no pretender; but so they did to the gentle girl. Judged by the voices of all who saw them from a station of good-will, both were found true and loyal to any promises involved in their first acts. Enemies it was that made the difference between their subsequent fortunes. The boy rose to a splendour, and a

noonday prosperity, both personal and public, that rang through the records of his people, and became a by-word amongst his posterity for a thousand years, until the sceptre was departing from Judah. The poor, forsaken girl, on the contrary, drank not herself from that cup of rest which she had secured for France. . . . This pure creature—pure from every suspicion of even a visionary self-interest, even as she was pure in senses more obvious—never once did this holy child, as regarded herself, relax from her belief in the darkness that was travelling to meet her. She might not prefigure the very manner of her death; she saw not in vision, perhaps, the aerial altitude of the fiery scaffold, the spectators without end on every road pouring into Rouen as to a coronation, the surging smoke, the volleying flames, the hostile faces all around, the pitying eye that lurked but here and there, until nature and imperishable truth broke loose from artificial restraints;—these might not be apparent through the mists of the hurrying future. But the voice that called her to death, that she heard for ever.”—T. De Quincey, *Joan of Arc* (*Collected Writings*, v. 5).—A discussion of doubts that have been raised concerning the death of Joan at the stake will be found in Octave Delepiere's *Historical Difficulties and Contested Events*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 10.—E. de Monstrelet, *Chronicles* (*Johnes' trans.*), bk. 2, ch. 57-105.—H. Parr, *Life and Death of Joan of Arc*.—J. Tuckey, *Joan of Arc*.—Mrs. A. E. Bray, *Joan of Arc*.

A. D. 1431-1453.—The English expelled.—“In Joan of Arc the English certainly destroyed the cause of their late reverses. But the impulse had been given, and the crime of base vengeance could not stay it. Fortune declared every where and in every way against them. In vain was Henry VI. brought to Paris, crowned at Notre Dame, and made to exercise all the functions of royalty in court and parliament. The duke of Burgundy, disgusted with the English, became at last reconciled to Charles, who spared no sacrifice to win the support of so powerful a subject. The amplest possible amends were made for the murder of the late duke. The towns beyond the Somme were ceded to Burgundy, and the reigning duke [but not his successors] was exempted from all homage towards the king of France. Such was the famous treaty of Arras [Sept. 21, 1435], which restored to Charles his throne, and deprived the English of all hopes of retaining their conquests in the kingdom. The crimes and misrule of the Orleans faction were forgotten; popularity ebbd in favour of Charles. . . . One of the gates of Paris was betrayed by the citizens to the constable and Dunois [April, 1436]. Willoughby, the governor, was obliged to shut himself up in the Bastille with his garrison, from whence they retired to Rouen. Charles VII. entered his capital, after twenty years' exclusion from it, in November, 1437. Thenceforward the war lost its serious character. Charles was gradually established on his throne, and the struggle between the two nations was feebly carried on, broken merely by a few sieges and enterprises, mostly to the disadvantage of the English. . . . There had been frequent endeavours and conferences towards a peace between the French and English. The demands on either side proved irreconcilable. A truce was however concluded, in 1444, which lasted four years; it

was sealed by the marriage of Henry VI. with Margaret of Anjou, daughter of René, and granddaughter of Louis, who had perished while leading an army to the conquest of Naples. . . . In 1449 the truce was allowed to expire. The quarrels of York and Lancaster had commenced, and England was unable to defend her foreign possessions. Normandy was invaded. The gallant Talbot could not preserve Rouen with a disaffected population, and Charles recovered without loss of blood [1449] the second capital of his dominions. The only blow struck by the English for the preservation of Normandy was at Fourmigny near Bayeux. . . . Normandy was for ever lost to the English after this action or skirmish. The following year Guyenne was invaded by the count de Dunois. He met with no resistance. The great towns at that day had grown wealthy, and their maxim was to avoid a siege at all hazards.” Lord Talbot was killed in an engagement at Castillon (1450), and “with that hero expired the last hopes of his country in regard to France. Guyenne was lost [A. D. 1453] as well as Normandy, and Calais remained to England the only fruit of so much blood spilt and so many victories achieved.”—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 11.—E. de Monstrelet, *Chronicles* (*Johnes' trans.*), bk. 2, ch. 109, bk. 3, ch. 65.—See, also, AQUITAINE: A. D. 1360-1453.

A. D. 1438.—Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII.—Reforming decrees of the Council of Basel adopted for the Gallican church.—After the rupture between the reforming Council of Basel and Pope Eugenius IV. (see PAPACY: A. D. 1431-1448), Charles VII. of France “determined to adopt in his own kingdom such of the decrees of the Council as were for his advantage, seeing that no opposition could be made by the Pope. Accordingly a Synod was summoned at Bourges on May 1, 1438. The ambassadors of Pope and Council urged their respective causes. It was agreed that the King should write to Pope and Council to stay their hands in proceeding against one another; meanwhile, that the reformation be not lost, some of the Basel decrees should be maintained in France by royal authority. The results of the synod's deliberation were laid before the King, and on July 7 were made binding as a pragmatic sanction on the French Church. The Pragmatic Sanction enacted that General Councils were to be held every ten years, and recognised the authority of the Council of Basel. The Pope was no longer to reserve any of the greater ecclesiastical appointments, but elections were to be duly made by the rightful patrons. Grants to benefices in expectancy, ‘whence all agree that many evils arise,’ were to cease, as well as reservations. In all cathedral churches, one prebend was to be given to a theologian who had studied for ten years in a university, and who was to lecture or preach at least once a week. Benefices were to be conferred in future, one-third on graduates, two-thirds on deserving clergy. Appeals to Rome, except for important causes, were forbidden. The number of Cardinals was to be 24, each of the age of 30 at least. Annates and first-fruits were no longer to be paid to the Pope, but only the necessary legal fees on institution. Regulations were made for greater reverence in the conduct of Divine service; prayers were to be said by the priest in an audible

voice; mummeries in churches were forbidden, and clerical concubinage was to be punished by suspension for three months. Such were the chief reforms of its own special grievances, which France wished to establish. It was the first step in the assertion of the rights of national Churches to arrange for themselves the details of their own ecclesiastical organisation."—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation*, bk. 3, ch. 9 (v. 2).

A. D. 1447.—Origin of the claims of the house of Orleans to the duchy of Milan. See MILAN: A. D. 1447-1454.

A. D. 1453-1461.—The reconstructed kingdom.—The new plant of Absolutism.—"At the expulsion of the English, France emerged from the chaos with an altered character and new features of government. The royal authority and supreme jurisdiction of the parliament were universally recognised. Yet there was a tendency towards insubordination left among the great nobility, arising in part from the remains of old feudal privileges, but still more from that lax administration which, in the convulsive struggles of the war, had been suffered to prevail. In the south were some considerable vassals, the houses of Foix, Albret, and Armagnac, who, on account of their distance from the seat of empire, had always maintained a very independent conduct. The dukes of Brittany and Burgundy were of a more formidable character, and might rather be ranked among foreign powers than privileged subjects. The princes, too, of the royal blood, who, during the late reign, had learned to partake or contend for the management, were ill-inclined towards Charles VII., himself jealous, from old recollections of their ascendancy. They saw that the constitution was verging rapidly towards an absolute monarchy, from the direction of which they would studiously be excluded. This apprehension gave rise to several attempts at rebellion during the reign of Charles VII., and to the war, commonly entitled, for the Public Weal ('du bien public'), under Louis XI. Among the pretenses alleged by the revolvers in each of these, the injuries of the people were not forgotten; but from the people they received small support. Weary of civil dissension, and anxious for a strong government to secure them from depredation, the French had no inducement to intrust even their real grievances to a few malcontent princes, whose regard for the common good they had much reason to distrust. Every circumstance favoured Charles VII. and his son in the attainment of arbitrary power. The country was pillaged by military ruffians. Some of these had been led by the dauphin to a war in Germany, but the remainder still infested the high roads and villages. Charles established his companies of ordonnance, the basis of the French regular army, in order to protect the country from such depredators. They consisted of about nine thousand soldiers, all cavalry, of whom fifteen hundred were heavy-armed; a force not very considerable, but the first, except mere body-guards, which had been raised in any part of Europe as a national standing army. These troops were paid out of the produce of a permanent tax, called the *taille*; an innovation still more important than the former. But the present benefit cheating the people, now prone to submissive habits, little or no opposition was made, except in Guienne, the inhabitants of

which had speedy reason to regret the mild government of England, and vainly endeavoured to return to its protection. It was not long before the new despotism exhibited itself in its harshest character. Louis XI., son of Charles VII., who during his father's reign, had been connected with the discontented princes, came to the throne greatly endowed with those virtues and vices which conspire to the success of a king."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, pt. 2.

A. D. 1458-1461.—Renewed submission of Genoa to the King, and renewed revolt. See GENOA: A. D. 1458-1464.

A. D. 1461.—Accession of King Louis XI.—Contemporary portrait of him by Commynes.—"Of all the princes that I ever knew, the wisest and most dexterous to extricate himself out of any danger or difficulty in time of adversity, was our master King Louis XI. He was the humblest in his conversation and habit, and the most painful and indefatigable to win over any man to his side that he thought capable of doing him either mischief or service: though he was often refused, he would never give over a man that he wished to gain, but still pressed and continued his insinuations, promising him largely, and presenting him with such sums and honours as he knew would gratify his ambition; and for such as he had discarded in time of peace and prosperity, he paid dear (when he had occasion for them) to recover them again; but when he had once reconciled them, he retained no enmity towards them for what had passed, but employed them freely for the future. He was naturally kind and indulgent to persons of mean estate, and hostile to all great men who had no need of him. Never prince was so conversable, nor so inquisitive as he, for his desire was to know everybody he could; and indeed he knew all persons of any authority or worth in England, Spain, Portugal and Italy, in the territories of the Dukes of Burgundy and Bretagne, and among his own subjects; and by those qualities he preserved the crown upon his head, which was in much danger by the enemies he had created to himself upon his accession to the throne. But above all, his great bounty and liberality did him the greatest service: and yet, as he behaved himself wisely in time of distress, so when he thought himself a little out of danger, though it were but by a truce, he would disoblige the servants and officers of his court by mean and petty ways, which were little to his advantage; and as for peace, he could hardly endure the thoughts of it. He spoke slightly of most people, and rather before their faces, than behind their backs, unless he was afraid of them, and of that sort there were a great many, for he was naturally somewhat timorous. When he had done himself any prejudice by his talk, or was apprehensive he should do so, and wished to make amends, he would say to the person whom he had disoblige, 'I am sensible my tongue has done me a great deal of mischief; but, on the other hand, it has sometimes done me much good; however, it is but reason I should make some reparation for the injury.' And he never used this kind of apologies to any person, but he granted some favour to the person to whom he made it, and it was always of considerable amount. It is certainly a great blessing from God upon any prince to have experienced adversity as well as prosperity, good as well as evil, and especially if the good outweighs

the evil, as it did in the king our master. I am of opinion that the troubles he was involved in, in his youth, when he fled from his father, and resided six years together with Philip Duke of Burgundy, were of great service to him; for there he learned to be complaisant to such as he had occasion to use, which was no slight advantage of adversity. As soon as he found himself a powerful and crowned king, his mind was wholly bent upon revenge; but he quickly found the inconvenience of this, repented by degrees of his indiscretion, and made sufficient reparation for his folly and error, by regaining those he had injured, as shall be related hereafter. Besides, I am very confident that if his education had not been different from the usual education of such nobles as I have seen in France, he could not so easily have worked himself out of his troubles; for they are brought up to nothing but to make themselves ridiculous, both in their clothes and discourse; they have no knowledge of letters; no wise man is suffered to come near them, to improve their understandings; they have governors who manage their business, but they do nothing themselves."—Such is the account of Louis XI. which Philip de Commines gives in one of the early chapters of his delightful Memoirs. In a later chapter he tells naively of the king's suspicions and fears, and of what he suffered, at the end of his life, as the penalty of his cruel and crafty dealings with his subjects: "Some five or six months before his death, he began to suspect everybody, especially those who were most capable and deserving of the administration of affairs. He was afraid of his son, and caused him to be kept close, so that no man saw or discoursed with him, but by his special command. At last he grew suspicious of his daughter, and of his son-in-law the Duke of Bourbon, and required an account of what persons came to speak with them at Plessis, and broke up a council which the Duke of Bourbon was holding there, by his order. . . . Behold, then, if he had caused many to live under him in continual fear and apprehension, whether it was not returned to him again; for of whom could he be secure when he was afraid of his son-in-law, his daughter, and his own son? I speak this not only of him, but of all other princes who desire to be feared, that vengeance never falls on them till they grow old, and then, as a just penance, they are afraid of everybody themselves; and what grief must it have been to this poor King to be tormented with such terrors and passions? He was still attended by his physician, Master James Coctier, to whom in five months' time he had given fifty-four thousand crowns in ready money, besides the bishopric of Amiens for his nephew, and other great offices and estates for himself and his friends; yet this doctor used him very roughly indeed; one would not have given such outrageous language to one's servants as he gave the King, who stood in such awe of him, that he durst not forbid him his presence. It is true he complained of his impudence afterwards, but he durst not change him as he had done all the rest of his servants; because he had told him after a most audacious manner one day, 'I know well that some time or other you will dismiss me from court, as you have done the rest; but be sure (and he confirmed it with a great oath) you shall not live eight days after it'; with which expression the King was so terrified,

that ever after he did nothing but flatter and bribe him, which must needs have been a great mortification to a prince who had been bumbly obeyed all his life by so many good and brave men. The King had ordered several cruel prisons to be made; some were cages of iron, and some of wood, but all were covered with iron plates both within and without, with terrible locks, about eight feet wide and seven high; the first contriver of them was the Bishop of Verdun, who was immediately put in the first of them that was made, where he continued fourteen years. Many bitter curses he has had since for his invention, and some from me as I lay in one of them eight months together in the minority of our present King. He also ordered heavy and terrible fetters to be made in Germany, and particularly a certain ring for the feet, which was extremely hard to be opened, and fitted like an iron collar, with a thick weighty chain, and a great globe of iron at the end of it, most unreasonably heavy, which engines were called the King's Nets. . . . As in his time this barbarous variety of prisons was invented, so before he died he himself was in greater torment, and more terrible apprehension than those whom he had imprisoned; which I look upon as a great mercy towards him, and as a part of his purgatory; and I have mentioned it here to show that there is no person, of what station or dignity soever, but suffers some time or other, either publicly or privately, especially if he has caused other people to suffer. The King, towards the latter end of his days, caused his castle of Plessis-Tours to be encompassed with great bars of iron in the form of thick grating, and at the four corners of the house four sparrow-nests of iron, strong, massy, and thick, were built. The grates were without the wall on the other side of the ditch, and sank to the bottom. Several spikes of iron were fastened into the wall, set as thick by one another as was possible, and each furnished with three or four points. He likewise placed ten bow-men in the ditches, to shoot at any man that durst approach the castle before the opening of the gates; and he ordered they should lie in the ditches, but retire to the sparrow-nests upon occasion. He was sensible enough that this fortification was too weak to keep out an army, or any great body of men, but he had no fear of such an attack; his great apprehension was, that some of the nobility of his kingdom, having intelligence within, might attempt to make themselves masters of the castle by night. . . . Is it possible then to keep a prince (with any regard to his quality) in a closer prison than he kept himself? The cages which were made for other people were about eight feet square; and he (though so great a monarch) had but a small court of the castle to walk in, and seldom made use of that, but generally kept himself in the gallery, out of which he went into the chambers on his way to mass, but never passed through the court. . . . I have not recorded these things merely to represent our master as a suspicious and mistrustful prince; but to show, that by the patience which he expressed in his sufferings (like those which he inflicted on other people), they may be looked upon, in my judgment, as a punishment which our Lord inflicted upon him in this world, in order to deal more mercifully with him in the next, as well in regard to those things before-mentioned as to the distempers of his body, which were

great and painful, and much dreaded by him before they came upon him; and, likewise, that those princes who may be his successors, may learn by his example to be more tender and indulgent to their subjects, and less severe in their punishments than our master had been: although I will not censure him, or say I ever saw a better prince; for though he oppressed his subjects himself he would never see them injured by anybody else."—Philip de Commines, *Memoirs*, bk. 1, ch. 10, and bk. 6, ch. 11.

A. D. 1461-1468.—The character and reign of Louis XI.—The League of the Public Weal.—"Except St. Louis, he [Louis XI.] was the first, as, indeed (with the solitary exception of Louis Philippe), he is still the only king of France whose mind was ever prepared for the duties of that high station by any course of severe and systematic study. Before he ascended the throne of his ancestors he had profoundly meditated the great Italian authors, and the institutions and maxims of the Italian republics. From those lessons he had derived a low esteem of his fellow-men, and especially of those among them upon whom wealth, and rank, and power had descended as an hereditary birthright. . . . He clearly understood, and pursued with inflexible steadfastness of purpose the elevation of his country and the grandeur of his own royal house and lineage; but he pursued them with a torpid imagination, a cold heart, and a ruthless will. He regarded mankind as a physiologist contemplating the living subjects of his science, or as a chess-player surveys the pieces on his board. . . . It has been said of Louis XI., that the appearance of the men of the Revolution of 1789 first made him intelligible. . . . Louis was the first of the terrible Ideologists of France—of that class of men who, to enthrone an idolized idea, will offer whole hecatombs of human sacrifices at the shrine of their idol. The Idea of Louis was that of levelling all powers in the state, in order that the administration of the affairs, the possession of the wealth, and the enjoyment of the honours of his kingdom might be grasped by himself and his successors as their solitary and unrivalled dominion. . . . Before his accession to the throne, all the great fiefs into which France had been divided under the earlier Capetian kings had, with the exception of Bretagne, been either annexed to the royal domain, or reduced to a state of dependence on the crown. But, under the name of Apanages, these ancient divisions of the kingdom into separate principalities had reappeared. The territorial feudalism of the Middle Ages seemed to be reviving in the persons of the younger branches of the royal house. The Dukes of Burgundy had thus become the rulers of a state [see BURGUNDY: A. D. 1467] which, under the government of more politic princes, might readily, in fulfillment of their desires, have attained the rank of an independent kingdom. The Duke of Bretagne, still asserting the peculiar privileges of his duchy, was rather an ally than a subject of the king of France. Charles, Duke of Berri, the brother of Louis, aspired to the possession of the same advantages. And these three great territorial potentates, in alliance with the Duc de Bourbon and the Comte de St. Pol, the brothers-in-law of Louis and of his queen, united together to form that confederacy against him to which they gave the very inappropriate title of La Ligue du Bien Public.

It was, however, a title which recognized the growing strength of the Tiers État, and of that public opinion to which the Tiers État at once gave utterance and imparted authority. Selfish ambition was thus compelled to assume the mask of patriotism. The princes veiled their insatiable appetite for their own personal advantages under the popular and plausible demands of administrative reforms—of the reduction of imposts—of the government of the people by their representatives—and, consequently, of the convocation of the States-General. To these pretensions Louis was unable to make any effectual resistance." An indecisive but bloody battle was fought at Montleher, near Paris (July 16, 1465), from which both armies retreated with every appearance of defeat. The capital was besieged ineffectually for some weeks by the League; then the king yielded, or seemed to do so, and the Treaty of Conflans was signed. "He assented, in terms at least, to all the demands of his antagonists. He granted to the Duke of Berri the duchy of Normandy as an apanage transmissible in perpetuity to his male heirs. . . . The confederates then laid down their arms. The wily monarch bided his time. He had bestowed on them advantages which he well knew would destroy their popularity and so subvert the basis of their power, and which he also knew the state of public opinion would not allow them to retain. To wrest those advantages from their hands, it was only necessary to comply with their last stipulation, and to convene the States-General. They met accordingly, at Tours, on the 6th of April, 1468." As Louis had anticipated—or, rather, as he had planned—the States-General cancelled the grant of Normandy to the Duke of Berri (which the king had been able already to recover possession of, owing to quarrels between the dukes of Berri and Brittany) and, generally, took away from the princes of the League nearly all that they had extorted in the Treaty of Conflans. On the express invitation of the king they appointed a commission to reform abuses in the government—which commission "attempted little and effected nothing"—and, then, having assisted the cunning king to overcome his threatening nobles, the States-General were dissolved, to meet no more while Louis XI. occupied the throne. In a desperate situation he had used the dangerous weapon against his enemies with effect; he was too prudent to draw it from the sheath a second time.—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France*, lect. 11.—"The career of Louis XI. presents a curious problem. How could a ruler whose morality fell below that of Jonathan Wild yet achieve some of the greatest permanent results of patriotic statesmanship, and be esteemed not only by himself but by so calm an observer as Commines the model of kingly virtue? As to Louis's moral character and principles, or want of principle, not a doubt can be entertained. To say he committed the acts of a villain is to fall far short of the truth. . . . He possessed a kind of religious belief, but it was a species of religion which a respectable heathen would have scorned. He attempted to bribe heaven, or rather the saints, just as he attempted to win over his Swiss allies—that is, by gifts of money. . . . Yet this man, who was daunted by no cruelty, and who could be bound by no oath save one, did work which all statesmen must admire, and

which French patriots must fervently approve. He was the creator of modern France. When he came to the throne it seemed more than likely that an utterly selfish and treacherous nobility would tear the country in pieces. The English still threatened to repeat the horrors of their invasions. The House of Burgundy overbalanced the power of the crown, and stimulated lawlessness throughout the whole country. The peasantry were miserably oppressed, and the middle classes could not prosper for want of that rule of law which is the first requisite for civilization. When Louis died, the existence of France and the power of the French crown was secured: 'He had extended the frontiers of his kingdom; Picardy, Provence, Burgundy, Anjou, Maine, Roussillon had been compelled to acknowledge the immediate authority of the crown.' He had crushed the feudal oligarchy; he had seen his most dangerous enemy destroyed by the resistance of the Swiss; he had baffled the attempt to construct a state which would have imperilled the national existence of France; he had put an end to all risk of English invasion; and he left France the most powerful country in Europe. Her internal government was no doubt oppressive, but, at any rate, it secured the rule of law; and his schemes for her benefit were still unfinished. He died regretting that he could not carry out his plans for the reform of the law and for the protection of commerce; and, in the opinion of Commynes, if God had granted him the grace of living five or six years more, he would greatly have benefited his realm. He died commending his soul to the intercession of the Virgin, and the last words caught from his lips were: 'Lord, in thee have I trusted; let me never be confounded.' Nor should this be taken as the expression of hopeless self-delusion or gratuitous hypocrisy. In the opinion of Commynes, uttered after the king's death, 'he was more wise, more liberal, and more virtuous in all things than any contemporary sovereign.' The expressions of Commynes were, it may be said, but the echo of the low moral tone of the age. This, no doubt, is true; but the fact that the age did not condemn acts which, taken alone, seem to argue the utmost depravity, still needs explanation. The matter is the more worthy of consideration because Louis represents, though in an exaggerated form, the vices and virtues of a special body of rulers. He was the incarnation, so to speak, of kingcraft. The word and the idea it represents have now become out of date, but for about two centuries—say, roughly, from the middle of the seventeenth century—the idea of a great king was that of a monarch who ruled by means of cunning, intrigue, and disregard of ordinary moral rules. We here come across the fact which explains both the career and the reputation of Louis and of others, such as Henry VII. of England, who were masters of kingcraft. The universal feeling of the time, shared by subjects no less than by rulers, was that a king was not bound by the rules of morality, and especially by the rules of honesty, which bind other men. Until you realize this fact, nothing is more incomprehensible than the adulation lavished by men such as Bacon or Casaubon on a ruler such as James I. . . . The real puzzle is to ascertain how this feeling that kings were above the moral law came into existence. The facts of history afford the

necessary explanation. When the modern European world was falling into shape the one thing required for national prosperity was the growth of a power which might check the disorders of the feudal nobility, and secure for the mass of the people the blessings of an orderly government. The only power which, in most cases, could achieve this end, was the crown. In England the monarchs put an end to the wars of the nobility. In France the growth of the monarchy secured not only internal quiet, but protection from external invasion. In these and in other cases the interest of the crown and the interest of the people became for a time identical. . . . Acts which would have seemed villainous when done to promote a purely private interest, became mere devices of statesmanship when performed in the interest of the public. The maxims that the king can do no wrong, and that the safety of the people is the highest law, blended together in the minds of ambitious rulers. The result was the production of men like Louis XI."—A. V. Dicey, *Willert's Louis XI. (The Nation, Dec. 7, 1876)*.—"A careful examination of the reign of Louis the Eleventh has particularly impressed upon me one fact, that the ends for which he toiled and sinned throughout his whole life were attained at last rather by circumstances than by his labours. The supreme object of all his schemes was to crush that most formidable of all his foes, Burgundy. And yet had Charles confined his ambition within reasonable limits, had he possessed an ordinary share of statecraft, and, above all, could he have controlled those fiery passions, which drove him to the verge of madness, he would have won the game quite easily. Louis lacked one of the essential qualities of statecraft—patience; and was wholly destitute of that necessity of ambition—boldness. An irritable restlessness was one of the salient points of his character. His courtiers and attendants were ever intriguing to embroil him in war, 'because,' says Comines, 'the nature of the King was such, that unless he was at war with some foreign prince, he would certainly find some quarrel or other at home with his servants, domestics, or officers, for his mind must be always working.' His mood was ever changing, and he was by turns confiding, suspicious, avaricious, prodigal, audacious, and timid. He frequently nullified his most crafty schemes by impatience for the result. He would sow the seed with the utmost care, but he could not wait for the fructification. In this he was false to the practice of those Italian statesmen who were avowedly his models. It was this irritable restlessness which brought down upon him the hatred of all classes, from the noble to the serf; for we find him at one time cunningly bidding for popularity, and immediately afterwards destroying all he had gained by some rash and inconsiderate act. His extreme timidity hampered the execution of all his plans. He had not even the boldness of the coward who will fight when all the strength is on his own side. Constantly at war, during a reign of twenty-two years there were fought but two battles, Montlhéry and Guingette, both of which, strange to say, were undecided, and both of which were fought against his will and counsel. . . . He left France larger by one-fourth than he had inherited it; but out of the five provinces which he acquired, Provence was bequeathed him, Roussillon was

pawned to him by the usurping King of Navarre, and Burgundy was won for him by the Swiss. His triumphs were much more the result of fortune than the efforts of his own genius."—*Louis the Eleventh* (Temple Bar, v. 46, pp. 523-524).

ALSO IN: J. Michelet, *Hist. of France*, bk. 13. —P. F. Willert, *The Reign of Louis XI.*—J. F. Kirk, *Hist. of Charles the Bold*, bk. 1, ch. 4-6.—P. de Commynes, *Memoirs*, bk. 1.—E. de Monstrelet, *Chronicles* (Johnes' trans.), bk. 3, ch. 99-153.

A. D. 1467-1477.—The troubles of Louis XI. with Charles the Bold, of Burgundy.—Death of the Duke and Louis' acquisition of Burgundy. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1467-1468, to 1477.

A. D. 1483.—The kingdom as left by Louis XI.—Louis XI., who died Aug. 30, A. D. 1483, "had joined to the crown Berry, the apanage of his brother, Provence, the duchy of Burgundy, Anjou, Maine, Ponthieu, the counties of Auxerre, of Mâcon, Charolais, the Free County, Artois, Marche, Armagnac, Cerdagne, and Roussillon. . . . The seven latter provinces did not yet remain irrevocably united with France: one part was given anew in apanage, and the other part restored to foreign sovereigns, and only returned one by one to the crown of France. . . . The principal work of Louis XI. was the abasement of the second feudality, which had raised itself on the ruins of the first, and which, without him, would have plunged France into anarchy. The chiefs of that feudality were, however, more formidable, since, for the most part, they belonged to the blood royal of France. Their powerful houses, which possessed at the accession of that prince a considerable part of the kingdom, were those of Orleans, Anjou, Burgundy, and Bourbon. They found themselves much weakened at his death, and dispossessed in great part, as we have seen in the history of the reign, by confiscations, treaties, gifts or heritages. By the side of these houses, which issued from that of France, there were others whose power extended still, at this period, in the limits of France proper, over vast domains. Those of Luxembourg and La Mark possessed great wealth upon the frontier of the north; that of Vaudemont had inherited Lorraine and the duchy of Bar; the house of La Tour was powerful in Auvergne; in the south the houses of Foix and Albert ruled, the first in the valley of Ariège, the second between the Adour and the Pyrenees. In the west the house of Brittany had guarded its independence; but the moment approached when this beautiful province was to be forever united with the crown. Lastly, two foreign sovereigns held possessions in France; the Pope had Avignon and the county Venaissin; and the Duke of Savoy possessed, between the Rhone and the Saône, Bugey and Valromey. The time was still distant when the royal authority would be seen freely exercised through every territory comprised in the natural limits of the kingdom. But Louis XI. did much to attain this aim, and after him no princely or vassal house was powerful enough to resist the crown by its own forces, and to put the throne in peril."—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, pp. 315-318, and foot-note.

A. D. 1483.—Accession of King Charles VIII.

A. D. 1485-1487.—The League of the Princes.—Charles VIII., son and successor of Louis XI., came to the throne at the age of thir-

teen, on the death of his father in 1483. His eldest sister, Anne, married to the Lord of Beaujeu, made herself practically regent of the kingdom, by sheer ability and force of character, and ruled during the minority, pursuing the lines of her father's policy. The princes of the blood-royal, with the Dukes of Orleans and Bourbon at their head, formed a league against her. They were supported by many nobles, including Philip de Commynes, the Count of Dunois and the Prince of Orange. They also received aid from the Duke of Brittany, and from Maximilian of Austria, who now controlled the Netherlands. Anne's general, La Trémouille, defeated the league in a decisive battle (A. D. 1487) near St. Aubin du Cormier, where the Duke of Orleans, the Prince of Orange, and many nobles and knights were made prisoners. The Duke and the Prince were sent to Anne, who shut them up in strong places, while most of their companions were summarily executed.—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, bk. 3, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 26.

A. D. 1491.—Brittany, the last of the great fiefs, united to the crown.—The end of the Feudal System. See BRITTANY: A. D. 1491.

A. D. 1492-1515.—The reigns of Charles VIII. and Louis XII.—Their Italian Expeditions and Wars.—The effects on France.—Beginning of the Renaissance.—Louis XI. was succeeded by his son, Charles VIII., a boy of thirteen years, whose elder sister Anne governed the kingdom ably until he came of age. She dealt firmly with a rebellion of the nobles and suppressed it. She frustrated an intended marriage of Anne of Brittany with Maximilian of Austria, which would have drawn the last of the great semi-independent fiefs into a dangerous relationship, and she made Charles instead of his rival the husband of the Breton heiress. When Charles, who had little intelligence, assumed the government, he was excited with dreams of making good the pretensions of the Second House of Anjou to the Kingdom of Naples. Those pretensions, which had been bequeathed to Louis XI., and which Charles VIII. had now inherited, had the following origin: "In the eleventh century, Robert Guiscard, of the Norman family of Hauteville, at the head of a band of adventurers, took possession of Sicily and South Italy, then in a state of complete anarchy. Roger, the son of Robert, founded the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies under the Pope's suzerainty. In 1189 the Guiscard family became extinct, whereupon the German Emperor laid claim to the kingdom in right of his wife Constance, daughter of one of the Norman kings. The Roman Pontiffs, dreading such powerful neighbours, were adverse to the arrangement, and in 1254 King Conrad, being succeeded by his son Conradin, still a minor, furnished a pretext for bestowing the crown of the Two Sicilies on Charles d'Anjou, brother of St. Louis. Manfred, guardian of the boy Conradin, and a natural son of the Emperor Frederick II., raised an army against Charles d'Anjou, but was defeated, and fell in the encounter of 1266. Two years later, Prince Conradin was cruelly beheaded in Naples. Before his death, however, he made a will, by which he invested Peter III. of Aragon, son-in-law of Manfred, with full power over the Two Sicilies, exhorting him to avenge his death [see ITALY: A. D. 1250-1268].

This bequest was the origin of the rivalry between the houses of Aragon and Anjou, a rivalry which developed into open antagonism when the island of Sicily was given up to Peter of Aragon and his descendants, while Charles d'Anjou still held Naples for himself and his heirs [see ITALY: A. D. 1282-1300]. In 1435 Joan II., Queen of Naples, bequeathed her estates to Alfonso V. of Aragon, surnamed the Magnanimous, to the exclusion of Louis III. of Anjou. After a long and bloody struggle, Alfonso succeeded in driving the Anjou dynasty out of Naples [see ITALY: A. D. 1343-1389, and 1386-1414]. Louis III. was the last representative of this once-powerful family. He returned to France, survived his defeat two-and-twenty years, and by his will left all his rights to the Count of Maine, his nephew, who, on his death, transferred them to Louis XI. The wily Louis was not tempted to claim this worthless legacy. His successor, Charles VIII., less matter-of-fact, and more romantic, was beguiled into a series of brilliant, though sterile, expeditions, disastrous to national interests, neglecting the Flemish provinces, the liege vassals of France, and thoroughly French at heart. Charles VIII. put himself at the head of his nobles, made a triumphal entry into Naples and returned without having gained an inch of territory [see ITALY: A. D. 1492-1494, and 1494-1496]. De Commynes judges the whole affair a mystery; it was, in fact, one of those dazzling and chivalrous adventures with which the French delighted to astonish Europe. Louis XII., like Charles VIII. [whom he succeeded in 1498], proclaimed his right to Naples, and also to the Duchy of Milan, inherited from his grandmother, Valentine de Visconti. These pretended rights were more than doubtful. The Emperor Wenceslas, on conferring the duchy on the Viscontis, excluded women from the inheritance, and both Louis XI. and Charles VIII. recognised the validity of the Salic law in Milan by concluding an alliance with the Sforzas. The seventeen years of Louis XII.'s reign was absorbed in these Italian wars, in which the French invariably began by victory, and as invariably ended in defeat. The League of Cambrai, the Battles of Agnadel, Ravenna, Novara, the Treaties of Grenada and Blois, are the principal episodes of this unlucky campaign."—C. Coignet, *Francis the First and His Times*, ch. 3.—See, also, ITALY: A. D. 1499-1500.—"The warriors of France came back from Italy with the wonders of the South on their lips and her treasures in their hands. They brought with them books and paintings, they brought with them armour inlaid with gold and silver, tapestries enriched with precious metals, embroidered clothing, and even household furniture. Distributed by many hands in many different places, each precious thing became a separate centre of initiative power. The châteaux of the country nobles boasted the treasures which had fallen to the share of their lords at Genoa or at Naples; and the great women of the court were eager to divide the spoil. The contagion spread rapidly. Even in the most fantastic moment of Gothic inspiration, the French artist gave evidence that his right hand obeyed a national instinct for order, for balance, for completeness, and that his eye preferred, in obedience to a national predilection, the most refined harmonies of colour. Step by step he had been feeling his way; now, the broken link of tradition was

again made fast; the workmen of Paris and the workmen of Athens joined hands, united by the genius of Italy. It must not, however, be supposed that no intercourse had previously existed between France and Italy. The roads by Narbonne and Lyons were worn by many feet. The artists of Tours and Poitiers, the artists of Paris and Dijon, were alike familiar with the path to Rome. But an intercourse, hitherto restricted, was rendered by the wars of Charles VIII. all but universal. . . . Cruelly as the Italians had suffered at the hands of Charles VIII. they still looked to France for help; they knew that though they had been injured they had not been betrayed. But the weak and generous impulses of Charles VIII. found no place in the councils of his successors. . . . The doom of Italy was pronounced. Substantially the compact was this. Aided by Borgia, the French were to destroy the free cities of the north, and in return France was to aid Borgia in breaking the power of the independent nobles who yet resisted Papal aggression in the south. In July 1499 the work began. At first the Italians failed to realise what had taken place. When the French army entered the Milanese territory the inhabitants fraternised with the troops, Milan, Genoa, Pavia opened their gates with joy. But in a few months the course of events, in the south, aroused a dread anxiety. There, Borgia, under the protection of the French king, and with the assistance of the French arms, was triumphantly glutting his brutal rage and lust, whilst Frenchmen were forced to look on helpless and indignant. Milan, justly terrified, made an attempt to throw herself on the mercy of her old ruler. To no purpose. Louis went back over the Alps, leaving a strong hand and a strong garrison in Milan, and dragging with him the unfortunate Louis Sforza, a miserable proof of the final destruction of the most brilliant court of Upper Italy. . . . By the campaign of 1507, the work, thus begun, was consummated. The ancient spirit of independence still lingered in Genoa, and Venice was not yet crushed. There were still fresh laurels to be won. In this Holy War the Pope and the Emperor willingly joined forces with France. . . . The deathblow was first given to Genoa. She was forced, Marot tells us, 'la corde au cou, la glaive sous la gorge, implorer la clémence de ce prince.' Venice was next traitorously surprised and irreparably injured. Having thus brilliantly achieved the task of first destroying the lettered courts, and next the free cities of Italy, Louis died, bequeathing to François I. the shame of fighting out a hopeless struggle for supremacy against allies who, no longer needing help, had combined to drive the French from the field. There was, indeed, one other duty to be performed. The shattered remains of Italian civilisation might be collected, and Paris might receive the men whom Italy could no longer employ. The French returned to France empty of honour, gorged with plunder, satiated with rape and rapine, boasting of cities sacked, and garrisons put to the sword. They had sucked the lifeblood of Italy, but her death brought new life to France. The impetus thus acquired by art and letters coincided with a change in political and social constitutions. The gradual process of centralisation which had begun with Louis XI. transformed the life of the whole nation. . . . The royal court began to take proportions hitherto unknown. It gradually

became a centre which gathered together the rich, the learned, and the skilled. Artists, who had previously been limited in training, isolated in life, and narrowed in activity by the rigid conservative action of the great guilds and corporations, were thus brought into immediate contact with the best culture of their day. For the Humanists did not form a class apart, and their example incited those with whom they lived to effort after attainments as varied as their own, whilst the Court made a rallying point for all, which gave a sense of countenance and protection even to those who might never hope to enter it. . . . Emancipation of the individual is the watchword of the sixteenth century; to the artist it brought relief from the trammels of a caste thralldom, and the ceaseless efforts of the Humanists find an answer even in the new forms seen slowly breaking through the sheath of Gothic art."—Mrs. Mark Pattison, *The Renaissance of Art in France*, v. 1, ch. 1.

16th Century.—Renaissance and Reformation.—"The first point of difference to be noted between the Renaissance in France and the Renaissance in Italy is one of time. Roughly speaking it may be said that France was a hundred years behind Italy. . . . But if the French Renaissance was a later and less rapid growth, it was infinitely harder. The Renaissance literature in Italy was succeeded by a long period of darkness, which remained unbroken, save by fitful gleams of light, till the days of Alfieri. The Renaissance literature in France was the prelude to a literature, which, for vigour, variety, and average excellence, has in modern times rarely, if ever, been surpassed. The reason for this superiority on the part of France, for the fact that the Renaissance produced there more abiding and more far-reaching results, may be ascribed partly to the natural law that precocious and rapid growths are always less hardy than later and more gradual ones, partly to the character of the French nation, to its being at once more intellectual and less imaginative than the Italian, and therefore more influenced by the spirit of free inquiry than by the worship of beauty; partly to the greater unity and vitality of its political life, but in a large measure to the fact that in France the Renaissance came hand in hand with the Reformation. . . . We must look upon the Reformation as but a fresh development of the Renaissance movement, as the result of the spirit of free inquiry carried into theology, as a revolt against the authority of the Roman Church. Now the Renaissance in Italy preceded the Reformation by more than a century. There is no trace in it of any desire to criticise the received theology. . . . In France on the other hand the new learning and the new religion, Greek and heresy, became almost controvertible terms. Lefèvre d'Étaples, the doyen of French humanists, translated the New Testament into French in 1524: the Estiennes, the Hebrew scholar François Vatable, Turnèbe, Ramus, the great surgeon Ambroise Paré, the artists Bernard Palissy and Jean Goujon were all avowed protestants; while Clement Marot, Budé, and above all Rabelais, for a time at least, looked on the reformation with more or less favour. In fact so long as the movement appeared to them merely as a revolt against the narrowness and illiberality of monastic theology, as an assertion of the freedom of the human intellect, the men of letters and cul-

ture with hardly an exception joined hands with the reformers. It was only when they found that it implied a moral as well as an intellectual regeneration, that it began to wear for some of them a less congenial aspect. This close connexion between the Reformation and the revival of learning was, on the whole, a great gain to France. It was not as in Germany, where the stronger growth of the Reformation completely choked the other. In France they met on almost equal terms, and the result was that the whole movement was thereby strengthened and elevated both intellectually and morally. . . . French humanism can boast of a long roll of names honourable not only for their high attainments, but also for their integrity and purity of life. Robert Estienne, Turnèbe, Ramus, Cujas, the Chancellor de l'Hôpital, Estienne Pasquier, Thou, are men whom any country would be proud to claim for her sons. And as with the humanists, so it was with the Renaissance generally in France. On the whole it was a manly and intelligent movement. . . . The literature of the French Renaissance, though in point of form it is far below that of the Italian Renaissance, in manliness and vigour and hopefulness is far superior to it. It is in short a literature, not of maturity, but of promise. One has only to compare its greatest name, Rabelais, with the greatest name of the Italian Renaissance, Ariosto, to see the difference. How formless! how crude! how gross! how full of cumbersome details and wearisome repetitions is Rabelais! How limp! how harmonious is Ariosto! what perfection of style, what delicacy of touch! He never wearies us, he never offends our taste. And yet one rises from the reading of Rabelais with a feeling of buoyant cheerfulness, while Ariosto in spite of his wit and gaiety is inexpressibly depressing. The reason is that the one bids us hope, the other bids us despair; the one believes in truth and goodness and in the future of the human race, the other believes in nothing but the pleasures of the senses, which come and go like many-coloured bubbles and leave behind them a boundless ennui. Rabelais and Ariosto are true types of the Renaissance as it appeared in their respective countries."—A. Tilley, *The Literature of the French Renaissance*, ch. 2.

A. D. 1501-1504.—Treaty of Louis XII. with Ferdinand of Aragon for the partition of Naples.—French and Spanish conquest.—Quarrel of the confederates, and war.—The Spaniards in possession of the Neapolitan domain. See ITALY: A. D. 1501-1504.

A. D. 1504.—Norman and Breton fishermen on the Newfoundland banks. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1501-1578.

A. D. 1504-1506.—The treaties of Blois, with Ferdinand and Maximilian, and the abrogation of them.—Relinquishment of claims on Naples. See ITALY: A. D. 1504-1506.

A. D. 1507.—Revolt and subjugation of Genoa. See GENOA: A. D. 1500-1507.

A. D. 1508-1509.—The League of Cambrai against Venice. See VENICE: A. D. 1508-1509.

A. D. 1510-1513.—The breaking up of the League of Cambrai.—The Holy League formed by Pope Julius II. against Louis XII.—The French expelled from Milan and all Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1510-1513.

A. D. 1513-1515.—English invasion under Henry VIII.—The Battle of the Spurs.—Mar-

riage of Louis XII. with Mary of England.—The King's death.—Accession of Francis I.—“The long preparations of Henry VIII. of England for the invasion of France [in pursuance of the ‘Holy League’ against Louis XII., formed by Pope Julius II. and renewed by Leo X.,—see ITALY: A. D. 1510-1513] being completed, that king, in the summer of 1513, landed at Calais, whither a great part of his army had already been transported. The offer of 100,000 golden crowns easily persuaded the Emperor to promise his assistance, at the head of a body of Swiss and Germans. But at the moment Henry was about to penetrate into France, he received the excuses of Maximilian, who, notwithstanding a large advance received from England, found himself unable to levy the promised succours. Nothing disheartened by this breach of faith, the King of England had already advanced into Artois; when the Emperor, attended by a few German nobles, appeared in the English camp, and was cordially welcomed by Henry, who duly appreciated his military skill and local knowledge. A valuable accession of strength was also obtained by the junction of a large body of Swiss, who, encouraged by the victory of Novara, had already crossed the Jura, and now marched to the seat of war. The poverty of the Emperor degraded him to the rank of a mercenary of England; and Henry consented to grant him the daily allowance of 100 crowns for his table. But humiliating as this compact was to Maximilian, the King of England reaped great benefit from his presence. A promiscuous multitude of Germans had flocked to the English camp, in hopes of partaking in the spoil; and the arrival of their valiant Emperor excited a burst of enthusiasm. The siege of Terouenne was formed: but the bravery of the besieged baffled the efforts of the allies; and a month elapsed, during which the English sustained severe loss from frequent and successful sorties. By the advice of the Emperor, Henry resolved to risk a battle with the French, and the plain of Guinegate was once more the field of conflict [August 18, 1513]. This spot, where Maximilian had formerly struck terror into the legions of Louis XI., now became the scene of a rapid and undisputed victory. The French were surprised by the allies, and gave way to a sudden panic; and the shameful flight of the cavalry abandoned the bravest of their leaders to the hands of their enemies. The Duke of Longueville, La Palisse, Imbercourt, and the renowned Chevalier Bayard, were made prisoners; and the ridicule of the conquerors commemorated the inglorious flight by designating the rout as the Battle of the Spurs. The capture of Terouenne immediately followed; and the fall of Tournay soon afterwards opened a splendid prospect to the King of England. Meanwhile the safety of France was threatened in another quarter. A large body of Swiss, levied in the name of Maximilian but paid with the gold of the Pope, burst into Burgundy; and Dijon was with difficulty saved from capture. From this danger, however, France was extricated by the dexterous negotiation of Trémouille; and the Swiss were induced to withdraw. . . . Louis now became seriously desirous of peace. He made overtures to the Pope, and was received into favour upon consenting to renounce the Council of Pisa. He conciliated the Kings of Aragon and England by proposals of marriage; he offered his second

daughter Renée to the young Charles of Spain; and his second Queen, Anne of Brittany, being now dead, he proposed to unite himself with Mary of England, the favourite sister of Henry. . . . But though peace was made upon this footing, the former of the projected marriages never took place: the latter, however, was magnificently solemnized, and proved fatal to Louis. The amorous King forgot his advanced age in the arms of his young and beautiful bride; his constitution gave way under the protracted festivities consequent on his nuptials; and on the 1st of January, 1515, Louis XII. was snatched from his adoring people, in his 53d year. He was succeeded by his kinsman and son-in-law, Francis, Count of Angoulême, who stood next in hereditary succession, and was reputed one of the most accomplished princes that ever mounted the throne of France.”—Sir R. Comyn, *Hist. of the Western Empire*, ch. 38 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: J. S. Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, ch. 1.—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Latin and Teutonic Nations from 1494 to 1514*, bk. 2, ch. 4, sect. 7-8.

A. D. 1515.—Accession of Francis I.—His invasion of Italy.—The Battle of Marignano.—“François I. was in his 21st year when he ascended the throne of France. His education in all manly accomplishments was perfect, and . . . he manifested . . . an intelligence which had been carefully cultivated. . . . Unfortunately his moral qualities had been profoundly corrupted by the example of his mother, Louise of Savoy, a clever and ambitious woman, but selfish, unscrupulous, and above all shamelessly licentious. Louise had been an object of jealousy to Anne of Brittany, who had always kept her in the shade, and she now snatched eagerly at the prospect of enjoying power and perhaps of reigning in the name of her son, whose love for his mother led him to allow her to exercise an influence which was often fatal to the interests of his kingdom. . . . Charles duke of Bourbon, who was notoriously the favoured lover of Louise, was appointed to the office of constable, which had remained vacant since 1488; and one of her favourite ministers, Antoine Duprat, first president of the parliament of Paris, was entrusted with the seals. Both were men of great capacity; but the first was remarkable for his pride, and the latter for his moral depravity. The first cares of the new king of France were to prepare for war. . . . Unfortunately for his country, François I. shared in the infatuation which had dragged his predecessors into the wars in Italy; and all these warlike preparations were designed for the reconquest of Milan. He had already intimated his design by assuming at his coronation the titles of king of France and duke of Milan. . . . He entered into an alliance with Charles of Austria, prince of Castile, who had now reached his majority and assumed the government of the Netherlands. . . . A treaty between these two princes, concluded on the 24th of March, 1515, guaranteed to each party not only the estates they held or which might subsequently descend to them, but even their conquests. . . . The republic of Venice and the king of England renewed the alliances into which they had entered with the late king, but Ferdinand of Aragon refused even to prolong the truce unless the whole of Italy were included in it, and he entered into a separate alliance with the

emperor, the duke of Milan, and the Swiss, to oppose the designs of the French king. The efforts of François I. to gain over the Swiss had been defeated by the influence of the cardinal of Sion. Yet the pope, Leo X., hesitated, and avoided compromising himself with either party. In the course of the month of July [1515], the most formidable army which had yet been led from France into Italy was assembled in the district between Grenoble and Embrun, and the king, after entrusting the regency to his mother, Louise, with unlimited powers, proceeded to place himself at its head."—T Wright, *Hist. of France*, bk. 3, ch. 1 (v. 1).—"The passes in Italy had already been occupied by the Swiss under their captain general Galeazzo Visconti. Galeazzo makes their number not more than 6,000. . . . They were posted at Susa, commanding the two roads from Mont Cenis and Geneva, by one of which the French must pass or abandon their artillery. In this perplexity it was proposed by Triulzio to force a lower passage across the Cottian Alps leading to Saluzzo. The attempt was attended with almost insurmountable difficulties. . . . But the French troops with wonderful spirits and alacrity . . . were not to be baffled. They dropped their artillery by cables from steep to steep; down one range of mountains and up another, until five days had been spent in this perilous enterprise, and they found themselves safe in the plains of Saluzzo. Happily the Swiss, secure in their position at Susa, had never dreamed of the possibility of such a passage. . . . Prosper Colonna, who commanded in Italy for the Pope, was sitting down to his comfortable dinner at Villa Franca, when a scout covered with dust dashed into his apartment announcing that the French had crossed the Alps. The next minute the town was filled with the advanced guard, under the Sieur d'Ymbereourt and the celebrated Bayard. The Swiss at Susa had still the advantage of position, and might have hindered the passage of the main body of the French; but they had no horse to transport their artillery, were badly led, and evidently divided in their councils. They retired upon Novara," and to Milan, intending to effect a junction with the viceroy of Naples, who advanced to Cremona. On the morning of the 13th of September, Cardinal Scheimer harangued the Swiss and urged them to attack the French in their camp, which was at Marignano, or Melignano, twelve miles away. His fatal advice was acted on with excitement and haste. "The day was hot and dusty. The advanced guard of the French was under the command of the Constable of Bourbon, whose vigilance defeated any advantage the Swiss might otherwise have gained by the suddenness and rapidity of their movements. At nine o'clock in the morning, as Bourbon was sitting down at table, a scout, dripping with water, made his appearance. He had left Milan only a few hours before, had waded the canals, and came to announce the approach of the enemy. . . . The Swiss came on apace; they had disencumbered themselves of their hats and caps, and thrown off their shoes, the better to fight without slipping. They made a dash at the French artillery, and were foiled after hard fighting. . . . It was an autumnal afternoon; the sun had gone down; dust and night-fall separated and confused the combatants. The French trumpets sounded a retreat; both armies crouched down

in the darkness within cast of a tennis-ball of each other. . . . Where they fought, there each man laid down to rest when darkness came on, within hand-grip of his foe." The next morning, "the autumnal mist crawled slowly away, and once more exposed the combatants to each other's view. The advantage of the ground was on the side of the French. They were drawn up in a valley protected by a ditch full of water. Though the Swiss had taken no refreshment that night, they renewed the fight with unimpaired animosity and vigour. . . . Francis, surrounded by a body of mounted gentlemen, performed prodigies of valour. The night had given him opportunity for the better arrangement of his troops; and as the day wore on, and the sun grew hot, the Swiss, though 'marvellously deliberate, brave, and obstinate,' began to give way. The arrival of the Venetian general, D'Alviano, with fresh troops, made the French victory complete. But the Swiss retreated inch by inch with the greatest deliberation, carrying off their great guns on their shoulders. . . . The French were too exhausted to follow. And their victory had cost them dear; for the Swiss, with peculiar hatred to the French gentry and the lance-knights, had shown no mercy. They spared none, and made no prisoners. The glory of the battle was great. . . . The Swiss, the best troops in Europe, and hitherto reckoned invincible . . . had been the terror and scourge of Italy, equally formidable to friend and foe, and now their prestige was extinguished. But it was not in these merely military aspects that the battle of Marignano was important. No one who reads the French chronicles of the times, can fail to perceive that it was a battle of opinions and of classes even more than of nations; of a fierce and rising democratical element, now rolled back for a short season, only to display itself in another form against royalty and nobility;—of the burgher classes against feudalism. . . . The old romantic element, overlaid for a time by the political convulsions of the last century, had once more gained the ascendant. It was to blaze forth and revive, before it died out entirely, in the Sydneys and Raleighs of Queen Elizabeth's reign; it was to lighten up the glorious imagination of Spenser before it faded into the dull prose of Puritan divinity, and the cold grey dawn of inductive philosophy. But its last great battle was the battle of Marignano."—J. S. Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, v. 1, ch. 3.

Also in: Miss Pardoe, *Court and Reign of Francis I.*, v. 1, ch. 6-7.—L. Larchey, *Hist. of Bayard*, bk. 3, ch. 1-2.

A. D. 1515-1518.—Francis I. in possession of Milan.—His treaties with the Swiss and the Pope.—Nullification of the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII.—The Concordat of Bologna.—"On the 15th of September, the day after the battle [of Marignano], the Swiss took the road back to their mountains. Francis I. entered Milan in triumph. Maximilian Sforza took refuge in the castle, and twenty days afterwards on the 4th of October, surrendered, consenting to retire to France, with a pension of 30,000 crowns, and the promise of being recommended for a cardinal's hat, and almost consoled for his downfall 'by the pleasure of being delivered from the insolence of the Swiss, the exactions of the Emperor Maximilian, and the rascalities of the Spaniards.' Fifteen years afterwards, in June, 1530, he died in oblivion at

Paris. Francis I. regained possession of all Milaness, adding thereto, with the pope's consent, the duchies of Parma and Piacenza, which had been detached from it. . . . Two treaties, one of November 7, 1515, and the other of November 29, 1516, re-established not only peace, but perpetual alliance, between the King of France and the thirteen Swiss Cantons, with stipulated conditions in detail. Whilst these negotiations were in progress, Francis I. and Leo X., by a treaty published at Viterbo, on the 18th of October, proclaimed their hearty reconciliation. The pope guaranteed to Francis I. the duchy of Milan, restored to him those of Parma and Piacenza, and recalled his troops which were still serving against the Venetians." At the same time, arrangements were made for a personal meeting of the pope and the French king, which took place at Bologna in December, 1515. "Francis did not attempt to hide his design of reconquering the kingdom of Naples, which Ferdinand the Catholic had wrongfully usurped, and he demanded the pope's countenance. The pope did not care to refuse, but he pointed out to the king that everything foretold the very near death of King Ferdinand; and 'Your Majesty,' said he, 'will then have a natural opportunity for claiming your rights; and as for me, free, as I shall then be, from my engagements with the King of Arragon in respect of the crown of Naples, I shall find it easier to respond to your majesty's wish.' The pope merely wanted to gain time. Francis, putting aside for the moment the kingdom of Naples, spoke of Charles VII.'s Pragmatic Sanction [see above: A. D. 1438], and the necessity of putting an end to the difficulties which had arisen on this subject between the court of Rome and the Kings of France, his predecessors. 'As to that,' said the pope, 'I could not grant what your predecessors demanded; but be not uneasy; I have a compensation to propose to you which will prove to you how dear your interests are to me.' The two sovereigns had, without doubt, already come to an understanding on this point, when, after a three days' interview with Leo X., Francis I. returned to Milan, leaving at Bologna, for the purpose of treating in detail the affair of the Pragmatic Sanction, his chancellor, Duprat, who had accompanied him during all this campaign as his adviser and negotiator. . . . The popes . . . had all of them protested since the days of Charles VII. against the Pragmatic Sanction as an attack upon their rights, and had demanded its abolition. In 1461, Louis XI. . . . had yielded for a moment to the demand of Pope Pius II., whose countenance he desired to gain, and had abrogated the Pragmatic; but, not having obtained what he wanted thereby, and having met with strong opposition in the Parliament of Paris to his concession, he had let it drop without formally retracting it. . . . This important edict, then, was still vigorous in 1515, when Francis I., after his victory at Melegnano and his reconciliation with the pope, left Chancellor Duprat at Bologna to pursue the negotiation reopened on that subject. The 'compensation,' of which Leo X., on redemanding the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, had given a peep to Francis I., could not fail to have charms for a prince so little scrupulous, and for his still less scrupulous chancellor. The pope proposed that the Pragmatic, once for all abolished, should be replaced by a Concordat between the two sov-

ereigns, and that this Concordat, whilst putting a stop to the election of the clergy by the faithful, should transfer to the king the right of nomination to bishoprics and other great ecclesiastical offices and benefices, reserving to the pope the right of presentation of prelates nominated by the king. This, considering the condition of society and government in the 16th century, in the absence of political and religious liberty, was to take away from the church her own existence, and divide her between two masters, without giving her, as regarded either of them, any other guarantee of independence than the mere chance of their dissensions and quarrels. . . . Francis I. and his chancellor saw in the proposed Concordat nothing but the great increment of influence it secured to them, by making all the dignitaries of the church suppliants at first and then clients of the kingship. After some difficulties as to points of detail, the Concordat was concluded and signed on the 18th of August, 1516. Five months afterwards, on the 5th of February, 1517, the king repaired in person to Parliament, to which he had summoned many prelates and doctors of the University. The Chancellor explained the points of the Concordat. . . . The king ordered its registration, 'for the good of his kingdom and for quittance of the promise he had given the pope.' For more than a year the Parliament of Paris resisted the royal order, and it was not until the 22d of March, 1518, that it yielded to the king's threats and proceeded to registration of the Concordat, with forms and reservations "which were evidence of compulsion. The other Parliaments of France followed with more or less zeal . . . the example shown by that of Paris. The University was heartily disposed to push resistance farther than had been done by Parliament."—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 28 (v. 4).—"The execution of the Concordat was vigorously contested for years afterwards. Cathedrals and monastic chapters proceeded to elect bishops and abbots under the provisions of the Pragmatic Sanction; and every such case became a fresh source of exasperation between the contending powers. . . . But the Parliament, though clamouring loudly for the 'Gallican liberties,' and making a gallant stand for national independence as against the usurpations of Rome, was unable to maintain its ground against the overpowering despotism of the Crown. The monarchical authority ultimately achieved a complete triumph. In 1527 a peremptory royal ordinance prohibited the courts of Parliament from taking further cognisance of causes affecting elections to consistorial benefices and conventual priories; and all such matters were transferred to the sole jurisdiction of the Council of State. After this the agitation against the Concordat gradually subsided. But although, in virtue of its compulsory registration by the Parliament, the Concordat became part of the law of the land, it is certain that the Gallican Church never accepted this flagrant invasion of its liberties."—W. H. Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, v. 1, pp. 109-110.

A. D. 1515-1547.—The institution of the Court.—Its baneful influence.—"Francis I. instituted the Court, and this had a decisive influence upon the manners of the nobility. Those lords, whose respect royalty had difficulty in keeping when they were at their castles, having come to court, prostrated themselves before the

throne, and yielded obedience with their whole hearts. A few words will describe this Court. The king lodged and fed in his own large palace, which was fitted for the purpose, the flower of the French nobility. Some of these lords were in his service, under the title of officers of his household—as chamberlains, purveyors, equerries, &c. Large numbers of domestic offices were created solely as an excuse for their presence. Others lived there, without duties, simply as guests. All these, besides lodging and food, had often a pension as well. A third class were given only a lodging, and provided their own table; but all were amused and entertained with various pleasures, at the expense of the king. Balls, carousals, stately ceremonials, grand dinners, theatricals, conversations inspired by the presence of fair women, constant intercourse of all kinds, where each could choose for himself, and where the refined and literary found a place as well as the vain and profligate,—such was court life, a truly different thing from the monotonous and brutal existence of the feudal lord at his castle in the depths of his province. So, from all sides, nobles flocked to court, to gratify both the most refined tastes and the most degraded passions. Some came hoping to make their fortune, a word from the king sufficing to enrich a man; others came to gain a rank in the army, a lucrative post in the finance department, an abbey, or a bishopric. From the time kings held court, it became almost a law, that nothing should be granted to a nobleman who lived beyond its pale. Those lords who persisted in staying on their own estates were supposed to rail against the administration, or, as we of the present would express it, to be in opposition. 'They must indeed be men of gross minds who are not tempted by the polish of the court; at all events it is very insolent in them to show so little wish to see their sovereign, and enjoy the honor of living under his roof.' Such was almost precisely the opinion of the king in regard to the provincial nobility. . . . Ambition drew the nobles to court; ambition, society, and dissipation kept them there. To incur the displeasure of their master, and be exiled from court was, first, to lose all hope of advancement, and then to fall from paradise into purgatory. It killed some people. But life was much more expensive at court than in the castles. As in all society where each is constantly in the presence of his neighbor, there was unbounded rivalry as to who should be most brilliant, most superb. The old revenues did not suffice, while, at the same time, the inevitable result of the absence of the lords was to decrease them. Whilst the expenses of the noblemen at Chambord or Versailles were steadily on the increase, his intendant, alone and unrestrained upon the estate, filled his own pockets, and sent less money every quarter, so that, to keep up the proper rank, the lord was forced to beg a pension from the king. Low indeed was the downfall of the old pride and feudal independence! The question was how to obtain these pensions, ranks, offices, and favors of all kinds. The virtues most prized and rewarded by the kings were not civic virtues,—capacity, and services of value for the public good; what pleased them was, naturally, devotion to their person, blind obedience, flattery, and subservience."—P. Lacombe, *A Short History of the French People*, ch. 23.

A. D. 1516-1517.—Maximilian's attempt against Milan.—Diplomatic intrigues.—The Treaty of Noyon.—After Francis I. had taken possession of Milan, and while Pope Leo X. was making professions of friendship to him at Bologna, a scheme took shape among the French king's enemies for depriving him of his conquest, and the pope was privy to it. "Henry VIII. would not openly break the peace between England and France, but he offered to supply Maximilian with Swiss troops for an attack upon Milan. It was useless to send money to Maximilian, who would have spent it on himself"; but troops were hired for the emperor by the English agent, Pace, and "at the beginning of March [1516] the joint army of Maximilian and the Swiss assembled at Trent. On March 24 they were within a few miles of Milan, and their success seemed sure, when suddenly Maximilian found that his resources were exhausted and refused to proceed; next day he withdrew his troops and abandoned his allies. . . . The expedition was a total failure; yet English gold had not been spent in vain, as the Swiss were prevented from entirely joining the French, and Francis I. was reminded that his position in Italy was by no means secure. Leo X., meanwhile, in the words of Pace, 'had played marvellously with both hands in this enterprise.' . . . England was now the chief opponent of the ambitious schemes of France, and aimed at bringing about a league with Maximilian, Charles [who had just succeeded Ferdinand of Spain, deceased January 23, 1516], the Pope, and the Swiss. But Charles's ministers, chief of whom was Croy, lord of Chievres, had a care above all for the interests of Flanders, and so were greatly under the influence of France. . . . France and England entered into a diplomatic warfare over the alliance with Charles. First, England on April 19 recognised Charles as King of Spain, Navarre, and the Two Sicilies; then Wolsey strove to make peace between Venice and Maximilian as a first step towards detaching Venice from its French alliance." On the other hand, negotiations were secretly carried on and (August 13) "the treaty of Noyon was concluded between Francis I. and Charles. Charles was to marry Louise, the daughter of Francis I., an infant of one year old, and receive as her dower the French claims on Naples; Venice was to pay Maximilian 200,000 ducats for Brescia and Verona; in case he refused this offer and continued the war, Charles was at liberty to help his grandfather, and Francis I. to help the Venetians, without any breach of the peace now made between them. . . . In spite of the efforts of England, Francis I. was everywhere successful in settling his difficulties. On November 29 a perpetual peace was made at Friburg between France and the Swiss Cantons; on December 3 the treaty of Noyon was renewed, and Maximilian was included in its provisions. Peace was made between him and Venice by the provision that Maximilian was to hand over Verona to Charles, who in turn should give it up to the King of France, who delivered it to the Venetians; Maximilian in return received 100,000 ducats from Venice and as much from France. The compact was duly carried out: 'On February 8, 1517,' wrote the Cardinal of Sion, 'Verona belonged to the Emperor; on the 9th to the King Catholic; on the 15th to the French; on the 17th to the Venetians.' Such was the end of the wars

that had arisen from the League of Cambrai. After a struggle of eight years the powers that had confederated to destroy Venice came together to restore her to her former place. Venice might well exult in this reward of her long constancy, her sacrifices and her disasters."—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy, during the Period of the Reformation*, bk. 5, ch. 19 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: J. S. Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, ch. 4-6 (v. 1).

A. D. 1519.—Candidacy of Francis I. for the Imperial crown. See GERMANY: A. D. 1519.

A. D. 1520-1523.—Rivalry of Francis I. and Charles V.—The Emperor's successes in Italy and Navarre.—Milan again taken from France.—The wrongs and the treason of the Constable of Bourbon.—"With their candidature for the Imperial crown, burst forth the inextinguishable rivalry between Francis I. and Charles V. The former claimed Naples for himself and Navarre for Henry d'Albret: the Emperor demanded the Milanese as a fief of the Empire, and the Duchy of Burgundy. Their resources were about equal. If the empire of Charles were more extensive the kingdom of France was more compact. The Emperor's subjects were richer, but his authority more circumscribed. The reputation of the French cavalry was not inferior to that of the Spanish infantry. Victory would belong to the one who should win over the King of England to his side. . . . Both gave pensions to his Prime Minister, Cardinal Wolsey; they each asked the hand of his daughter Mary, one for the dauphin, the other for himself. Francis I. obtained from him an interview at Calais, and forgetting that he wished to gain his favour, eclipsed him by his elegance and magnificence [see FIELD OF THE CLOTH OF GOLD]. Charles V., more adroit, had anticipated this interview by visiting Henry VIII. in England. He had secured Wolsey by giving him hopes of the tiara. . . . Everything succeeded with the Emperor. He gained Leo X. to his side and thus obtained sufficient influence to raise his tutor, Adrian of Utrecht, to the papacy [on the death of Leo, Dec. 1, 1521]. The French penetrated into Spain, but arrived too late to aid the rising there [in Navarre, 1521]. The governor of the Milanese, Lautrec, who is said to have exiled from Milan nearly half its inhabitants, was driven out of Lombardy [and the Pope retook Parma and Placentia]. He met with the same fate again in the following year: the Swiss, who were ill-paid, asked either for dismissal or battle, and allowed themselves to be beaten at La Bicoque [April 29, 1522]. The money intended for the troops had been used for other purposes by the Queen-mother, who hated Lautrec. At the moment when Francis I. was thinking of re-entering Italy, an internal enemy threw France into the utmost danger. Francis had given mortal offence to the Constable of Bourbon, one of those who had most contributed to the victory of Marignan. Charles, Count of Montpensier and Dauphin of Auvergne, held by virtue of his wife, a granddaughter of Louis XI., the Duchy of Bourbon, and the counties of Clermont, La Marche and other domains, which made him the first noble in the kingdom. On the death of his wife, the Queen-mother, Louise of Savoy, who had wanted to marry the Constable and had been refused by him, resolved to ruin him. She disputed with him this rich inheritance and obtained from her

son that the property should be provisionally sequestered. Bourbon, exasperated, resolved to pass over to the Emperor (1523). Half a century earlier, revolt did not mean disloyalty. The most accomplished knights in France, Dunois and John of Calabria, had joined the 'League for the public weal.' . . . But now it was no question of a revolt against the king; such a thing was impossible in France at this time. It was a conspiracy against the very existence of France that Bourbon was plotting with foreigners. He promised Charles V. to attack Burgundy as soon as Francis I. had crossed the Alps, and to rouse into revolt five provinces of which he believed himself master; the kingdom of Provence was to be re-established in his favour, and France, partitioned between Spain and England, would have ceased to exist as a nation. He was soon able to enjoy the reverses of his country."—J. Michelet, *Summary of Modern Hist.*, ch. 6.—"Henry VIII. and Charles V. were both ready to secure the services of the ex-Constable. He decided in favour of Charles as the more powerful of the two. . . . These secret negotiations were carried on in the spring of 1523, while Francis I. (having sent a sufficient force to protect his northern frontier) was preparing to make Italy the seat of war. With this object the king ordered a rendezvous of the army at Lyons, in the beginning of September, and having arranged to pass through Moulins on his way to join the forces, called upon the Constable to meet him there and to proceed with him to Lyons. Already vague rumours of an understanding between the Emperor and Bourbon had reached Francis, who gave no credence to them; but on his way M. de Brézé, Seneschal of Normandy, attached to the Court of Louise of Savoy, sent such precise details of the affair by two Norman gentlemen in the Constable's service that doubt was no longer possible." Francis accordingly entered Moulins with a considerable force, and went straight to Bourbon, who feigned illness. The Constable stoutly denied to the king all the charges which the latter revealed to him, and Francis, who was strongly urged to order his arrest, refused to do so. But a few days later, when the king had gone forward to Lyons, Bourbon, pretending to follow him, rode away to his strong castle of Chantelles, from whence he wrote letters demanding the restitution of his estates. As soon as his flight was known, Francis sent forces to seize him; but the Constable, taking one companion with him, made his way out of the kingdom in disguise. Escaping to Italy, he was there placed in command of the imperial army.—C. Coignet, *Francis I. and his Times*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: Miss Pardoe, *The Court and Reign of Francis I.*, v. 1, ch. 14-19.—See, also, AUSTRIA: A. D. 1519-1555.

A. D. 1521.—Invasion of Navarre. See NAVARRE: A. D. 1442-1521.

A. D. 1521-1525.—Beginning of the Protestant Reform movement. See PAPACY: A. D. 1521-1535.

A. D. 1523-1524.—First undertakings in the New World.—Voyages of Verrazano. See AMERICA: A. D. 1523-1524.

A. D. 1523-1525.—The death of Bayard.—Second invasion of Italy by Francis I.—His defeat and capture at Pavia.—"Bonniwet, the personal enemy of Bourbon, was now entrusted with the command of the French army. He

marched without opposition into the Milanese, and might have taken the capital had he pushed on to its gates. Having by irresolution lost it, he retreated to winter quarters behind the Tesino. The operations of the English in Picardy, of the imperialists in Champagne, and of the Spaniards near the Pyrenees, were equally insignificant. The spring of 1524 brought on an action, if the attack of one point can be called such, which proved decisive for the time. Bonnivet advanced rashly beyond the Tesino. The imperialists, commanded by four able generals, Launois, Pescara, Bourbon, and Sforza, succeeded in almost cutting off his retreat. They at the same time refused Bonnivet's offer to engage. They hoped to weaken him by famine. The Swiss first murmured against the distress occasioned by want of precaution. They deserted across the river; and Bonnivet, thus abandoned, was obliged to make a precipitate and perilous retreat. A bridge was hastily flung across the Sessia, near Romagnano; and Bonnivet, with his best knights and gendarmes, undertook to defend the passage of the rest of the army. The imperialists, led on by Bourbon, made a furious attack. Bonnivet was wounded, and he gave his place to Bayard, who, never entrusted with a high command, was always chosen for that of a forlorn hope. The brave Vandenesse was soon killed; and Bayard himself received a gun-shot through the reins. The gallant chevalier, feeling his wound mortal, caused himself to be placed in a sitting posture beneath a tree, his face to the enemy, and his sword fixed in guise of a cross before him. The constable Bourbon, who led the imperialists, soon came up to the dying Bayard, and expressed his compassion. 'Weep not for me,' said the chevalier, 'but for thyself. I die in performing my duty; thou art betraying thine.' Nothing marks more strongly the great rise, the sudden sacro-sanctity of the royal authority in those days, than the general horror which the treason of Bourbon excited. . . . The fact is, that this sudden horror of treason was owing, in a great measure, to the revived study of the classics, in which treason to one's country is universally mentioned as an impiety and a crime of the deepest dye. Feudality, with all its oaths, had no such horror of treason. . . . Bonnivet had evacuated Italy after this defeat at Romagnano. Bourbon's animosity stimulated him to push his advantage. He urged the emperor to invade France, and recommended the Bourbonnais and his own patrimonial provinces as those most advisable to invade. Bourbon wanted to raise his friends in insurrection against Francis; but Charles desisted selfishness in this scheme of Bourbon, and directed Pescara to march with the constable into the south of France and lay siege to Marseilles. . . . Marseilles made an obstinate resistance," and the siege was ineffectual. "Francis, in the meantime, alarmed by the invasion, had assembled an army. He burned to employ it, and avenge the late affront. The king of England, occupied with the Scotch, gave him respite in the north; and he resolved to employ this by marching, late as the season was, into Italy. His generals, who by this time were sick of warring beyond the Alps, opposed the design; but not even the death of his queen, Claude, could stop Francis. He passed Mount Cenis; marched upon Milan, whose population was spiritless and broken by the plague, and took it without resis-

tance. It was then mooted whether Lodi or Pavia should be besieged. The latter, imprudently, as it is said, was preferred. It was at this time that Pope Clement VII., of the house of Medici, who had lately succeeded Adrian, made the most zealous efforts to restore peace between the monarchies. He found Charles and his generals arrogant and unwilling to treat. The French, said they, must on no account be allowed a footing in Italy. Clement, impelled by pique towards the emperor, or generosity to Francis, at once abandoned the prudent policy of his predecessors, and formed a league with the French king, to whom, after all, he brought no accession of force. This step proved afterwards fatal to the city of Rome. The siege of Pavia was formed about the middle of October [1524]. Antonio de Leyva, an experienced officer, supported by veteran troops, commanded in the town. The fortifications were strong, and were likely to hold for a considerable time. By the month of January the French had made no progress; and the impatient Francis despatched a considerable portion of his army for the invasion of Naples, hearing that the country was drained of troops. This was a gross blunder, which Pescara observing, forbore to send any force to oppose the expedition. He knew that the fate of Italy would be decided before Pavia. Bourbon, in the mean time, disgusted with the jealousies and tardiness of the imperial generals, employed the winter in raising an army of lansquenets on his own account. From the duke of Savoy he procured funds; and early in the year 1525 the constable joined Pescara at Lodi with a fresh army of 12,000 mercenaries. They had, besides, some 7,000 foot, and not more than 1,500 horse. With these they marched to the relief of Pavia. Francis had a force to oppose to them, not only inferior in numbers, but so harassed with a winter's siege, that all the French generals of experience counselled a retreat. Bonnivet and his young troop of courtiers were for fighting; and the monarch hearkened to them. Pavia, to the north of the river, was covered in great part by the chateau and walled park of Mirabel. Adjoining this, and on a rising ground, was the French camp, extending to the Tesino. Through the camp, or through the park, lay the only ways by which the imperialists could reach Pavia. The camp was strongly entrenched and defended by artillery, except on the side of the park of Mirabel, with which it communicated." On the night of February 23, the imperialists made a breach in the park wall, through which they pressed next morning, but were driven back with heavy loss. "This was victory enough, could the French king have been contented with it. But the impatient Francis no sooner beheld his enemies in rout, than he was eager to chase them in person, and complete the victory with his good sword. He rushed forth from his entrenchments at the head of his gendarmes, flinging himself between the enemy and his own artillery, which was thus masked and rendered useless. The imperialists rallied as soon as they found themselves safe from the fire of the cannon," and the French were overwhelmed. "The king . . . behind a heap of slain, defended himself valiantly; so beaten and shattered, so begrimed with blood and dust, as to be scarcely distinguishable, notwithstanding his conspicuous armour. He had received several wounds, one in the forehead;

and his horse, struck with a ball in the head, reared, fell back, and crushed him with his weight: still Francis rose, and laid prostrate several of the enemies that rushed upon him." But presently he was recognized and was persuaded to surrender his sword to Lannoi, the viceroy of Naples. "Such was the signal defeat that put an end to all French conquests and claims in Italy."—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 4 (v. 2).—J. S. Brewer, *Reign of Henry VIII.*, ch. 21 (v. 2).—H. G. Smith, *Romance of History*, ch. 6.

A. D. 1525-1526.—The captivity of Francis I. and his deliberate perfidy in the Treaty of Madrid.—The captive king of France was lodged in the castle at Pizzighitone. "Instead of bearing his captivity with calmness and fortitude, he chafed and fretted under the loss of his wonted pleasures; at one moment he called for death to end his woes, while at another he was ready to sign disastrous terms of peace, meaning to break faith so soon as ever he might be free again. . . . France, at first stupefied by the mishap, soon began to recover hope. The Regent, for all her vices and faults, was proud and strong; she gathered what force she could at Lyons, and looked round for help. . . . Not only were there anxieties at home, but the frontiers were also threatened. On the side of Germany a popular movement ['the Peasant War'], closely connected with the religious excitement of the time, pushed a fierce and cruel rabble into Lorraine, whence they proposed to enter France. But they were met by the Duke of Guise and the Count of Vaudemont, his brother, at the head of the garrisons of Burgundy and Champagne, and were easily dispersed. It was thought that during these troubles Lannoy would march his army, flushed with victory, from the Po to the Rhone. . . . But Lannoy had no money to pay his men, and could not undertake so large a venture. Meanwhile negotiations began between Charles V. and the King; the Emperor demanding, as ransom, that Bourbon should be invested with Provence and Dauphiny, joined to his own lands in Auvergne, and should receive the title of king; and secondly that the Duchy of Burgundy should be given over to the Emperor as the inheritor of the lands and rights of Charles the Bold. But the King of France would not listen for a moment. And now the King of England and most of the Italian states, alarmed at the great power of the Emperor, began to change sides. Henry VIII. came first. He signed a treaty of neutrality with the Regent, in which it was agreed that not even for the sake of the King's deliverance should any part of France be torn from her. The Italians joined in a league to restore the King to liberty, and to secure the independence of Italy: and Turkey was called on for help. . . . The Emperor now felt that Francis was not in secure keeping at Pizzighitone. . . . He therefore gave orders that Francis should at once be removed to Spain." The captive king "was set ashore at Valencia, and received with wonderful welcome: dances, festivals, entertainments of every kind, served to relieve his captivity; it was like a restoration to life! But this did not suit the views of the Emperor, who wished to weary the King into giving up all thought of resistance: he trusted to his impatient and frivolous character; his mistake, as he found to his cost, lay in think-

ing that a man of such character would keep his word. He therefore had him removed from Valencia to Madrid, where he was kept in close and galling confinement, in a high, dreary chamber, where he could not even see out of the windows. This had the desired effect. The King talked of abdicating; he fell ill of ennui, and was like to die: but at last he could hold out no longer, and abandoning all thought of honourable action, agreed to shameful terms, consoling himself with a private protest against the validity of the deed, as having been done under compulsion."—G. W. Kitchen, *Hist. of France*, v. 2, bk. 2, ch. 5.—"By the Treaty of Madrid, signed January 14th, 1526, Francis 'restored' to the Emperor the Duchy of Burgundy, the county of Charolais, and some other smaller fiefs, without reservation of any feudal suzerainty, which was also abandoned with regard to the counties of Flanders and Artois, the Emperor, however, resigning the towns on the Somme, which had been held by Charles the Bold. The French King also renounced his claims to the kingdom of Naples, the Duchy of Milan, the county of Asti, and the city of Genoa. He contracted an offensive and defensive alliance with Charles, undertaking to attend him with an army when he should repair to Rome to receive the Imperial crown, and to accompany him in person whenever he should march against the Turks or heretics. He withdrew his protection from the King of Navarre, the Duke of Gelderland, and the La Mareks; took upon himself the Emperor's debt to England, and agreed to give his two eldest sons as hostages for the execution of the treaty. Instead, however, of the independent kingdom which Bourbon had expected, all that was stipulated in his favour was a free pardon for him and his adherents, and their restoration in their forfeited domains. . . . The provisions of the above treaty Francis promised to execute on the word and honour of a king, and by an oath sworn with his hand upon the holy Gospels: yet only a few hours before he was to sign this solemn act, he had called his plenipotentiaries, together with some French nobles, secretaries, and notaries, into his chamber, where, after exacting from them an oath of secrecy, he entered into a long discourse touching the Emperor's harshness towards him, and signed a protest, declaring that, as the treaty he was about to enter into had been extorted from him by force, it was null and void from the beginning, and that he never intended to execute it: thus, as a French writer has observed, establishing by an authentic notarial act that he was going to commit a perjury." Treaties have often been shamefully violated, yet it would perhaps be impossible to parallel this gross and deliberate perjury. In March, Francis was conducted to the Spanish frontier, where, on a boat in mid-stream of the Bidassoa, "he was exchanged for his two sons, Francis and Henry, who were to remain in Spain, as hostages for the execution of the treaty. The tears started to his eyes as he embraced his children, but he consigned them without remorse to a long and dreary exile." As speedily as possible after regaining his liberty, Francis assembled the states of his kingdom and procured from them a decision "that the King could not alienate the patrimony of France, and that the oath which he had taken in his captivity did not abrogate the still more solemn one which had been administered to him at his coronation." After which he deemed himself

discharged from the obligations of his treaty, and had no thought of surrendering himself again a prisoner, as he was honourably bound to do.—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 2, ch. 5 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: A. B. Cochrane, *Francis I. in Capitivity*.—W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 4 (v. 2).—C. Coignet, *Francis I. and his Times*, ch. 5-8.

A. D. 1526-1527.—Holy League with Pope Clement VII. against Charles V.—Bourbon's attack on Rome. See ITALY: A. D. 1523-1527, and 1527.

A. D. 1527-1529.—New alliance against Charles V.—Early successes in Lombardy.—Disaster at Naples.—Genoa and all possessions in Italy lost.—The humiliating Peace of Cambrai. See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

A. D. 1529-1535.—Persecution of the Protestant Reformers and spread of their doctrines. See PAPACY: A. D. 1521-1535.

A. D. 1531.—Alliance with the Protestant princes of the German League of Smalkalde. See GERMANY: A. D. 1530-1532.

A. D. 1532.—Final reunion of Brittany with the crown. See BRITANNY: A. D. 1532.

A. D. 1532-1547.—Treaty with the Pope.—Marriage of Prince Henry with Catherine de' Medici.—Renewed war with Charles V.—Alliance with the Turks.—Victory at Cerisoles.—Treaty of Crespy.—Increased persecution of Protestants.—Massacre of Waldenses.—War with England.—Death of Francis I.—“The ‘ladies’ peace’ . . . lasted up to 1536; incessantly troubled, however, by far from pacific symptoms, proceedings and preparations. In October, 1532, Francis I. had, at Calais, an interview with Henry VIII., at which they contracted a private alliance, and undertook ‘to raise between them an army of 80,000 men to resist the Turk.’” But when, in 1535, Charles V. attacked the seat of the Barbary pirates, and took Tunis, Francis “entered into negotiations with Soliman II., and concluded a friendly treaty with him against what was called ‘the common enemy.’” Francis had been for some time preparing to resume his projects of conquest in Italy; he had effected an interview at Marseilles, in October, 1533, with Pope Clement VII., who was almost at the point of death, and it was there that the marriage of Prince Henry of France with Catherine de' Medici [daughter of Lorenzo, Duke of Urbino, and granddaughter of Piero de' Medici] was settled. Astonishment was expressed that the pope's niece had but a very moderate dowry. ‘You don't see, then,’ said Clement VII.'s ambassador, ‘that she brings France three jewels of great price, Genoa, Milan and Naples?’ When this language was reported at the court of Charles V., it caused great irritation there. In 1536 all these combustibles of war exploded; in the month of February, a French army entered Piedmont, and occupied Turin; and, in the month of July, Charles V. in person entered Provence at the head of 50,000 men. Anne de Montmorency, having received orders to defend southern France, began by laying it waste in order that the enemy might not be able to live in it. . . . Montmorency made up his mind to defend, on the whole coast of Provence, only Marseilles and Arles; he pulled down the ramparts of the other towns, which were left exposed to the enemy. For two months Charles V. prosecuted this campaign without a

fight, marching through the whole of Provence an army which fatigue, shortness of provisions, sickness, and ambuscades were decimating ingloriously. At last he decided upon retreating. . . . On returning from his sorry expedition, Charles V. learned that those of his lieutenants whom he had charged with the conduct of a similar invasion in the north of France, in Picardy, had met with no greater success than he himself in Provence.” A truce for three months was soon afterwards arranged, and in June, 1538, through the mediation of Pope Paul III., a treaty was signed at Nice which extended the truce to ten years. Next month the two sovereigns met at Aigues-Mortes and exchanged many assurances of friendship.”—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 28 (v. 4).—In August, 1539, a revolt at Ghent “called Charles V. into Flanders; he was then in Spain, and his shortest route was through France. He requested permission to cross the kingdom, and obtained it, after having promised the Constable Montmorency that he would give the investiture of Milan to the second son of the King. His sojourn in France was a time of expensive fêtes, and cost the treasury four millions; yet, in the midst of his pleasures, the Emperor was not without uneasiness. . . . Francis, however, respected the rights of hospitality; but Charles did not give to his son the investiture of Milan. The King, indignant, exiled the constable for having trusted the word of the Emperor without exacting his signature, and avenged himself by strengthening his alliance with the Turks, the most formidable enemies of the empire. . . . The hatred of the two monarchs was carried to its height by these last events; they mutually outraged each other by injurious libels, and submitted their differences to the Pope. Paul III. refused to decide between them, and they again took up arms [1542]. The King invaded Luxembourg, and the Dauphin Roussillon; and while a third army in concert with the Mussulmans besieged Nice [1542], the last asylum of the dukes of Savoy, by land, the terrible Barbarossa, admiral of Soliman, attacked it by sea. The town was taken, the castle alone resisted, and the siege of it was raised. Barbarossa consoled himself for this check by ravaging the coasts of Italy, where he made 10,000 captives. The horror which he inspired recoiled on Francis I., his ally, whose name became odious in Italy and Germany. He was declared the enemy of the empire, and the Diet raised against him an army of 24,000 men, at the head of which Charles V. penetrated into Champagne, while Henry VIII., coalescing with the Emperor, attacked Picardy with 10,000 English. The battle of Cerisoles, a complete victory, gained during the same year [April 14, 1544], in Piedmont, by Francis of Bourbon, Duke d'Enghien, against Gast, general of the Imperial troops, did not stop this double and formidable invasion. Charles V. advanced almost to Château-Thierry. But discord reigned in his army; he ran short of provisions, and could easily have been surrounded; he then again promised Milan to the Duke of Orleans, the second son of the King. This promise irritated the Dauphin Henry, who was afraid to see his brother become the head of a house as dangerous for France as had been that of Burgundy; he wished to reject the offer of the Emperor and to cut off his retreat. A rivalry among women, it is said, saved Charles V. . . .

The war was terminated almost immediately afterwards [1544] by the treaty of Crespy in Valois. The Emperor promised his daughter to the Duke of Orleans, with the Low Countries and Franche-Comté, or one of his nieces, with Milan. Francis restored to the Duke of Savoy the greater part of the places that he held in Piedmont; he renounced all ulterior pretensions to the kingdom of Naples, the duchy of Milan, and likewise to the sovereignty of Flanders and Artois; Charles, on his part, gave up the duchy of Burgundy. This treaty put an end to the rivalry of the two sovereigns, which had ensanguined Europe for 25 years. The death of the Duke of Orleans freed the Emperor from dispossessing himself of Milan or the Low Countries; he refused all compensation to the King, but the peace was not broken. Francis I. profited by it to redouble his severity with regard to the Protestants. A population of many thousands of Waldenses, an unfortunate remnant from the religious persecutions of the 13th century, dwelt upon the confines of Provence, and the County Venaissin, and a short time back had entered into communion with the Calvinists. The King permitted John Mesnier, Baron d'Oppède, first president of the Parliament of Aix, to execute [1546] a sentence delivered against them five years previously by the Parliament. John d'Oppède himself directed this frightful execution. Twenty-two towns or villages were burned and sacked; the inhabitants, surprised during the night, were pursued among the rocks by the glare of the flames which devoured their houses. The men perished by executions, but the women were delivered over to terrible violences. At Cabrières, the principal town of the canton, 700 men were murdered in cold blood, and all the women were burnt; lastly, according to the tenor of the sentence, the houses were rased, the woods cut down, the trees in the gardens torn up, and in a short time this country, so fertile and so thickly peopled, became a desert and a waste. This dreadful massacre was one of the principal causes of the religious wars which desolated France for so long a time. . . . The war continued between [Henry VIII.] and Francis I. The English had taken Boulogne, and a French fleet ravaged the coasts of England, after taking possession of the Isle of Wight [1545]. Hostilities were terminated by the treaty of Guines [1547], which the two kings signed on the edge of their graves, and it was arranged that Boulogne should be restored for the sum of 2,000,000 of gold crowns. . . . Henry VIII. and Francis I. died in the same year [1547]."—E. de Bonnechosc, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, pp. 363-367.

ALSO IN: W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 6-9 (v. 2).—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of England*, ch. 20-23 (v. 4).

A. D. 1534-1535.—The voyages of Jacques Cartier and the taking possession of Canada. See AMERICA: A. D. 1534-1535.

A. D. 1534-1560.—Persecution of the Protestants.—Their organization.—Their numbers.—"Francis I. had long shrunk from persecution, but having once begun he showed no further hesitation. During the remainder of his reign and the whole of that of his son Henry II. (1534-1559) the cruelty of the sufferings inflicted on the Reformers increased with the number of the victims. At first they were strangled and burnt, then burnt alive, then hung in chains to

roast over a slow fire. . . . The Edict of Chateaubriand (1551), taking away all right of appeal from those convicted of heresy, was followed by an attempt to introduce an Inquisition on the model of that of Spain, and when this failed owing to the opposition of the lawyers, the Edict of Compiègne (1557) denounced capital punishment against all who in public or private professed any heterodox doctrine. It is a commonplace that persecution avails nothing against the truth—that the true Church springs from the blood of martyrs. Yet the same cause which triumphed over persecution in France was crushed by it in Spain and in the Walloon Netherlands. Was it therefore not the truth? The fact would rather seem to be, that there is no creed, no sect which cannot be extirpated by force. But that it may prevail, persecution must be without respect of persons, universal, continuous, protracted. Not one of these conditions was fulfilled in France. The opinions of the greater nobles and princes, and of those who were their immediate followers, were not too narrowly scanned, nor was the persecution equally severe at all times and in all places. Some governors and judges and not a few of the higher clergy inclined to toleration. . . . The cheerful constancy of the French martyrs was admirable. Men, women and children walked to execution singing the psalms of Marot and the Song of Simeon. This boldness confounded their enemies. Hawkers distributed in every part of the country the books issued from the press of Geneva and which it was a capital offence even to possess. Preachers taught openly in the streets and market-places. . . . The increasing numbers of their converts and the high position of some among them gave confidence to the Protestants. Delegates from the reformed congregations of France were on their way to Paris to take part in the deliberations of the first national Synod on the very day (April 2, 1559) when the peace of Cateau Cambresis was signed, a peace which was to be the prelude to a vigorous and concerted effort to root out heresy on the part of the kings of France and Spain. The object of the meeting was twofold: first to draw up a detailed profession of faith, which was submitted to Calvin—there was, he said, little to add, less to correct—secondly to determine the 'ecclesiastical discipline' of the new Church. The ministers were to be chosen by the elders and deacons, but approved by the whole congregation. The affairs of each congregation were placed under the control of the Consistory, a court composed of the pastors, elders and deacons; more important matters were reserved for the decision of the provincial 'colloques' or synods, which were to meet twice a year, and in which each church was represented by its pastor and at least one elder. Above all was the national Synod also composed of the clergy and of representative laymen. This organisation was thoroughly representative and popular, the elected delegates of the congregations, the elders and deacons, preponderated in all the governing bodies, and all ministers and churches were declared equal. The Reformed churches, which, although most numerous in the South, spread over almost the whole country, are said at this time to have counted some 400,000 members (1559). These were of almost all classes, except perhaps the lowest, although even among the

peasantry there were some martyrs for the faith." On the accession of Charles IX., in 1560, "a quarter of the inhabitants of France were, it was said, included in the 2,500 reformed congregations. This is certainly an exaggeration, but it is probable that the number of the Protestants was never greater than during the first years of the reign of Charles IX. . . . The most probable estimate is that at the beginning of the wars of religion the Huguenots with women and children amounted to some 1,500,000 souls out of a population of between fifteen and twenty millions. But in this minority were included about one-fourth of the lesser nobility, the country gentlemen, and a smaller proportion of the great nobles, the majority of the better sort of townspeople in many of the most important towns, such as Caen, Dieppe, Havre, Nantes, La Rochelle, Nîmes, Montpellier, Montauban, Châlons, Mâcon, Lyons, Valence, Limoges and Grenoble, and an important minority in other places, such as Rouen, Orleans, Bordeaux and Toulouse. The Protestants were most numerous in the South-west, in Poitou, in the Marche, Limousin, Angoumois and Périgord, because in those districts, which were the seats of long-established and flourishing manufactures, the middle classes were most prosperous, intelligent and educated. It is doubtful whether the Catholics were not in a large majority, even where the superior position, intelligence and vigour of the Huguenots gave them the upper hand. Only in some parts of the South-west and of Dauphiny do the bulk of the population appear to have been decidedly hostile to the old religion. During the course of the Civil War the Protestants came to be more and more concentrated in certain parts of the country, as for instance between the Garonne and the Loire."—P. F. Willert, *Henry of Navarre and the Huguenots in France*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1541-1543.—Jacques Cartier's last explorations in Canada. See AMERICA: A. D. 1541-1603.

A. D. 1541-1564.—The rise and influence of Calvinism. See GENEVA: A. D. 1536-1564.

A. D. 1547.—Accession of King Henry II.

A. D. 1547-1559.—The rise of the Guises.

—Alliance with the German Protestants.—Wars with the emperor, and with Spain and England.—Acquisition of Les Trois Evêchés, and of Calais.—Unsuccessful campaign in Italy.—Battle and siege of St. Quentin.—Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis.—"The son of Francis I., who in 1547 ascended the throne under the title of Henry II., was told by his dying father to beware of the Guises. . . . The Guises were a branch of the ducal House of Lorraine, which, although the dukedom was a fief of the German empire, had long stood in intimate relations with the court and nobility of France. The founder of the family was Claude, a younger son of René II., Duke of Lorraine, who, being naturalised in France in 1505, rendered himself conspicuous in the wars of Francis I., and was created first Duke of Guise. He died in 1550, leaving five daughters and six sons. His eldest daughter, Mary, became the wife of James V. of Scotland, and mother of Mary Queen of Scots. The sons were all men of extraordinary energy and ambition, and their united influence was, for a number of years, more than a match for that of the crown. Francis, second Duke of Guise, acquired, while still a young man, extraordinary

renown as a military commander, by carrying out certain ambitious designs of France on a neighbouring territory. . . . As is well known, French statesmen have for many centuries cherished the idea that the natural boundary of France on the east is the Rhine, from its mouth to its source, and thence along the crest of the Alps to the Mediterranean. . . . To begin the realisation of the idea, advantage was taken of the war which broke out between the Emperor Charles V. and his Protestant subjects in North Germany [see GERMANY: A. D. 1546-1552]. Although the Protestants of France were persecuted to the death, Henry II., with furtively ambitious designs, offered to defend the Protestants of Germany against their own emperor; and entered into an alliance in 1551 with Maurice of Saxony and other princes, undertaking to send an army to their aid. As bases of his operations, it was agreed that he might take temporary military possession of Toul, Verdun, and Metz, three bishoprics [forming a district called the Trois Evêchés], each with a portion of territory lying within the area of the duchy of Lorraine, but held as distinct fiefs of the German empire—such, in fact, being fragments of Lothair's kingdom, which fell to Germany, and had in no shape been incorporated with France. It was stipulated that, in occupying these places, the French were not to interfere with their old connection with the empire. The confidence reposed in the French was grievously abused. All the stipulations went for nothing. In 1552, French troops took possession of Toul and Verdun, also of Nancy, the capital of Lorraine, treating the duchy, generally, as a conquered country. Seeing this, Metz shut her gates and trusted to her fortifications. To procure an entrance and secure possession, there was a resort to stratagems which afford a startling illustration of the tricks that French nobles at that time could be guilty of in order to gain their ends. The French commander, the Constable Montmorency, begged to be allowed to pass through the town with a few attendants, while his army made a wide circuit on its route. The too credulous custodiers of the city opened the gates, and, to their dismay, the whole French forces rushed in, and began to rule in true despotic fashion. . . . Thus was Metz secured for France in a way which modern Frenchmen, we should imagine, can hardly think of without shame. Germany, however, did not relinquish this important fortress without a struggle. Furious at its loss, the Emperor Charles V. proceeded to besiege it with a large army. The defence was undertaken by the Duke of Guise, assisted by a body of French nobility. After an investment of four months, and a loss of 30,000 men, Charles was forced to raise the siege, January 1, 1553, all his attempts at the capture of the place being effectually baffled."—W. Chambers, *France: its History and Revolutions*, ch. 6.—"The war continued during the two following years; but both parties were now growing weary of a contest in which neither achieved any decisive superiority"; and the emperor, having negotiated an armistice, resigned all his crowns to his son, Philip II., and his brother Ferdinand (October, 1555). "Meantime Pope Paul IV., who detested the Spaniards and longed for the complete subversion of their power in the Peninsula, entered into a league with the French king against Philip; Francis of Guise was encouraged

in his favorite project of effecting a restoration of the crown of Naples to his own family, as the descendants of René of Anjou; and in December, 1556, an army of 16,000 men, commanded by the Duke of Guise, crossed the Alps, and, marching direct to Rome, prepared to attack the Spanish viceroy of Naples, the celebrated Duke of Alva. In April, 1557, Guise advanced into the Abruzzi, and besieged Civitella; but here he encountered a determined resistance, and, after sacrificing a great part of his troops, found it necessary to abandon the attempt. He retreated toward Rome, closely pursued by the Duke of Alva; and the result was that the expedition totally failed. Before his army could recover from the fatigues and losses of their fruitless campaign, the French general was suddenly recalled by a dispatch containing tidings of urgent importance from the north of France. The Spanish army in the Netherlands, commanded by the Duke of Savoy, having been joined by a body of English auxiliaries under the Earl of Pembroke, had invaded France and laid siege to St. Quentin. This place was badly fortified, and defended by a feeble garrison under the Admiral de Coligny. Montmorency advanced with the main army to re-enforce it, and on the 10th of August rashly attacked the Spaniards, who outnumbered his own troops in the proportion of more than two to one, and inflicted on him a fatal and irretrievable defeat. The loss of the French amounted, according to most accounts, to 4,000 slain in the field, while at least an equal number remained prisoners, including the Constable himself. The road to Paris lay open to the victors. . . . The Duke of Savoy was eager to advance; but the cautious Philip, happily for France, rejected his advice, and ordered him to press the siege of St. Quentin. That town made a desperate resistance for more than a fortnight longer, and was captured by storm on the 27th of August [1557]. . . . Philip took possession of a few other neighbouring fortresses, but attempted no serious movement in prosecution of his victory. . . . The Duke of Guise arrived from Italy early in October, to the great joy of the king and the nation, and was immediately created lieutenant-general of the kingdom, with powers of almost unlimited extent. He applied himself, with his utmost ability and perseverance, to repair the late disasters; and with such success, that in less than two months he was enabled to assemble a fresh and well-appointed army at Compiègne. Resolving to strike a vigorous blow before the enemy could reappear in the field, he detached a division of his army to make a feint in the direction of Luxemburg; and, rapidly marching westward with the remainder, presented himself on the 1st of January, 1558, before the walls of Calais. . . . The French attack was a complete surprise; the two advanced forts commanding the approaches to the town were bombarded, and surrendered on the 3d of January; three days later the castle was carried by assault; and on the 8th, the governor, Lord Wentworth, was forced to capitulate. . . . Guise, no longer tenable after the fall of Calais, shared the same fate on the 21st of January; and thus, within the short space of three weeks, were the last remnants of her ancient dominion on the Continent snatched from the grasp of England — possessions which she had held for upward of 200 years. . . . This remarkable exploit, so flattering to the national pride, created

universal enthusiasm in France, and carried to the highest pitch the reputation and popularity of Guise. From this moment his influence became paramount; and the marriage of the dauphin to the Queen of Scots, which was solemnised on the 24th of April, 1558, seemed to exalt the house of Lorraine to a still more towering pinnacle of greatness. It was stipulated by a secret article of the marriage-contract that the sovereignty of Scotland should be transferred to France, and that the two crowns should remain united forever, in case of the decease of Mary without issue. Toward the end of the year negotiations were opened with a view to peace." They were interrupted, however, in November, 1558, by the death of Queen Mary of England, wife of Philip of Spain. "When the congress reassembled at Le Cateau-Cambresis, in February, 1559, the Spanish ministers no longer maintained the interests of England; and Elizabeth, thus abandoned, agreed to an arrangement which virtually ceded Calais to France, though with such nominal qualifications as satisfied the sensitiveness of the national honour. Calais was to be restored to the English at the end of eight years, with a penalty, in case of failure, of 500,000 crowns. At the same time, if any hostile proceedings should take place on the part of England against France within the period specified, the queen was to forego all claim to the fulfilment of the article." The treaty between France and England was signed April 2, 1559, and that between France and Spain the following day. By the latter, "the two monarchs mutually restored their conquests in Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Picardy, and Artois; France abandoned Savoy and Piedmont, with the exception of Turin and four other fortresses [restoring Philibert Emanuel, Duke of Savoy, to his dominions — see SAVOY AND PIEDMONT: A. D. 1559-1580]; she evacuated Tuscany, Corsica, and Montferrat, and yielded up no less than 189 towns or fortresses in various parts of Europe. By way of compensation, Henry preserved the district of the 'Trois Evêchés' — Toul, Metz, and Verdun — and made the all-important acquisition of Calais. This pacification was sealed, according to custom, by marriages" — Henry's daughter Elizabeth to Philip of Spain, and his sister Marguerite to the Duke of Savoy. In a tournament, at Paris, which celebrated these marriages, Henry received an injury from the lance of Montgomery, captain of his Scottish guards, which caused his death eleven days afterwards — July 10, 1559. — W. H. Jervis, *Student's Hist. of France*, ch. 15.

ALSO IN: J. L. Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, pt. 1, ch. 2-3 (v. 1). — Lady Jackson, *The Court of France in the 16th Century*, v. 2, ch. 9-20. — L. von Ranke, *Övil Wars and Monarchy in France, 16th and 17th Centuries*, ch. 6 (v. 1).

A. D. 1548. — Marriage of Antoine de Bourbon to Jeanne d'Albret, heiress of Navarre. See NAVARRE: A. D. 1528-1563.

A. D. 1552. — Alliance with the Turks. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1528-1570.

A. D. 1554-1565. — Huguenot attempts at colonization in Brazil and in Florida, and their fate. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1562-1563; 1564-1565; 1565, and 1567-1568.

A. D. 1558-1559. — Aid given to revolt in Corsica. See GENOA: A. D. 1528-1559.

A. D. 1559. — Accession of King Francis II.

A. D. 1559-1561.—Francis II., Charles IX., the Guises and Catharine de' Medici.—The Conspiracy of Amboise.—Rapid spread and organization of Protestantism.—Rise of the Huguenot party.—Disputed origin of its name.—Henry II. "had been married from political motives to the niece of Clement VII., Catharine de Medici. This ambitious woman came to France conscious that the marriage was a political one, mentally a stranger to her husband; and such she always remained. This placed her from the first in a false position. The King was influenced by any one rather than by his wife; and a by no means charming mistress, Diana of Poitiers, played her part by the side of and above the Queen. . . . Immediately after the death of her husband, in 1559, she [Catharine] greedily grasped at power. The young King, Francis II., was of age when he entered his fourteenth year. There could therefore be no legal regency, though there might be an actual one, for a weakly monarch of sixteen was still incompetent to govern. But she was thwarted in her first grasp at power. Under Francis I., a family [the Guises—see above] previously unknown in French history had begun to play a prominent part. . . . The brothers succeeded in bringing about a political marriage which promised to throw the King, who was mentally a child, entirely into their hands. Their sister Mary had been married to James V. of Scotland, whose crown was then rather an insignificant one, but was now beginning to gain importance. The issue of this marriage was a charming girl, who was destined for the King's wife. She was betrothed to him without his consent when still a child. The young Queen was Mary Stuart. Her misfortunes, her beauty, and her connection with European history, have made her a historical personage, more conspicuous indeed for what she suffered than for what she did; her real importance is not commensurate with the position she occupies. This, then, was the position of the brothers Guise at court. The King was the husband of their niece; both were children in age and mind, and therefore doubly required guidance. The brothers, Francis and Charles, had the government entirely in their hands; the Duke managed the army, the Cardinal the finances and foreign affairs. Two such leaders were the mayors of the palace. The whole constitution of the court reminds us of the 'rois fainéants' and the office of major-domo under the Carolingians. Thus, just when Catharine was about to take advantage of a favourable moment, she saw herself once more eclipsed and thrust aside, and that by insolent upstarts of whom one thing only was certain, that they possessed unusual talents, and that their consciences were elastic in the choice of means. It was not only from Catharine that the supremacy of the Guises met with violent opposition, but also from Protestantism, the importance of which was greatly increasing in France. . . . In the time of Henry II., in spite of all the edicts and executions, Protestantism had made great progress. . . . In the spring of 1559, interdicted Protestantism had secretly reviewed its congregations, and at the first national synod drawn up a confession of faith and a constitution for the new Church. Preachers and elders had appeared from every part of France, and their eighty articles of 28th May, 1559, have become the code of laws of French Protestantism. The Calvinistic principle

of the Congregational Church, with choice of its own minister, deacons, and elders; a consistory which maintained strict discipline in matters of faith and morals . . . was established upon French soil, and was afterwards publicly accepted by the whole party. The more adherents this party gained in the upper circles, the bolder was its attitude; there was, indeed, no end to the executions, or to the edicts against heresy, but a spirit of opposition, previously unknown, had gradually gained ground. Prisoners were set free, the condemned were rescued from the hands of the executioners on the way to the scaffold, and a plan was devised among the numerous fugitives in foreign lands for producing a turn in the course of events by violent means. La Rénaudie, a reformed nobleman from Perigord, who had sworn vengeance on the Guises for the execution of his brother, had, with a number of other persons of his own way of thinking, formed a plan for attacking the Guises, carrying off the King, and placing him under the guardianship of the Bourbon agnates. . . . The project was betrayed; the Guises succeeded in placing the King in security in the Castle of Amboise; a number of the conspirators were seized, another troop overpowered and dispersed on their attack upon the castle, on the 17th of March, 1560; some were killed, some taken prisoners and at once executed. It was then discovered, or pretended, that the youngest of the Bourbon princes [see *BOURBON, HOUSE OF*], Louis of Condé, was implicated in the conspiracy [known as the Conspiracy or Tumult of Amboise]. . . . The Guises now ventured, in contempt of French historical traditions, to imprison this prince of the blood, this agnate of the reigning house; to summon him before an arbitrary tribunal of partisans, and to condemn him to death. . . . This affair kept all France in suspense. All the nobles, although strongly infected with Huguenot ideas, were on Condé's side; even those who condemned his religious opinions made his cause their own. They justly thought that if he fell none of them would be safe. In the midst of this ferment, destiny interposed. On the 5th of December, 1560, Francis II. died suddenly, and a complete change took place. His death put an end to a network of intrigues, which aimed at knocking the rebellion, political and religious, on the head. . . . During this confusion one individual had been watching the course of events with the eagerness of a beast ready to seize on its prey. Catharine of Medici was convinced that the time of her dominion had at length arrived. . . . Francis II. was scarcely dead when she seized upon the person and the power of Charles IX. He was a boy of ten years old, not more promising than his eldest brother, sickly and weakly like all the sons of Henry II., more attached to his mother than the others, and he had been neglected by the Guises. . . . One of her first acts was to liberate Condé; this was a decided step towards reconciliation with the Bourbons and the Protestants. The whole situation was all at once changed. The court was ruled by Catharine; her feverish thirst for power was satisfied. The Guises and their adherents were, indeed, permitted to remain in their offices and posts of honour, in order not fatally to offend them; but their supremacy was destroyed, and the new power was based upon the Queen's understanding with the heads of the Huguenot party."—L. Häusser, *The Period of the Reforma-*

tion, 1517 to 1648, ch. 25.—“The recent commotion had disclosed the existence of a body of malcontents, in part religious, in part also political, scattered over the whole kingdom and of unascertained numbers. To its adherents the name of Huguenots was now for the first time given. What the origin of this celebrated appellation was, it is now perhaps impossible to discover. . . . It has been traced back to the name of the Eidgenossen or ‘confederates,’ under which the party of freedom figured in Geneva when the authority of the bishop and duke was overthrown; or to the ‘Roy Huguet,’ or ‘Hugon,’ a hobgoblin supposed to haunt the vicinity of Tours, to whom the superstitious attributed the nocturnal assemblies of the Protestants; or to the gate ‘du roy Hugon’ of the same city, near which those gatherings were wont to be made. Some of their enemies maintained the former existence of a diminutive coin known as a ‘huguenot,’ and asserted that the appellation, as applied to the reformed, arose from their ‘not being worth a huguenot,’ or farthing. And some of their friends, with equal confidence and no less improbability, declared that it was invented because the adherents of the house of Guise secretly put forward claims upon the crown of France in behalf of that house as descended from Charlemagne, whereas the Protestants loyally upheld the rights of the Valois sprung from Hugh Capet. In the diversity of contradictory statements, we may perhaps be excused if we suspend our judgment. . . . Not a week had passed after the conspiracy of Amboise before the word was in everybody’s mouth. Few knew or cared whence it arose. A powerful party, whatever name it might bear, had sprung up, as it were, in a night. . . . No feature of the rise of the Reformation in France is more remarkable than the sudden impulse which it received during the last year or two of Henry II.’s life, and especially within the brief limits of the reign of his eldest son. . . . There was not a corner of the kingdom where the number of incipient Protestant churches was not considerable. Provence alone contained 60, whose delegates this year met in a synod at the blood-stained village of Mérindol. In large tracts of country the Huguenots had become so numerous that they were no longer able or disposed to conceal their religious sentiments, nor content to celebrate their rites in private or nocturnal assemblies. This was particularly the case in Normandy, in Languedoc, and on the banks of the Rhone.”—H. M. Baird, *Hist. of the Rise of the Huguenots*, bk. 1, ch. 10 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, 4th series, c. 29.

A. D. 1560.—Accession of King Charles IX.

A. D. 1560-1563.—Changed policy of Catharine de’ Medici.—Delusive favors to the Huguenots.—The Guises and the Catholics again ascendant.—The massacre of Vassy.—Outbreak of civil war.—Battle of Dreux.—Assassination of Guise.—Peace and the Edict of Amboise.—“Catherine de Medici, now regent, thought it wisest to abandon the policy which had till then prevailed under the influence of the Guises, and while she confirmed the Lorraine princes in the important offices they held, she named, on the other hand, Antoine de Bourbon [king of Navarre] lieutenant-general of the kingdom, and took Michel de l’Hôpital as her chief adviser. . . . Chancellor de l’Hôpital, like the

Regent, aimed at the destruction of the parties which were rending the kingdom asunder; but his political programme was that of an honest man and a true liberal. A wise system of religious toleration and of administrative reform would, he thought, restore peace and satisfy all true Frenchmen. ‘Let us,’ he said, ‘do away with the diabolical party-names which cause so many seditions—Lutherans, Huguenots, and Papists; let us not alter the name of Christians.’ . . . The edicts of Saint Germain and of January (1562) were favourable to the Huguenots. Religious meetings were allowed in rural districts; all penalties previously decreed against Dissenters were suspended on condition that the old faith should not be interfered with: finally, the Huguenot divines, with Théodore de Bèze at their head, were invited to meet the Roman Catholic prelates and theologians in a conference (colloque) at Poissy, near Paris. Théodore de Bèze, the faithful associate and coadjutor of Calvin in the great work of the Reformation, both at Geneva and in France, is justly and universally regarded as the historian of the early Huguenots. . . . The speech he delivered at the opening of the colloque is an eloquent plea for liberty and mutual forbearance. Unfortunately, the conciliatory measures he proposed satisfied no one.”—G. Masson, *The Huguenots*, ch. 2.—“The edict of January . . . gave permission to Protestants to hold meetings for public worship outside the towns, and placed their meetings under the protection of the law. . . . The Parliament of Paris refused to register the edict until after repeated orders from the Queen-mother. The Parliament of Dijon refused to register it. . . . The Parliament of Aix refused. Next, Antoine de Navarre, bribed by a promise of the restoration of the Spanish part of his little kingdom, announced that the colloquy of Poissy had converted him, dismissed Beza and the reformed preachers, sent Jeanne back to Béarn, demanded the dismissal of the Chatillons from the court, and invited the Duke of Guise and his brother, the Cardinal, who were at their château of Joinville, to return to Paris. Then occurred—it was only six weeks after the Edict of January—the massacre of Vassy. Nine hundred out of 3,000—the population of that little town—were Protestants. Rejoicing in the permission granted them by the new law, they were assembled on the Sunday morning, in a barn outside the town, for the purpose of public service. The Duke of Guise and the Cardinal, with their armed escort of gentlemen and soldiers, riding on their way to Paris, heard the bells which summoned the people, and asked what they meant. Being told that it was a Huguenot ‘prêche,’ the Duke swore that he would Huguenot them to some purpose. He rode straight to the barn and entered the place, threatening to murder them all. The people relying on the law, barred the doors. Then the massacre began. The soldiers burst open the feeble barrier, and began to fire among the perfectly unarmed and inoffensive people. Sixty-four were killed—men, women, and children; 200 were wounded. This was the signal for war. Condé, on the intelligence, immediately retired from the court to Meaux, whence he issued a proclamation calling on all the Protestants of the country to take up arms. Coligny was at Chatillon, whither Catharine addressed him letter after letter, urging upon him, in ambiguous terms,

the defence of the King. It seems, though this is obscure, that at one time Condé might have seized the royal family and held them. But if he had the opportunity, he neglected it, and the chance never came again. Henceforward, however, we hear no more talk about Catharine becoming a Protestant. That pretence will serve her no more. Before the clash of arms, there was silence for a space. Men waited till the last man in France who had not spoken should declare himself. The Huguenots looked to the Admiral, and not to Condé. It was on him that the real responsibility lay of declaring civil war. It was a responsibility from which the strongest man might shrink. . . . The Admiral having once made up his mind, hesitated no longer, and, with a heavy heart, set off the next day to join Condé. He wrote to Catharine that he took up arms, not against the King, but against those who held him captive. He wrote also to his old uncle, the Constable [Montmorency]. . . . The Constable replied. There was no bitterness between uncle and nephew. The former was fighting to prevent the 'universal ruin' of his country, and for his 'petits maîtres,' the boys, the sons of his old friend, Henry II. Montmorency joined the Guises in perfect loyalty, and with the firm conviction that it was the right thing for him to do. The Chatillon fought in the name of law and justice, and to prevent the universal massacre of his people. . . . Then the first civil war began with a gallant exploit—the taking of Orleans [April 1562]. Condé rode into it at the head of 2,000 cavalry, all shouting like school-boys, and racing for six miles who should get into the city first. They pillaged the churches, and turned out the Catholics. 'Those who were that day turned outside the city wept catholically that they were dispossessed of the magazines of the finest wines in France.' Truly a dire misfortune, for the Catholics to lose all the best claret districts! Orleans taken, the Huguenots proceeded to issue protestations and manifestoes, in all of which the hand of the Admiral is visible. They are not fighting against the King, who is a prisoner; the war was begun by the Guises. . . . They might have added, truly enough, that Condé and the Admiral held in their hands letters from Catharine, urging them to carry on the contest for the sake of the young King. The fall of Orleans was quickly followed by that of Rouen, Tours, Blois, Bourges, Vienne, Valence, and Montauban. The civil war was fairly begun. The party was now well organized. Condé was commander-in-chief by right of his birth; Coligny was real leader by right of his reputation and wisdom. It was by him that a Solemn League and Covenant was drawn up, to be signed by every one of the Calvinist chiefs. These were, besides Condé and the Chatillons, La Rochefoucauld, . . . Coligny's nephew and Condé's brother-in-law—he was the greatest seigneur in Poitou; Rohan, from Dauphiné, who was Condé's cousin; the Prince of Porcian, who was the husband of Condé's niece. Each of these lords came with a following worthy of his name. Montgomery, who had slain Henry II., brought his Normans; Genlis, the Picards. . . . With Andelot came a troop of Bretons; with the Count de Grammont came 6,000 Gascons. Good news poured in every day. Not only Rouen, but Havre, Caen, and Dieppe submitted in the North. Angers and Nantes followed. The road was

open in the end for bringing troops from Germany. The country in the southwest was altogether in their hands. Meantime, the enemy were not idle. They began with massacres. In Paris they murdered 800 Huguenots in that first summer of the war. From every side fugitives poured into Orleans, which became the city of refuge. There were massacres at Amiens, Senlis, Cahors, Toulouse, Angoulême—everywhere. Coligny advised a march upon Paris, where, he urged, the Guises had but a rabble at their command. His counsels when war was once commenced, were always for vigorous measures. Condé preferred to wait. Andelot was sent to Germany, where he raised 3,000 horse. Calvin despatched letters in every direction, urging on the churches and the Protestant princes to send help to France. Many of Coligny's old soldiers of St. Quentin came to fight under his banner. Elizabeth of England offered to send an army if Calais were restored; when she saw that no Frenchman would give up that place again, she still sent men and money, though with grudging spirit. At length both armies took the field. The Duke of Guise had under him 8,000 men; Condé 7,000. They advanced, and met at the little town of Vassodun, where a conference was held between the Queen-mother and Navarre on the one hand, and Condé and Coligny on the other. Catharine proposed that all the chiefs of both sides—Guise, the Cardinal de Lorraine, St. André, Montmorency, Navarre, Condé, and the Chatillon brothers—should all alike go into voluntary exile. Condé was nearly persuaded to accept this absurd proposal. Another conference was held at Taley. These conferences were only delays. An attempt was made by Catharine to entrap Condé, which was defeated by the Admiral's prompt rescue. The Parliament of Paris issued a decree commanding all Romanists in every parish to rise in arms at the sound of the bell and to slay every Huguenot. It was said that 50,000 were thus murdered. No doubt the numbers were grossly exaggerated. . . . These cruelties naturally provoked retaliation. . . . An English army occupied Havre. English troops set out for Rouen. Some few managed to get within the walls. The town was taken by the Catholics [October 25, 1562], and, for eight days, plundered. Needless to say that Guise hanged every Huguenot he could find. Here the King of Navarre was killed. The loss of Rouen, together with other disasters, greatly discouraged the Huguenots. Their spirits rose, however, when news came that Andelot, with 4,000 reiters, was on his way to join them. He brought them in safety across France, being himself carried in a litter, sick with ague and fever. The Huguenots advanced upon Paris, but did not attack the city. At Dreux [December 19, 1562], they met the army of Guise. Protestant historians endeavor to show that the battle was drawn. In fact both sides sustained immense losses. St. André was killed, Montmorency and Condé were taken prisoners. Yet Coligny had to retire from the field—his rival had outgeneralled him. It was characteristic of Coligny that he never lost heart. . . . With his German cavalry, a handful of his own infantry, and a small troop of English soldiers, Coligny swept over nearly the whole of Normandy. It is true that Guise was not there to oppose him. Every thing looked well. He was arranging for a 'splendid alliance' with

England, when news came which stayed his hand. Guise marched southwards to Orleans. . . . There was in Orleans a young Huguenot soldier named Jean Poltrot de Méré. He was a fanatic. . . . He waited for an opportunity, worked himself into the good graces of the Duke, and then shot him with three balls, in the shoulder. Guise died three days later. . . . Then a peace was signed [and ratified by the Edict of Amboise, March 19, 1563]. Condé, won over and seduced by the sirens of the Court, signed it. It was a humiliating and disastrous peace. Huguenots were to be considered loyal subjects; foreign soldiers should be sent out of the country; churches and temples should be restored to their original uses; the suburbs of one town in every bailiwick were to be used for Protestant worship (this was a great reduction on the Edict of Jaunary, which allowed the suburbs of every town); and the nobility and gentry were to hold worship in their own houses after their own opinions. The Admiral was furious at this weakness. 'You have ruined,' he said to Condé, 'more churches by one stroke of the pen than the enemy could have done in ten years of war.'—W. Besant, *Gaspard de Coligny*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: Duc d'Aumale, *Hist. of the Princes de Condé*, bk. 1, ch. 3 (v. 1).—E. Bersier, *Earlier Life of Coligny*, ch. 21-26.

A. D. 1563-1564.—Recovery of Havre from the English.—The Treaty of Troyes.—Under the terms on which the Huguenot leaders procured help from Elizabeth, the English queen held Havre, and refused to restore it until after the restoration of Calais to England, and the repayment of a loan of 140,000 crowns. The Huguenots, having now made peace with their Catholic fellow countrymen, were not prepared to fulfill the English contract, according to Elizabeth's claims, but demanded that Havre should be given up. The Queen refusing, both the parties, lately in arms against each other, joined forces, and laid siege to Havre so vigorously that it was surrendered to them on the 28th of July, 1563. Peace with England was concluded in the April following, by a treaty negotiated at Troyes, and the Queen lost all her rights over Calais.—Duc d'Aumale, *Hist. of the Princes of Condé*, v. 1, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: J. A. Froude, *Hist. of England: Reign of Elizabeth*, ch. 6 and 8 (v. 1-2).

A. D. 1563-1570.—The conference at Bayonne.—Outbreak of the Second Civil War.—Battle of St. Denis.—Peace of Longjumeau.—The Third Civil War.—Huguenot rally at La Rochelle.—Appearance of the Queen of Navarre.—Battle of Jarnac.—Death of Condé.—Henry of Navarre chosen to command.—Battle of Moncontour.—Peace of St. Germain.—The religious peace established under the Edict of Amboise lasted four years. "Not that the Huguenots enjoyed during these years anything like security or repose. The repeated abridgment even of those narrow liberties conferred by the Edict of Amboise, and the frequent outbreaks of popular hatred in which numbers of them perished, kept them in perpetual alarm. Still more alarming was the meeting at Bayonne [of Catherine de' Medici, the young king, her son, and the Duke of Alva, representing Philip II. of Spain] in the summer of 1565. . . . Amid the Court festivities which took place, it was known that there had been many secret meetings between Alva, Catherine, and Charles. The darkest sus-

picious as to their objects and results spread over France. It was generally believed—falsely, as from Alva's letters it now appears—that a simultaneous extermination of all heretics in the French and Spanish dominions had been agreed upon. To anticipate this stroke, Coligni proposed that the person of the King should be seized upon. The Court, but slenderly guarded, was then at Monceaux. The project had almost succeeded. Some time, however, was lost. The Court got warning and fled to Meaux. Six thousand Swiss arrived, and by a rapid march carried the King to Paris. After such a failure, nothing was left to the Huguenots but the chances of a second civil war. Condé entered boldly on the campaign. Though he had with him but 1,500 horse and 1,200 infantry, he marched to Paris, and offered battle to the royal troops beneath its walls. The Constable [Montmorency], who had 18,000 men at his command, accepted the challenge, and on the 10th of November 1567, the battle of St. Denis was fought. . . . Neither party could well claim the victory, as both retired from the field. The royal army had to mourn the loss that day of its aged and gallant commander, the Constable. Condé renewed next day the challenge, which was not accepted. The winter months were spent by the Huguenots in effecting a junction with some German auxiliaries, and in the spring they appeared in such force upon the field that, on the 23d March 1568, the Peace of Longjumeau was ratified, which re-established, free from all modifications and restrictions, the Edict of Amboise. It was evident from the first that this treaty was not intended to be kept; that it had been entered into by the government solely to gain time, and to scatter the ranks of the Huguenots. Coligni sought Condé at his château of Noyers in Burgundy. He had scarcely arrived when secret intelligence was given them of a plot upon their lives. They had barely time to fly, making many a singular escape by the way, and reaching Rochelle, which from this time became the head-quarters of the Huguenots, on the 15th September 1568. During the first two religious wars . . . the seat of war was so remote from her dominions that the Queen of Navarre [Jeanne d'Albret,—see NAVARRE: A. D. 1528-1563] had satisfied herself with opening her country as an asylum for those Huguenots driven thither out of the southern counties of France. But when she heard that Condé and Coligni . . . were on their way to Rochelle, to raise there once more the Protestant banner, convinced that the French Court meditated nothing short of the extermination of the Huguenots, she determined openly to cast in her lot with her co-religionists, and to give them all the help she could. Dexterously deceiving Montluc, who had received instructions to watch her movements, and to seize upon her person if she showed any intention of leaving her own dominions, after a flight as precipitous and almost as perilous as that of Condé and Coligni, she reached Rochelle on the 29th September, ten days after their arrival. This town, for nearly a century the citadel of Protestantism in France, having by its own unaided power freed itself from the English dominion [in the period between 1363 and 1380] had had extraordinary municipal privileges bestowed on it in return—among others, that of an entirely independent jurisdiction, both civil and military. Like so many of the great commercial marts of

Europe, in which the spirit of freedom was cherished, it had early welcomed the teaching of the Reformers, and at the time now before us nearly the whole of its inhabitants were Huguenots. . . . About the very time that the Queen of Navarre entered Rochelle a royal edict appeared, prohibiting, under pain of death, the exercise of any other than the Roman Catholic religion in France, imposing upon all the observance of its rites and ceremonies; and banishing from the realm all preachers of the doctrine of Calvin, fifteen days only being allowed them to quit the kingdom. It was by the sword that this stern edict was to be enforced or rescinded. Two powerful armies of nearly equal strength mustered speedily. One was nominally under the command of the Duke of Anjou, but really led by Tavannes, Biron, Brissac, and the young Duke of Guise, the last burning to emulate the military glory of his father; the other under the command of Condé and Coligny. The two armies were close upon one another; their generals desired to bring them into action; they were more than once actually in each other's presence; but the unprecedented inclemency of the weather prevented an engagement, and at last, without coming into collision, both had to retire to winter quarters. The delay was fatal to the Huguenots." In the following spring (March 13, 1569), while their forces were still scattered and unprepared, they were forced into battle with the better-generaled Royalists, at Jarnac, and were grievously defeated. Condé, wounded and taken prisoner, was treated at first with respect by the officers who received his sword. But "Montesquieu, captain of the Swiss Guard of the Duke of Anjou, galloped up to the spot, and, hearing who the prisoner was, deliberately levelled his pistol at him and shot him through the head. The Duke passed no censure on his officer, and expressed no regret at his deed. The grossest indignities were afterwards, by his orders, heaped upon the dead body of the slain. The defeat of Jarnac, and still more the death of Condé, threw the Huguenot army into despair. . . . The utter dissolution of the army seemed at hand. The Admiralsent a messenger to the Queen of Navarre at Rochelle, entreating her to come to the camp. She was already on her way. On arrival, and after a short consultation with the Admiral, the army was drawn up to receive her. She rode along the ranks—her son Henry on one side, the son of the deceased Condé on the other." Then she addressed to the troops an inspiring speech, concluding with these heroic words: "Soldiers, I offer you everything I have to give,—my dominions, my treasures, my life, and, what is dearer to me than all, my children. I make here solemn oath before you all—I swear to defend to my last sigh the holy cause which now unites us." "The soldiers crowded around the Queen, and unanimously, as if by sudden impulse, hailed young Henry of Navarre as their future general. The Admiral and La Roche-foucauld were the first to swear fidelity to the Prince; then came the inferior officers and the whole assembled soldiery; and it was thus that, in his fifteenth year, the Prince of Béarn was inaugurated as general-in-chief of the army of the Huguenots." In June the Huguenot army effected a junction at St. Yriex with a division of German auxiliaries, led by the Duc de Deux-Ponts, and including among its chiefs the Prince of Orange and

his brother Louis of Nassau. They attacked the Duke of Anjou at La Roche-Abelle and gained a slight advantage; but wasted their strength during the summer, contrary to the advice of the Admiral Coligny, in besieging Poitiers. The Duke of Anjou approached with a superior army, and, again in opposition to the judgment of Coligny, the Huguenots encountered him at Moncontour (October 3, 1569), where they suffered the worst of their defeats, leaving 5,000 dead and wounded on the field. Meanwhile a French army had entered Navarre, had taken the capital and spread destruction everywhere through the small kingdom; but the Queen sent Count de Montgomery to rally her people, and the invaders were driven out. Coligny and Prince Henry wintered their troops in the far south, then moved rapidly northwards in the spring, up the valley of the Rhone, across the Cevennes, through Burgundy, approaching the Loire, and were met by the Marshal de Cosse at Arnay-le-Duc, where Henry of Navarre won his first success in arms—Coligny being ill. Though it was but a partial victory it brought about a breathing time of peace. "This happened in the end of June, and on the 8th of August [1570] the Peace of St. Germain-en-Laye was signed, and France had two full years of quiet."—W. Hanna, *The Wars of the Huguenots*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: Duc d'Aumale, *Hist. of the Princes de Condé*, bk. 1, ch. 4-5 (v. 1-2).—M. W. Freer, *Life of Jeanne d'Albret*, ch. 8-10.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos of Eng. Hist.*, 5th series, c. 8.

A. D. 1570-1572.—Coligny at court and his influence with the King.—Projected war with Spain.—The desperate step of Catharine de' Medici, and its consequence in the plot of Massacre.—"After the Peace of 1570, it appeared as if a complete change of policy was about to take place. The Queen pretended to be friendly with the Protestants; her relations with the ambitious Guises were distant and cold, and the project of uniting the Houses of Bourbon and Valois by marriage [the marriage of Henry of Navarre with the king's sister, Marguerite] really looked as if she was in earnest. The most distinguished leader of the Huguenot party was the Admiral Caspar de Coligny. It is quite refreshing at this doleful period to meet with such a character. He was a nobleman of the old French school and of the best stamp; lived upon his estates with his family, his little court, his retainers and subjects, in ancient patriarchal style, and on the best terms, and regularly went with them to the Protestant worship and the communion; a man of unblemished morality and strict Calvinistic views of life. Whatever this man said or did was the result of his inmost convictions; his life was the impersonation of his views and thoughts. In the late turbulent times he had become an important person as leader and organizer of the Protestant armies. At his call, thousands of noblemen and soldiers took up arms, and they submitted under his command to very strict discipline. He could not boast of having won many battles, but he was famous for having kept his resources together after repeated defeats, and for rising up stronger than before after every lost engagement. . . . Now that peace was made, 'why,' he asked, 'excite further dissensions for the benefit of our common enemies? Let us direct our undivided forces against the real enemy of France—against Spain, who stirs up intrigues

in our civil wars. Let us crush this power, which condemns us to ignominious dependence.' The war against Spain was Coligny's project. It was the idea of a good Huguenot, for it was directed against the most blindly fanatical and dangerous foe of the new doctrines; but it was also that of a good Frenchman, for a victory over Spain would increase the power of France in the direction of Burgundy. . . . From September, 1571, Coligny was at court. On his first arrival he was heartily welcomed by the King, embraced by Catharine, and loaded with honours and favours by both. I am not of opinion that this was a deeply laid scheme to entrap the guileless hero, the more easily to ruin him. Catharine's ideas did not extend so far. Still less do I believe that the young King was trained to play the part of a hypocrite, and regarded Coligny as a victim to be cherished until the fête day. I think, rather, that Catharine, in her changeableness and hatred of the Guises, was now really disposed to make peace with the Protestants, and that the young King was for the time impressed by this superior personage. No youthful mind is so degraded as to be entirely inaccessible to such influence. . . . I believe that the first and only happy day in the life of this unfortunate monarch was when he met Coligny, who raised him above the degradation of vulgar life; and I believe further, that this relation was the main cause of the massacre of St. Bartholomew. A new influence was threatening to surround the King and to take deep root, which Catharine, her son Henry of Anjou, and the strict Catholic party, must do their utmost to avert; and it was quite in accordance with the King's weak character to allow the man to be murdered whom he had just called 'Father.' . . . It appears that about the middle of the year [1572] the matter [of war with Spain and help to the revolting Netherlands] was as good as decided. The King willingly acceded to Coligny's plan . . . [and] privately gave considerable sums for the support of the Flemish patriots, for the equipment of an army of 4,000 men, composed of Catholics and Protestants, who marched towards Mons, to succour Louis of Nassau. When in July this army was beaten, and the majority of the Huguenots were in despair, Coligny succeeded in persuading the King to equip a fresh and still larger army; but the opposition then bestirred itself. . . . The Queen . . . had been absent with her married daughter in Lorraine, and on her return she found everything changed; the Guises without influence, herself thrust on one side. Under the impression of the latest events in Flanders, which made it likely that the war with Spain would be ruinous, she hastened to the King, told him with floods of tears that it would be his ruin; that the Huguenots, through Coligny, had stolen the King's confidence, unfortunately for himself and the country. She made some impression upon him, but it did not last long, and thoughts of war gained the upper hand again. The idea now (August, 1572), must have been matured in Catharine's mind of venturing on a desperate step, in order to save her supremacy and influence. . . . The idea ripened in her mind of getting rid of Coligny by assassination. . . . Entirely of one mind with her son Henry, she turned to the Guises, with whom she was at enmity when they were in power, but friendly when they were of no more consequence than herself.

They breathed vengeance against the Calvinists, and were ready at once to avenge the murder of Francis of Guise by a murderous attack upon Coligny. An assassin was hired, and established in a house belonging to the Guises, near Coligny's dwelling, and as he came out of the palace, on the 22nd of August, a shot was fired at him, which wounded but did not kill him. Had Coligny died of his wound, Catharine would have been content. . . . But Coligny did not die; the Huguenots defiantly demanded vengeance on the well-known instigator of the deed; their threats reached the Queen and Prince Henry of Anjou, and the personal fascination which Coligny had exercised over King Charles appeared rather to increase than to diminish. Thus doubtless arose, during the anxious hours after the failure of the assassination, the idea of an act of violence on a large scale, which should strike a blow at Coligny and his friends before they had time for revenge. It certainly had not been in preparation for months, not even since the time that Coligny had been at Court; it was conceived in the agony of these hours."—L. Hausser, *The Period of the Reformation*, ch. 27.

ALSO IN: J. L. Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, pt. 3, ch. 6-7 (v. 2).—L. von Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*, ch. 15.

A. D. 1572 (August).—*The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day*.—"With some proofs, forged or real, in her hand that he was in personal danger, the Queen Mother [August 24] presented herself to her son. She told him that at the moment she was speaking the Huguenots were arming. Sixteen thousand of them intended to assemble in the morning, seize the palace, destroy herself, the Duke of Anjou, and the Catholic noblemen, and carry off Charles. The conspiracy, she said, extended through France. The chiefs of the congregations were waiting for a signal from Coligny to rise in every province and town. The Catholics had discovered the plot, and did not mean to sit still to be murdered. If the King refused to act with them, they would choose another leader; and whatever happened he would be himself destroyed. Unable to say that the story could not be true, Charles looked enquiringly at Tavannes and De Nevers, and they both confirmed the Queen Mother's words. Shaking his incredulity with reminders of Amboise and Meaux, Catherine went on to say that one man was the cause of all the troubles in the realm. The Admiral aspired to rule all France, and she—she admitted, with Anjou and the Guises, had conspired to kill him to save the King and the country. She dropped all disguise. The King, she said, must now assist them or all would be lost. . . . Charles was a weak, passionate boy, alone in the dark conclave of iniquity. He stormed, raved, wept, implored, spoke of his honour, his plighted word; swore at one moment that the Admiral should not be touched, then prayed them to try other means. But clear, cold and venomous, Catherine told him it was too late. If there was a judicial enquiry, the Guises would shield themselves by telling all that they knew. They would betray her; they would betray his brother; and, fairly or unfairly, they would not spare himself. . . . For an hour and a half the King continued to struggle. 'You refuse, then,' Catherine said at last. . . . 'Is it that you are afraid, Sire?' she hissed in his ear. 'By God's

death,' he cried, springing to his feet, 'since you will kill the Admiral, kill them all. Kill all the Huguenots in France, that none may be left to reproach me. Mort Dieu! Kill them all.' He dashed out of the cabinet. A list of those who were to die was instantly drawn up. Navarre and Condé were first included; but Catherine prudently reflected that to kill the Bourbons would make the Guises too strong. Five or six names were added to the Admiral's, and these Catherine afterwards asserted were all that it was intended should suffer. . . . Night had now fallen. Guise and Aumale were still lurking in the city, and came with the Duke of Montpensier at Catherine's summons. The persons who were to be killed were in different parts of the town. Each took charge of a district. Montpensier promised to see to the Palace; Guise and his uncle undertook the Admiral; and below these, the word went out to the leaders of the already organised sections, who had been disappointed once, but whose hour was now come. The Catholics were to recognise one another in the confusion by a white handkerchief on the left arm and a white cross in their caps. The Royal Guard, Catholics to a man, were instruments ready made for the work. Guise assembled the officers: he told them that the Huguenots were preparing to rise, and that the King had ordered their instant punishment. The officers asked no questions, and desired no better service. The business was to begin at dawn. The signal would be the tolling of the great bell at the Palace of Justice, and the first death was to be Coligny's. The soldiers stole to their posts. Twelve hundred lay along the Seine, between the river and the Hôtel de Ville; other companies watched at the Louvre. As the darkness waned, the Queen Mother went down to the gate. The stillness of the dawn was broken by an accidental pistol-shot. Her heart sank, and she sent off a messenger to tell Guise to pause. But it was too late. A minute later the bell boomed out, and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew had commenced." The assassins broke into the Admiral's dwelling and killed him as he lay wounded in bed. "The window was open. 'Is it done?' cried Guise from the court below, 'is it done?' Fling him out that we may see him." Still breathing, the Admiral was hurled upon the pavement. The Bastard of Angoulême wiped the blood from his face to be sure of his identity, and then, kicking him as he lay, shouted, 'So far well. Courage, my brave boys! now for the rest.' One of the Duc de Nevers's people hacked off the head. A rope was knotted about the ankles, and the corpse was dragged out into the street amidst the howling crowd. Teligny, . . . Rochefoucault, and the rest of the Admiral's friends who lodged in the neighbourhood were disposed of in the same way, and so complete was the surprise that there was not the most faint attempt at resistance. Montpensier had been no less successful in the Louvre. The staircases were all beset. The retinues of the King of Navarre and the Prince had been lodged in the palace at Charles's particular desire. Their names were called over, and as they descended unarmed into the quadrangle they were hewn in pieces. There, in heaps, they fell below the Royal window, under the eyes of the miserable King, who was forced forward between his mother and his brother that

he might be seen as the accomplice of the massacre. Most of the victims were killed upon the spot. Some fled wounded up the stairs, and were slaughtered in the presence of the Princesses. . . . By seven o'clock the work which Guise and his immediate friends had undertaken was finished with but one failure. The Count Montgomery and the Vidame of Chartres . . . escaped to England. The mob meanwhile was in full enjoyment. . . . While dukes and lords were killing at the Louvre, the bands of the sections imitated them with more than success; men, women, and even children, striving which should be the first in the pious work of murder. All Catholic Paris was at the business, and every Huguenot household had neighbours to know and denounce them. Through street and lane and quay and causeway, the air rang with yells and curses, pistol-shots and crashing windows; the roadways were strewn with mangled bodies, the doors were blocked by the dead and dying. From garret, closet, roof, or stable, crouching creatures were torn shrieking out, and stabbed and hacked at; boys practised their hands by strangling babies in their cradles, and headless bodies were trailed along the trottoirs. . . . Towards midday some of the quieter people attempted to restore order. A party of the town police made their way to the palace. Charles caught eagerly at their offers of service, and bade them do their utmost to put the people down; but it was all in vain. The soldiers, maddened with plunder and blood, could not be brought to assist, and without them nothing could be done. All that afternoon and night, and the next day and the day after, the horrible scenes continued, till the flames burnt down at last for want of fuel. The number who perished in Paris was computed variously from 2,000 to 10,000. In this, as in all such instances, the lowest estimate is probably the nearest to the truth. The massacre was completed—completed in Paris—only, as it proved, to be continued elsewhere. . . . On the 24th, while the havoc was at its height, circulars went round to the provinces that a quarrel had broken out between the Houses of Guise and Coligny; that the Admiral and many more had been unfortunately killed, and that the King himself had been in danger through his efforts to control the people. The governors of the different towns were commanded to repress at once any symptoms of disorder which might show themselves, and particularly to allow no injury to be done to the Huguenots." But Guise, when he learned of these circulars, which threw upon him the odium of the massacre, forced the King to recall them. "The story of the Huguenot conspiracy was revived. . . . The Protestants of the provinces, finding themselves denounced from the throne, were likely instantly to take arms to defend themselves. Couriers were therefore despatched with second orders that they should be dealt with as they had been dealt with at Paris; and at Lyons, Orleans, Rouen, Bordeaux, Toulon, Meaux, in half the towns and villages of France, the bloody drama was played once again. The King, thrown out into the hideous torrent of blood, became drunk with frenzy, and let slaughter have its way, till even Guise himself affected to be shocked, and interposed to put an end to it; not, however, till, according to the belief of the times, 100,000 men, women and

children had been miserably murdered. . . . The number again may be hoped to have been prodigiously exaggerated; with all large figures, when unsupported by exact statistics, it is safe to divide at least by ten."—J. A. Froude, *Hist. of England: Reign of Elizabeth*, ch. 23 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: H. White, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew*, ch. 12-14.—Duke of Sully, *Memoirs*, bk. 1.—G. P. Fisher, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew* (*New Englander*, Jan., 1880).

A. D. 1572 (August—October).—The king's avowal of responsibility for the Massacre, and celebration of his "victory."—Rejoicings at Rome and Madrid.—General horror of Europe.—The effects in France.—Changed character of the Protestant party.—"On the morning of the 26th of August, Charles IX. went to hold a 'bed of justice' in the parliament, carrying with him the king of Navarre, and he then openly avowed that the massacre had been perpetrated by his orders, made . . . excuse for it, grounded on a pretended conspiracy of the Huguenots against his person, and then directed the parliament to commence judicial proceedings against Coligni and his accomplices, dead or alive, on the charge of high treason. The parliament obeyed, and, after a process of two months, which was a mere tissue of falsehoods, they not only found all the dead guilty, but they included in the sentence two of the principal men who had escaped—the old captain Briquemaut, and Arnaud de Cavaignes. . . . Both were hanged at the Place de Grève, in the presence of the king, who compelled the king of Navarre also to be a witness of their execution. Having once assumed the responsibility of the massacre of the protestants, Charles IX. began to glory in the deed. On the 27th of August, he went with the whole court to Montfaucon, to contemplate the mutilated remains of the admiral. . . . Next day, a grand jubilee procession was headed by the king in celebration of his so-called victory. . . . The 'victory' was also celebrated by two medals. . . . Nevertheless, the minds of Charles and his mother were evidently ill at ease, and their misgivings as to the effect which would be produced at foreign courts by the news of these proceedings are very evident in the varying and often contradictory orders which they dispatched into the provinces. . . . The news of these terrible events caused an extreme agitation in all the courts throughout christian Europe. Philip of Spain, informed of the massacres by a letter from the king and the queen-mother, written on the 29th of August, replied by warm congratulations and expressions of joy. The cardinal of Lorraine, who was . . . at Rome, gave a reward of 1,000 écus of gold to the courier who brought the despatches, and the news was celebrated at Rome by the firing of the cannons of the castle of St. Angelo, and by the lighting of bon-fires in the streets. The pope (Gregory XIII.) and the sacred college went in grand procession to the churches to offer their thanks to God. . . . Not content with these demonstrations, the pope caused a medal to be struck. . . . Gregory dispatched immediately to the court of France the legate Fabio d'Orsini, with a commission to congratulate the king and his mother for the vigour they had shown in the repression of heresy, to demand the reception in France of the council of Trent, and the establishment of the Inquisition. . . . But the papal legate found the court of

France in a different temper from that which he anticipated. Catherine, alarmed at the effect which these great outrages had produced on the protestant sovereigns, found it necessary to give him private intimations that the congratulations of the pontiff were untimely, and could not be publicly accepted. . . . The policy of the French court at home was no less distasteful to the papal legate than its relations abroad. The old edicts against the public exercise of the protestant worship were gradually revived, and the Huguenots were deprived of the offices which they had obtained during the short period of toleration, but strict orders were sent round to forbid any further massacres, with threats of punishment against those who had already offended. On the 8th of October, the king published a declaration, inviting such of the protestants as had quitted the kingdom in consequence of the massacres to return, and promising them safety; but this was soon followed by letters to the governors of the provinces, directing them to exhort the Huguenot gentry and others to conform to the catholic faith, and declaring that he would tolerate only one religion in his kingdom. Many, believing that the protestant cause was entirely ruined in France, complied, and this defection was encouraged by the example of the two princes of Bourbon [Henry, now king of Navarre, his mother, Jeanne d'Albret, having died June 9, 1572, and Henry, the young prince of Condé], who, after some weeks of violent resistance, submitted at the end of September, and, at least in outward form, became catholics. It has been remarked that the massacre of St. Bartholomew's-day produced an entire change in the character of the protestant party in France. The Huguenots had hitherto been entirely ruled by their aristocracy, who took the lead and direction in every movement; but now the great mass of the protestant nobility had perished or deserted the cause, and from this moment the latter depended for support upon the inhabitants of some of the great towns and upon the un-noble class of the people; and with this change it took a more popular character, in some cases showing even a tendency to republicanism. In the towns where the protestants were strong enough to offer serious resistance, such as La Rochelle, Nîmes, Sancerre, and Montauban, the richer burghers, and a part at least of the municipal officers, were in favour of submission, and they were restrained only by the resolution and devotion of the less wealthy portion of the population."—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, bk. 3, ch. 7 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: H. M. Baird, *Hist. of the Rise of the Huguenots*, ch. 19 (v. 2).—A. de Montor, *Lives and Times of the Roman Pontiffs*, v. 1, pp. 810-812.

A. D. 1572-1573.—The Fourth Religious War.—Siege and successful defence of La Rochelle.—A favorable peace.—"The two Reformer-princes, Henry of Navarre and Henry de Condé, attended mass on the 29th of September, and, on the 3d of October, wrote to the pope, deploing their errors and giving hopes of their conversion. Far away from Paris, in the mountains of the Pyrenees and of Languedoc, in the towns where the Reformers were numerous and confident . . . the spirit of resistance carried the day. An assembly, meeting at Milhau, drew up a provisional ordinance for the government of the Reformed church, 'until it please God, who has the hearts of kings in His keeping, to change

that of King Charles IX. and restore the state of France to good order, or to raise up such neighboring prince as is manifestly marked out, by his virtue and by distinguishing signs, for to be the liberator of this poor afflicted people.' In November, 1572, the fourth religious war broke out. The siege of La Rochelle was its only important event. Charles IX. and his councillors exerted themselves in vain to avoid it. There was everything to disquiet them in this enterprise: so sudden a revival of the religious war after the grand blow they had just struck, the passionate energy manifested by the Protestants in asylum at La Rochelle, and the help they had been led to hope for from Queen Elizabeth, whom England would never have forgiven for indifference in this cause. . . . The king heard that one of the bravest Protestant chiefs, La Noue, 'Ironarm,' had retired to Mons with Prince Louis of Nassau. The Duke of Longueville . . . induced him to go to Paris. The king received him with great favor . . . and pressed him to go to La Rochelle and prevail upon the inhabitants to keep the peace. . . . La Noue at last consented, and repaired, about the end of November, 1572, to a village close by La Rochelle, whither it was arranged that deputies from the town would come and confer with him. . . . After hearing him, the senate rejected the pacific overtures made to them by La Noue. 'We have no mind [they said] to treat specially and for ourselves alone; our cause is that of God and of all the churches of France; we will accept nothing but what shall seem proper to all our brethren.' They then offered to trust themselves under La Noue's command, notwithstanding the commission by which he was acting for the king. "La Noue did not hesitate; he became, under the authority of the mayor, Jacques Henri, the military head of La Rochelle, whither Charles IX. had sent him to make peace. The king authorized him to accept this singular position. La Noue conducted himself so honorably in it, and everybody was so convinced of his good faith as well as bravery, that for three months he commanded inside La Rochelle, and superintended the preparations for defence, all the while trying to make the chances of peace prevail. At the end of February, 1573, he recognized the impossibility of his double commission, and he went away from La Rochelle, leaving the place in better condition than that in which he had found it, without either king or Rochellese considering that they had any right to complain of him. Biron first and then the Duke of Anjou in person took the command of the siege. They brought up, it is said, 40,000 men and 60 pieces of artillery. The Rochellese, for defensive strength, had but 22 companies of refugees or inhabitants, making in all 3,100 men. The siege lasted from the 26th of February to the 13th of June, 1573; six assaults were made on the place. . . . La Rochelle was saved. Charles IX. was more and more desirous of peace; his brother, the Duke of Anjou, had just been elected King of Poland; Charles IX. was anxious for him to leave France and go to take possession of his new kingdom. Thanks to these complications, the peace of La Rochelle was signed on the 6th of July, 1573. Liberty of creed and worship was recognized in the three towns of La Rochelle, Montauban, and Nîmes. They were not obliged to receive any royal garrison, on condition of

giving hostages to be kept by the king for two years. Liberty of worship throughout the extent of their jurisdiction continued to be recognized in the case of lords high-justiciary. Everywhere else the Reformers had promises of not being persecuted for their creed, under the obligation of never holding an assembly of more than ten persons at a time. These were the most favorable conditions they had yet obtained. Certainly this was not what Charles IX. had calculated upon when he consented to the massacre of the Protestants."—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 33.

A. D. 1573-1576.—Escape of Condé and Navarre.—Death of Charles IX.—Accession of Henry III.—The Fifth Civil War.—Navarre's repudiation of Catholicism.—The Peace of Monseur.—The King'signons and the nation's disgust.—"Catherine . . . had the address to procure the crown of Poland for the son of her predilection, Henry duke of Anjou. She had lavished her wealth upon the electors for this purpose. No sooner was the point gained than she regretted it. The health of Charles was now manifestly on the decline, and Catherine would fain have retained Henry; but the jealousy of the king forbade. After conducting the duke on his way to Poland the court returned to St. Germain, and Charles sunk, without hope or consolation, on his couch of sickness. Even here he was not allowed to repose. The young king of Navarre formed a project of escape with the prince of Condé. The duc d'Alençon, youngest brother of the king, joined in it. . . . The vigilance of the queen-mother discovered the enterprise, which, for her own purposes, she magnified into a serious plot. Charles was informed that a huguenot army was coming to surprise him, and he was obliged to be removed into a litter, in order to escape. . . . Condé was the only prince that succeeded in making his escape. The king of Navarre and the duc d'Alençon were imprisoned." The young king of Navarre "had already succeeded by his address, his frankness, and high character, in rallying to his interests the most honourable of the noblesse, who dreaded at once the perfidious Catherine and her children; who had renounced their good opinion of young Guise after the day of St. Bartholomew; and who, at the same time professing catholicism, were averse to huguenot principles and zeal. This party, called the Politiques, professed to follow the middle or neutral course, which at one time had been that of Catherine of Medici; but she had long since deserted it, and had joined in all the sanguinary and extreme measures of her son and of the Guises. Hence she was especially odious to the new and moderate party of the Politiques, among whom the family of Montmorency held the lead. Catherine feared their interference at the moment of the king's death, whilst his successor was absent in a remote kingdom; and she swelled the project of the princes' escape into a serious conspiracy, in order to be mistress of those whom she feared. . . . In this state of the court Charles IX. expired on the 30th of May, 1574, after having nominated the queen-mother to be regent during his successor's absence. . . . The career of the new king [Henry III.], while duke of Anjou, had been glorious. Raised to the command of armies at the age of 15, he displayed extreme courage as well as generalship. He had

defeated the veteran leader of the protestants at Jarnac and at Moncontour; and the fame of his exploits had contributed to place him on the elective throne of Poland, which he now occupied. Auguring from his past life, a brilliant epoch might be anticipated; and yet we enter upon the most contemptible reign, perhaps, in the annals of France. . . . Henry was obliged to run away by stealth from his Polish subjects [see POLAND: A. D. 1574-1590]. When overtaken by one of the nobles of that kingdom, the monarch, instead of pleading his natural anxiety to visit France and secure his inheritance, excused himself by drawing forth the portrait of his mistress, . . . and declared that it was love which hastened his return. At Vienna, however, Henry forgot both crown and mistress amidst the feasts that were given him; and he turned aside to Venice, to enjoy a similar reception from that rich republic. . . . The hostile parties were in the meantime arming. The Politiques, or neutral catholics, for the first time showed themselves in the field. They demanded the freedom of Cossé and of Montmorency, and at length formed a treaty of alliance with the huguenots. Henry, after indulging in the ceremony of being crowned, was obliged to lead an army into the field. Sieges were undertaken on both sides, and what is called the fifth civil war raged openly. It became more serious when the king's brother joined it. This was the duke of Alençon, a vain and fickle personage, of whom it pleased the king to become jealous. Alençon fled and joined the malcontents. The reformers, however, warred but languidly. Both parties were without active and zealous leaders; and the only notable event of this war was a skirmish in Champagne [the battle of Dormans, in which both sides lost heavily], where the duke of Guise received a slight wound in the cheek. From hence came his surname of 'Le Balafré.' In February, 1576, the king of Navarre made his escape from court. "He bent his course towards Guienne, and at Niort publicly avowed his adherence to the reformed religion, declaring that force alone had made him conform to the mass. It was about this time that the king, in lieu of leading an army against the malcontents, despatched the queen-mother, with her gay and licentious court, to win back his brother. She succeeded, though not without making large concessions [in a treaty called the 'Peace of Monsieur']. The duke of Alençon obtained Anjou, and other provinces in appanage, and henceforth was styled duke of Anjou. More favourable terms were granted to the huguenots: they were allowed ten towns of surety in lieu of six, and the appointment of a certain number of judges in the parliament. Such weakness in Henry disgusted the body of the catholics; and the private habits of his life contributed still more, if possible, than his public measures, to render him contemptible. He was continually surrounded by a set of young and idle favourites, whose affection it was to unite ferocity with frivolity. The king showed them such tender affection as he might evince towards woman; they even had the unblushing impudence to adopt feminine habits of dress; and the monarch passed his time in adorning them and himself with robes and ear-rings. . . . The indescribable tastes and amusements of Henry and his minions, as his favourites were called, . . . raised up through-

out the nation one universal cry of abhorrence and contempt."—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of France*, ch. 8-9 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: Lady Jackson, *The Last of the Valois*, v. 2, ch. 2-6.—S. Menzies, *Royal Favourites*, v. 1, ch. 5.

A. D. 1576-1585.—The rise of the League.—Its secret objects and aims.—Its alliance with Philip II. of Spain.—The Pope's Bull against Navarre and Condé.—"The famous association known as the 'Catholic League' or 'Holy Union,' took its rise from the strangely indulgent terms granted to the Huguenots by the 'Peace of Monsieur,' in April, 1576. Four years had scarcely elapsed since the bloodstained Eve of St. Bartholomew. It had been hoped that by means of that execrable crime the Reformation would have been finally crushed and extinguished in France; but instead of this, a treaty was concluded with the heretics, which placed them in a more favourable situation than they had ever occupied before. . . . It was regarded by the majority of Catholics as a wicked and cowardly betrayal of their most sacred interests. They ascribed it to its true source, namely, the hopeless incapacity of the reigning monarch, Henry III.; a prince whose monstrous vices and gross misgovernment were destined to reduce France to a state of disorganization bordering on national ruin. The idea of a general confederation of Catholics for the defence of the Faith against the inroads of heresy had been suggested by the Cardinal of Lorraine during the Council of Trent, and had been favourably entertained at the Court of Rome. The Duke of Guise was to have been placed at the head of this alliance; but his sudden death changed the face of affairs, and the project fell into abeyance. The Cardinal of Lorraine was now no more; he died at Avignon, at the age of 50, in December, 1574. . . . Henry, the third Duke of Guise, inherited in their fullest extent the ambition, the religious ardour, the lofty political aspirations, the enterprising spirit, the personal popularity, of his predecessors. The League of 1576 was conceived entirely in his interest. He was the leader naturally pointed out for such a movement;—a movement which, although its ulterior objects were at first studiously concealed, aimed in reality at substituting the family of Lorraine for that of Valois on the throne of France. The designs of the confederates, as set forth in the original manifesto which was circulated for signature, seemed at first slightly commendable, both with regard to religion and politics. According to this document, the Union was formed for three great purposes: to uphold the Catholic Church; to suppress heresy; and to maintain the honour, the authority and prerogatives of the Most Christian king and his successors. On closer examination, however, expressions were detected which hinted at less constitutional projects. . . . Their secret aims became incontestably manifest soon afterwards, when one of their confidential agents, an advocate named David, happened to die suddenly on his return from Rome, and his papers fell into the hands of the Huguenots, who immediately made them public. . . . A change of dynasty in France was the avowed object of the scheme thus disclosed. It set forth, in substance, that the Capetian monarchs were usurpers,—the throne belonging rightfully to the house of Lorraine as the lineal descendants of Charlemagne.

... The Duke of Guise, with the advice and permission of the Pope, was to imprison Henry for the rest of his days in a monastery, after the example of his ancestor Pepin when he dethroned the Merovingian Childeric. Lastly, the heir of the Carolingians was to be proclaimed King of France; and, on assuming the crown, was to make such arrangements with his Holiness as would secure the complete recognition of the sovereignty of the Vicar of Christ, by abrogating for ever the so-called 'liberties of the Gallican Church.' ... This revolutionary plot ... unhappily, was viewed with cordial sympathy, and supported with enthusiastic zeal, by many of the prelates, and a large majority of the parochial clergy, of France. ... The death of the Duke of Anjou, presumptive heir to the throne, in 1584, determined the League to immediate action. In the event of the king's dying without issue, which was most probable,—the crown would now devolve upon Henry of Bourbon [the King of Navarre], the acknowledged leader of the Huguenots. ... In January, 1585, the chiefs of the League signed a secret treaty at Joinville with the King of Spain, by which the contracting parties made common cause for the extirpation of all sects and heresies in France and the Netherlands, and for excluding from the French throne princes who were heretics, or who 'treated heretics with public impunity.' ... Liberal supplies of men and money were to be furnished to the insurgents by Philip from the moment that war should break out. ... The Leaguers lost no time in seeking for their enterprise the all-important sanction of the Holy See. For this purpose they despatched as their envoy to Rome a Jesuit named Claude Matthieu. ... The Jesuit fraternity in France had embraced with passionate ardour the anti-royalist cause. ... His Holiness [Gregory XIII.], however, was cautious and reserved. He expressed in general terms his consent to the project of taking up arms against the heretics, and granted a plenary indulgence to those who should aid in the holy work. But he declined to countenance the deposition of the king by violence. ... At length, however [September 9, 1585], Sixtus was persuaded to fulminate a bull against the King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé, in which ... both culprits, together with their heirs and posterity were pronounced for ever incapable of succeeding to the throne of France or any other dignity; their subjects and vassals were released from their oath of homage, and forbidden to obey them."—W. H. Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, v. 1, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*, ch. 21.

A. D. 1577-1578.—Rapid spread of the League.—The Sixth Civil War and the Peace of Bergerac.—Anjou in the Netherlands.—The League "spread like lightning over the whole face of France; Condé could find no footing in Picardy or even in Poitou; Henry of Navarre was refused entrance into Bordeaux itself; the heads of the League, the family-party of the Dukes of Guise, Mayenne and Nemours, seemed to carry all before them; the weak King leant towards them; the Queen Mother, intriguing ever, succeeded in separating Anjou from the Politiques, and began to seduce Damville. She hoped once more to isolate the Huguenots and to use the League to weaken and depress them. ...

The Court and the League seemed to be in perfect harmony, the King ... in a way, subscribed to the League, though the twelve articles were considerably modified before they were shown to him. ... The Leaguers had succeeded in making war [called the Sixth Civil War—1577], and winning some successes: but on their heels came the Court with fresh negotiations for peace. The heart's desire of the King was to crush the stubborn Huguenots and to destroy the moderates, but he was afraid to act; and so it came about that, though Anjou was won away from them, and compromised on the other side, and though Damville also deserted them, and though the whole party was in the utmost disorder and seemed likely to disperse, still the Court offered them such terms that in the end they seemed to have even recovered ground. Under the walls of Montpellier, Damville, the King's general, and Châtillon, the Admiral's son, at the head of the Huguenots, were actually manœuvring to begin a battle, when La Noue came up bearing tidings of peace, and at the imminent risk of being shot placed himself between the two armies, and stayed their uplifted hands. It was the Peace of Bergerac [confirmed by the Edict of Poitiers—Sept. 17, 1577], another ineffectual truce, which once more granted in the main what that of Chastenoy [or the 'Peace of Monsieur'] had already promised: it is needless to say that the League would have none of it; and partisan-warfare, almost objectless, however oppressive to the country, went on without a break: the land was overrun by adventurers and bandits, sure sign of political death. Nothing could be more brutalising or more brutal: but the savage traits of civil war are less revolting than the ghastly revelries of the Court. All the chiefs were alike—neither the King, nor Henry of Navarre, nor Anjou, nor even the strict Catholic Guise, disdained to wallow in debauch." Having quarreled with his brother, the King, "Anjou fled, in the beginning of 1578, to Angers, where, finding that there was a prospect of amusement in the Netherlands, he turned his back on the high Catholics, and renewed friendship with the Huguenot chiefs. He was invited to come to the rescue of the distressed Calvinists in their struggle against Philip, and appeared in the Netherlands in July 1578 [see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577-1581, and 1581-1584]."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France*, v. 2, pp. 370-373.

A. D. 1578-1580.—Treaty of Nérac.—The Seventh Civil War, known as the War of the Lovers.—The Peace of Fleix.—"The King, instead of availing himself of this interval of repose [after the Peace of Bergerac] to fortify himself against his enemies, only sank deeper and deeper into vice and infamy. ... The court resembled at once a slaughter-house and a brothel, although, amid all this corruption, the King was the slave of monks and Jesuits whom he implicitly obeyed. It was about this time (December 1578) that he instituted the military order of the Holy Ghost, that of St. Michael having fallen into contempt through being prostituted to unworthy objects. Meanwhile the Guises were using every effort to rekindle the war, which Catherine, on the other hand, was endeavouring to prevent. With this view she travelled, in August, into the southern provinces, and had an interview with Henry of Navarre at Nérac, bringing with her Henry's wife, her

daughter Margaret; a circumstance, however, which did not add to the pleasure of their meeting. Henry received the ladies coldly, and they retired into Languedoc, where they passed the remainder of the year. Nevertheless the negotiations were sedulously pursued; for a peace with the Hugonots was, at this time, indispensable to the Court. . . . In February 1579, a secret treaty was signed at Nérac, by which the concessions granted to the Protestants by the peace of Bergerac were much extended. . . . Catherine spent nearly the whole of the year 1579 in the south, endeavouring to avert a renewal of the war by her intrigues, rather than by a faithful observance of the peace. But the King of Navarre saw through her Italian artifices, and was prepared to summon his friends and captains at the shortest notice. The hostilities which he foresaw were not long in breaking out, and in a way that would seem impossible in any other country than France. When the King of Navarre fled from Court in 1576, he expressed his indifference for two things he had left behind, the mass and his wife; Margaret, the heroine of a thousand amours, was equally indifferent, and though they now contrived to cohabit together, it was because each connived at the infidelities of the other. Henry was in love with Mademoiselle Fosseuse, a girl of fourteen, while Margaret had taken for her gallant the young Viscount of Turenne, who had lately turned Hugonot. . . . The Duke of Anjou being at this time disposed to renew his connection with the Hugonots, Margaret served as the medium of communication between her brother and her husband; while Henry III., with a view to interrupt this good understanding, wrote to the King of Navarre to acquaint him of the intrigues of his wife with Turenne. Henry was neither surprised nor afflicted at this intelligence; but he laid the letter before the guilty parties, who both denied the charge, and Henry affected to believe their protestations. The ladies of the Court of Nérac were indignant at this act of Henry III., 'the enemy of women'; they pressed their lovers to renew hostilities against that discourteous monarch; Anjou added his instances to those of the ladies; and in 1580 ensued the war called from its origin 'la guerre des amoureux,' or war of the lovers: the seventh of what are sometimes styled the wars of 'religion'! The Prince of Condé, who lived on bad terms with his cousin, had already taken the field on his own account, and in November 1579 had seized on the little town of La Fère in Picardy. In the spring of 1580 the Protestant chiefs in the south unfurled their banners. The King of Navarre laid the foundation of his military fame by the bravery he displayed at the capture of Cahors; but on the whole the movement proved a failure. Henry III. had no fewer than three armies in the field, which were generally victorious, and the King of Navarre found himself menaced in his capital of Nérac by Marshal Biron. But Henry III., for fear of the Guises, did not wish to press the Hugonots too hard, and at length accepted the proffered mediation of the Duke of Anjou, who was at this time anxious to enter on the protectorate offered to him by the Flemings. Anjou set off for the south, accompanied by his mother and her 'flying squadron' [of seductive nymphs]; conferences were opened at the castle of Fleix in Périgord, and on November 26th 1580 a treaty was con-

cluded which was almost a literal renewal of that of Bergerac. Thus an equivocal peace, or rather truce, was re-established, which proved of some duration."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 3, ch. 8 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: Duc d'Aumale, *Hist. of the Princes de Condé*, bk. 2, ch. 1 (v. 2).

A. D. 1584-1589.—Henry of Navarre heir apparent to the throne.—Fresh hostility of the League.—The Edict of Nemours.—The Pope's *Brutum Fulmen*.—War of the Three Henrys.—Battle of Contras.—The Day of Barricades at Paris.—Assassination of Guise.—Assassination of Henry III.—"The Duc d'Anjou . . . died in 1584; Henri III. was a worn-out and feeble invalid; the reports of the doctors and the known virtue of the Queen forbade the hope of direct heirs. The King of Navarre was the eldest of the legitimate male descendants of Hugues Capet and of Saint-Louis [see BOURBON, HOUSE OF]. But on the one hand he was a relapsed heretic; on the other, his relationship to the King was so distant that he could never have been served heir to him in any civil suit. This last objection was of small account; the stringent rules which govern decisions in private affairs cannot be made applicable to matters affecting the tranquillity and well-being of nations. . . . His religion was the only pretext on which Navarre could be excluded. France was, and wished to remain, Catholic; she could not submit to a Protestant King. The managers of the League understood that this very wide-spread and even strongly cherished feeling might some day become a powerful lever, but that, in order to use it, it was very needful for them to avoid offending the national amour-propre; and they thought that they had succeeded in finding the means of effecting their object. Next to Navarre, the eldest of the Royal House was his uncle the Cardinal de Bourbon; the Guises acknowledged him as heir to the throne and first Prince of the Blood, under the protection of the Pope and of the King of Spain. . . . The feeble-minded old man, whom no one respected, was a mere phantom, and could offer no serious resistance, when it should be convenient to set him aside. . . . In every class throughout the nation the majority were anxious to maintain at once French unity and Catholic unity, disliking the Reformation, but equally opposed to ultramontane pretensions and to Spanish ambition. . . . But . . . this great party, already named the 'parti politique,' hung loosely together without a leader, and without a policy. For the present it was paralyzed by the contempt in which the King was held; while the dislike which was entertained for the religious opinions of the rightful heir to the throne seemed to deprive it of all hope for the future. Henry III. stood in need of the assistance of the King of Navarre; he would willingly have cleared away the obstacle which kept them apart, and he made an overture with a view to bring back that Prince to the Catholic religion. But these efforts could not be successful. The change of creed on the part of the Béarnais was to be a satisfaction offered to France, the pledge of a fresh agreement between the nation and his race, and not a concession to the threats of enemies. He was not an unbeliever; still less was he a hypocrite; but he was placed between two fanatical parties, and repelled by the excesses of both; so he doubted,

honestly doubted, and as his religious indecision was no secret, his conversion at the time of which we are now speaking would have been ascribed to the worst motives." As it was, he found it necessary to quiet disturbing rumors with regard to the proposals of the King by permitting a plain account of what had occurred to be made public. "Henry III., having no other answer to make to this publication, which justified all the complaints of the Catholics, replied to it by the treaty of Nemours and by the edict of July [1585]. These two acts annulled all the edicts in favour of toleration; and placed at the disposal of the League all the resources and all the forces of the monarchy." Soon afterwards the Pope issued against Navarre and Condé his bull of excommunication. By this "the Pontiff did not deprive the Bourbons of a single friend, and did not give the slightest fresh ardour to their opponents; but he produced a powerful reaction among a portion of the clergy, among the magistracy, among all the Royalists; wounded the national sensibility, consolidated that union between the two Princes which he wished to break off, and rallied the whole of the Reformed party round their leaders. The Protestant pamphleteers replied with no less vehemence, and gave to the Pontiff's bull that name of 'Brutum fulmen' by which it is still known. . . . Still the sentence launched from the Vatican had had one very decided result—it had fired the train of powder; war broke out at once."—Duc d'Aumale, *Hist. of the Princes of Condé*, bk. 2, ch. 1.—"The war, called from the three leading actors in it [Henry of Valois, Henry of Navarre, and Henry of Guise] the War of the Three Henrys, now opened in earnest. Seven powerful armies were marshalled on the part of the King of France and the League. The Huguenots were weak in numbers, but strong in the quality of their troops. An immense body of German 'Reiter' had been enrolled to act as an auxiliary force, and for some time had been hovering on the frontiers. Hearing that at last they had entered France, Henry of Navarre set out from Rochelle to effect a junction with them. The Duke of Joyeuse, one of the French King's chief favourites, who had the charge of the army that occupied the midland counties, resolved to prevent their junction. By a rapid movement he succeeded in crossing the line of Henry's march and forcing him into action. The two armies came in front of each other on a plain near the village of Coutras, on the 19th of October, 1587. The Royalist army numbered from 10,000 to 12,000, the Huguenot from 6,000 to 7,000—the usual disparity in numbers; but Henry's skilful disposition did more than compensate for his numerical inferiority. . . . The struggle lasted but an hour, yet within that hour the Catholic army lost 3,000 men, more than 400 of whom were members of the first families in the kingdom; 3,000 men were made prisoners. Not more than a third part of their entire army escaped. The Huguenots lost only about 200 men. . . . Before night fell he [Navarre] wrote a few lines to the French King, which run thus: 'Sire, my Lord and Brother,—Thank God, I have beaten your enemies and your army.' It was but too true that the poor King's worst enemies were to be found in the very armies that were marshalled in his name."—W. Hanna, *The Wars of the Huguenots*, ch. 6.—"The victory [at Coutras] had only a moral effect.

Henry lost time by going to lay at the feet of the Countess of Grammont the flags taken from the enemy. Meantime the Duke of Guise, north of the Loire, triumphed over the Germans under the Baron of Dohna at Vimory, near Montargis, and again near Auneau (1587). Henry III. was unskilful enough to leave to his rival the glory of driving them out of the country. Henry III. re-entered Paris. As he passed along, the populace cried out, 'Saul has killed his thousands, and David his ten thousands'; and a few days after, the Sorbonne decided that 'the government could be taken out of the hands of princes who were found incapable.' Henry III., alarmed, forbade the Duke of Guise to come to Paris, and quartered in the faubourgs 4,000 Swiss and several companies of the guards. The Sixteen [chiefs of sixteen sections of Paris, who controlled the League in that city] feared that all was over; they summoned the 'Balafre' and he came [May 9, 1588]. Cries of 'Hosannah to the Son of David!' resounded throughout Paris, and followed him to the Louvre. . . . The king and the chief of the League fortified themselves, one in the Louvre, the other in the Hôtel Guise. Negotiations were carried on for two days. On the morning of the 11th the duke, well attended, returned to the Louvre, and in loud tones demanded of the king that he should send away his counsellors, establish the Inquisition, and push to the utmost the war against the heretics. That evening the king ordered the companies of the city guards to hold several positions, and the next morning he introduced into the city the Swiss and 2,000 men of the French guards. But the city guards failed him. In two hours all Paris was under arms, all the streets were rendered impassable, and the advancing barricades soon reached the positions occupied by the troops [whence the insurrection became known as 'the Day of Barricades']. At this juncture Guise came out of his hôtel, dressed in a white doublet, with a small cane in his hand; saved the Swiss, who were on the point of being massacred, sent them back to the king with insulting scorn, and quieted everything as if by magic. He demanded the office of lieutenant-general of the kingdom for himself, the convocation of the States at Paris, the forfeiture of the Bourbons, and, for his friends, provincial governments and all the other offices. The queen-mother debated these conditions for three hours. During this time the attack was suspended, and Henry III. was thus enabled to leave the Louvre and make his escape. The Duke of Guise had made a mistake; but if he did not have the king, he had Paris. There was now a king of Paris and a king of France; negotiations were carried on, and to the astonishment of all, Henry III. at length granted what two months before he had refused in front of the barricades. He swore that he would not lay down his arms until the heretics were entirely exterminated; declared that any non-Catholic prince forfeited his rights to the throne, appointed the Duke of Guise lieutenant-general, and convoked the States at Blois [October, 1588]. The States of Blois were composed entirely of Leaguers," and were wholly controlled by the Duke of Guise. The latter despised the king too much to give heed to repeated warnings which he received of a plot against his life. Summoned to a private interview in the royal cabinet, at an early hour on the morning of the 23d of December,

he did not hesitate to present himself, boldly, alone, and was murdered as he entered, by eight of the king's body-guard, whom Henry III. had personally ordered to commit the crime. "Killing the Duke of Guise was not killing the League. At the news of his death Paris was stunned for a moment; then its fury broke forth. . . . The Sorbonne decreed 'that the French people were set free from the oath of allegiance taken to Henry III.' . . . Henry III. had gained nothing by the murder; . . . but he had helped the fortunes of the king of Navarre, into whose arms he was forced to cast himself. . . . The junction of the Protestant and the royal armies under the same standard completely changed the nature of the war. It was no longer feudal Protestantism, but the democratic League, which threatened royalty; monarchy entered into a struggle with the Catholic masses in revolt against it. Henry III. called together, at Tours, his useless Parliament, and issued a manifesto against Mayenne and the chiefs of the League. Henry of Navarre carried on the war energetically. In two months he was master of the territory between the Loire and the Seine, and 15,000 Swiss and lanzknechts joined him. On the evening of July 30th, 1589, the two kings, with 40,000 men, appeared before Paris. The Parisians could see the long line of the enemies' fires gleaming in a vast semicircle on the left bank of the Seine. The king of Navarre established his headquarters at Meudon; Henry III. at Saint-Cloud. The great city was astounded; the people had lost energy; but the fury was concentrated in the hearts of the chiefs and in the depths of the cloisters. . . . The arm of a fanatic became the instrument of the general fury, and put into practice the doctrine of tyrannicide more than once asserted in the schools and the pulpit. The assault was to be made on August 2d. On the morning of the previous day a young friar from the convent of the Dominicans, Jacques Clément, came out from Paris," obtained access to the king by means of a forged letter, and stabbed him in the abdomen, being, himself, slain on the spot by the royal guards. Henry III. "died the same night, and with him the race of Valois became extinct. The aged Catherine de' Medici had died six months before."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of France (abridged)*, ch. 45.

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France, 16th and 17th Centuries*, ch. 22-25.—W. S. Browning, *Hist. of the Huguenots*, ch. 35-42.

A. D. 1585.—Proffered sovereignty of the United Netherlands declined by Henry III. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1585-1586.

A. D. 1589-1590.—Henry of Navarre as Henry IV. of France.—His retreat to Normandy.—The battles at Arques.—Battle of Ivry.—"On being made aware that all hope was over, this King [Henry III.], whose life had been passed in folly, vanity and sensuality . . . prepared for death like a patriot king and a martyr. He summoned his nobles to his bedside, and told them that his only regret in dying was that he left the kingdom in disorder, and as the best mode of remedying the evil he recommended them to recognize the King of Navarre, to whom the kingdom belonged of right; making no account of the religious difference, because that king, with his sincere and earnest nature, must finally return to the bosom of the Church. Then turn-

ing to Henry, he solemnly warned him: 'Cousin,' he said, 'I assure you that you will never be King of France if you do not become Catholic, and if you do not make your peace with the Church.' Directly afterwards he breathed his last, reciting the 'Miserere.' This account is substantially confirmed by Perefex. According to Sully, Henry, hearing that the King had been stabbed, started for St. Cloud, attended by Sully, but did not arrive till he was dead; and D'Aubigny says: 'When the King of Navarre entered the chamber where the body was lying, he saw amidst the howlings some pulling their hats down upon their brows, or throwing them on the ground, clenching their fists, plotting, clasping each other's hands, making vows and promises.' . . . Henry's situation was embarrassing in the extreme, for only a small number of the Catholic nobles gave in an unqualified adhesion: a powerful body met and dictated the conditions upon which alone they would consent to his being proclaimed King of France: the two first being that within six months he would cause himself to be instructed in the Holy Catholic Apostolic Faith; and that during this interval he would nominate no Huguenot to offices of State. He replied that he was no bigot, and would readily seek instruction in the tenets of the Romish faith, but declined pledging himself to any description of exclusion or intolerance. M. Guadet computes that nine-tenths of his French subjects were Catholic, and the temper of the majority may be inferred from what was taking place in Paris, where the news of the late King's death was the signal for the most unseemly rejoicing. . . . Far from being in a condition to reduce the refractory Parisians, Henry was obliged to abandon the siege, and retire towards Normandy, where the expected succours from England might most easily reach him. Sully says that this retreat was equally necessary for the safety of his person and the success of his affairs. He was temporarily abandoned by several of the Huguenot leaders, who, serving at their own expense, were obliged from time to time to go home to recruit their finances and their followers. Others were made lukewarm by the prospect of his becoming Catholic; so that he was no longer served with enthusiasm by either party; and when, after making the best arrangements in his power, he entered Normandy, he had with him only 3,000 French foot, two regiments of Swiss and 1,200 horse; with which, after being joined by the Duc de Montpensier with 200 gentlemen and 1,500 foot, he drew near to Rouen, relying on a secret understanding within the walls which might give him possession of the place. Whilst preparations were making for the siege, sure intelligence was brought that the Duc de Mayenne was seeking him with an army exceeding 30,000; but, resolved to make head against them till the last extremity, Henry entrenched himself before Arques, which was only accessible by a causeway." A series of engagements ensued, beginning September 15, 1589; but finding that he could not dislodge his antagonist, Mayenne withdrew after some ten days of fighting, moving his army towards Picardy and leaving the road to Paris open. "Being too weak to recommence the siege or to occupy the city if taken by assault, Henry resolved to give the Parisians a sample of what they might expect if they persevered in their contumacy, and gave orders for

attacking all the suburbs at once. They were taken and sacked. Davila states that the plunder was so abundant that the whole camp was wonderfully relieved and sustained." From this attack on the Parisian suburbs, Henry proceeded to Tours, where he held his court for a time. Early in March, 1590, he laid siege to Dreux. "The Duc de Mayenne, reinforced by Spanish troops from the Low Countries under Count Egmont, left Paris to effect a diversion, and somewhat unexpectedly found himself compelled to accept the battle which was eagerly pressed upon him. This was the renowned battle of Ivry. The armies presented much the same contrast as at Coutras. The numerical superiority on one side, the Catholic, was more than compensated by the quality of the troops on the other. Henry's soldiers, as described by De Thou, were armed to the teeth. 'They displayed neither scarf nor decoration, but their accoutrements inspired grim terror. The army of the Duc, on the contrary, was magnificent in equipment. The officers wore bright-coloured scarves, while gold glittered upon their helmets and lances.' The two armies were confronted on the 13th of March, 1590, but it was getting dark before the dispositions were completed, and the battle was deferred till the following morning. The King passed the night like Henry V. at Agincourt, and took only a short rest in the open air on the field. . . . At daybreak he mounted his horse, and rode from rank to rank, pausing from time to time to utter a brief exhortation or encouragement. Prayers were offered up by the Huguenot ministers at the head of each division, and the bishop [Perefixe] gives the concluding words of that in which Divine aid was invoked by the King: 'But, Lord, if it has pleased Thee to dispose otherwise, or Thou seest that I ought to be one of those kings whom Thou punishest in Thy wrath, grant that I may be this day the victim of Thy Holy will: so order it that my death may deliver France from the calamities of war, and that my blood be the last shed in this quarrel.' Then, putting on his helmet with the white plume, before closing the vizor, he addressed the collected leaders:— 'My friends, if you share my fortune this day, I also share yours. I am resolved to conquer or to die with you. Keep your ranks firmly, I beg; if the heat of the combat compels you to quit them, think always of the rally; it is the gaining of the battle. You will make it between the three trees which you see there [pointing to three pear-trees on an eminence], and if you lose your ensigns, pennons and banners, do not lose sight of my white plume: you will find it always on the road of honour and victory.' It so chanced that his white plume was the actual rallying-point at the most critical moment. . . . His standard-bearer fell: a page bearing a white pennon was struck down at his side; and the rumour was beginning to spread that he himself was killed, when the sight of his bay horse and white plume, with the animating sound of his voice, gave fresh courage to all around and brought the bravest of his followers to the front. The result is told in one of his own missives. After stating that the battle began between 11 and 12, he continues: 'In less than an hour, after having discharged all their anger in two or three charges which they made and sustained, all their cavalry began to shift for themselves, abandoning their infantry, which

was very numerous. Seeing which, their Swiss appealed to my pity and surrendered—colonels, captains, soldiers, and colours. The lansquenets and French had no time to form this resolution, for more than 1,200 were cut to pieces, and the rest dispersed into the woods at the mercy of the peasants.' He urged on the pursuers, crying 'Spare the French, and down with the foreigners.' . . . Instead of pushing on towards Paris, which it was thought would have opened its gates to a conqueror in the flush of victory, Henry lingered at Mantes, where he improvised a Court, which his female favourites were summoned to attend."—*Henry IV. of France* (*Quarterly Rev.*, Oct., 1879).

ALSO IN: H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, ch. 11 (v. 2).—Duke of Sully, *Memoirs*, bk. 3 (v. 1).—G. P. R. James, *Life of Henry IV.*, bk. 11-12 (v. 2).

A. D. 1590.—The siege of Paris and its horrors.—Relief at the hands of the Spaniards under Parma.—Readiness of the League to give the crown to Philip II.—"The king, yielding to the councils of Biron and other Catholics, declined attacking the capital, and preferred waiting the slow, and in his circumstances eminently hazardous, operations of a regular siege. . . . Whatever may have been the cause of the delay, it is certain that the golden fruit of victory was not plucked, and that although the confederate army had rapidly dissolved, in consequence of their defeat, the king's own forces manifested as little cohesion. And now began that slow and painful siege, the details of which are as terrible, but as universally known, as those of any chapters in the blood-stained history of the century. Henry seized upon the towns guarding the rivers Seine and Marne, twin nurses of Paris. By controlling the course of those streams as well as that of the Yonne and Oise—especially by taking firm possession of Lagny on the Marne, whence a bridge led from the Isle of France to the Brie country—great thoroughfare of wine and corn—and of Corbeil at the junction of the little river Essonne with the Seine—it was easy in that age to stop the vital circulation of the imperial city. By midsummer, Paris, unquestionably the first city of Europe at that day, was in extremities. . . . Rarely have men at any epoch defended their fatherland against foreign oppression with more heroism than that which was manifested by the Parisians of 1590 in resisting religious toleration, and in obeying a foreign and priestly despotism. Men, women, and children cheerfully laid down their lives by thousands in order that the papal legate and the king of Spain might trample upon that legitimate sovereign of France who was one day to become the idol of Paris and of the whole kingdom. A census taken at the beginning of the siege had showed a population of 200,000 souls, with a sufficiency of provisions, it was thought, to last one month. But before the terrible summer was over—so completely had the city been invested—the bushel of wheat was worth 360 crowns. . . . The flesh of horses, asses, dogs, cats, rats, had become rare luxuries. There was nothing cheap, said a citizen bitterly, but sermons. And the priests and monks of every order went daily about the streets, preaching fortitude in that great resistance to heresy. . . . Trustworthy eye-witnesses of those dreadful days have placed the number of the dead during

the summer at 30,000. . . . The hideous details of the most dreadful sieges recorded in ancient or modern times were now reproduced in Paris. . . . The priests . . . persuaded the populace that it was far more righteous to kill their own children, if they had no food to give them, than to obtain food by recognizing a heretic king. It was related, too, and believed, that in some instances mothers had salted the bodies of their dead children and fed upon them, day by day, until the hideous repast would no longer support their own life. . . . The bones of the dead were taken in considerable quantities from the cemeteries, ground into flour, baked into bread, and consumed. It was called Madame Montpensier's cake, because the duchess earnestly proclaimed its merits to the poor Parisians. 'She was never known to taste it herself, however,' bitterly observed one who lived in Paris through that horrible summer. She was right to abstain, for all who ate of it died. . . . Lansquenets and other soldiers, mad with hunger and rage, when they could no longer find dogs to feed on, chased children through the streets, and were known in several instances to kill and devour them on the spot. . . . Such then was the condition of Paris during that memorable summer of tortures. What now were its hopes of deliverance out of this Gehenna? The trust of Frenchmen was in Philip of Spain, whose legions, under command of the great Italian chieftain [Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma, commander of the Spanish forces in the Netherlands], were daily longed for to save them from rendering obedience to their lawful prince. For even the king of straw—the imprisoned cardinal [Cardinal de Bourbon, whom the League had proclaimed king, under the title of Charles X., on the death of Henry III.]—was now dead, and there was not even the effigy of any other sovereign than Henry of Bourbon to claim authority in France. Mayenne, in the course of long interviews with the Duke of Parma at Condé and Brussels, had expressed his desire to see Philip king of France, and had promised his best efforts to bring about such a result." Parma, who was struggling hard with the obstinate revolt in the Netherlands, having few troops and little money to pay them with, received orders from his Spanish master to relieve Paris and conquer France. He obeyed the command to the best of his abilities. He left the Netherlands at the beginning of August, with 12,000 foot and 3,000 horse; effected a junction with Mayenne at Meaux, ten leagues from Paris, on the 22d, and the united armies—5,000 cavalry and 18,000 foot—arrived at Chelles on the last day of summer. "The two great captains of the age had at last met face to face. . . . The scientific duel which was now to take place was likely to task the genius and to bring into full display the peculiar powers and defects of the two." The winner in the duel was the Duke of Parma, who foiled Henry's attempts to bring him to battle, while he captured Lagny under the king's eyes. "The bridges of Charenton and St. Maur now fell into Farnese's hands without a contest. In an incredibly short space of time provisions and munitions were poured into the starving city, 2,000 boat-loads arriving in a single day. Paris was relieved. Alexander had made his demonstration and solved the problem. . . . The king was now in worse plight than ever. His army fell to pieces. His cava-

liers, cheated of their battle, and having neither food nor forage, rode off by hundreds every day." He made one last attempt, by a midnight assault on the city, but it failed. Then he followed the Spaniards—whom Parma led back to the Netherlands early in November—but could not bring about a battle or gain any important advantage. But Paris, without the genius of Alexander Farnese in its defence, was soon reduced to as complete a blockade as before. Lagny was recovered by the besieging royalists, the Seine and the Marne were again fast-locked, and the rebellious capital deprived of supplies. —J. L. Motley, *Hist. of the United Netherlands*, ch. 23 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: M. W. Freer, *Hist. of the Reign of Henry IV.*, bk. 1.—C. D. Yonge, *Hist. of France under the Bourbons*, ch. 2.

A. D. 1591-1593.—The siege of Rouen and Parma's second interference.—General advancement of Henry's cause.—Restiveness of the Catholics.—The King's abjuration of Protestantism.—"It seemed as if Henri IV. had undertaken the work of Penelope. After each success, fresh difficulties arose to render it fruitless. . . . Now it was the Swiss who refused to go on without their pay; or Elizabeth who exacted seaports in return for fresh supplies; or the Catholics who demanded the conversion of the King; or the Protestants who complained of not being protected. Depressed spirits had to be cheered, some to be satisfied, others to be reassured or restrained, allies to be managed, and all to be done with very little money and without any sacrifice of the national interests. Henri was equal to all, both to war and to diplomacy, to great concerns and to small. . . . His pen was as active as his sword. The collection of his letters is full of the most charming notes. . . . Public opinion, which was already influential and thirsting for news, was not neglected. Every two or three months a little publication entitled 'A Discourse,' or 'An Authentic Narrative,' or 'Account of all that has occurred in the King's Army,' was circulated widely. . . . Thus it was that by means of activity, patience, and tact, Henri IV. was enabled to retrieve his fortunes and to rally his party; so that by the end of the year 1591, he found himself in a position to undertake an important operation. . . . The King laid siege to Rouen in December, 1591. He was at the head of the most splendid army he had ever commanded; it numbered upwards of 25,000 men. This was not too great a number; for the fortifications were strong, the garrison numerous, well commanded by Villars, and warmly supported by the townspeople. The siege had lasted for some months when the King learned that Mayenne had at last made the Duke of Parma to understand the necessity of saving Rouen at all hazards. Thirty thousand Spanish and French Leaguers had just arrived on the Somme. Rouen, however, was at the last gasp; Henri could not make up his mind to throw away the fruits of so much toil and trouble; he left all his infantry under the walls, under the command of Biron, and marched off with his splendid cavalry." He attacked the enemy imprudently, near Aumale, February 5, met with a repulse, was wounded and just missed being taken prisoner in a precipitate retreat. But both armies were half paralyzed at this time by dissensions among their chiefs. That of the

Leaguers fell back to the Somme; but in April it approached Rouen again, and Parma was able, despite all Henri's efforts, to enter the town. This last check to the King "was the signal for a general desertion. Henri, left with only a small corps of regular troops and a few gentlemen, was obliged to retire rapidly upon Pont de l'Arche. The Duke of Parma did not follow him. Always vigilant, he wished before everything to establish himself on the Lower Seine, and laid siege to Caudebec, which was not likely to detain him long. But he received during that operation a severe wound, which compelled him to hand over the command to Mayenne." The incompetence of the latter soon lost all the advantages which Parma had gained. Henri's supporters rallied around him again almost as quickly as they had dispersed. "The Leaguers were pushed back upon the Seine and confined in the heart of the Pays de Caux. They were without provisions; Mayenne was at his wits' end; he had to resort for suggestions and for orders to the bed of suffering on which the Duke of Parma was held down by his wound." The great Italian soldier, dying though he was, as the event soon proved, directed operations which baffled the keen watchfulness and penetration of his antagonist, and extricated his army without giving to Henri the chance for battle which he sought. The Spanish army retired to Flemish territory. In the meantime, Henri's cause was being advanced in the north-east of his kingdom by the skill and valor of Turenne, then beginning his great career, and experiencing vicissitudes in the southeast, where Lesdiguières was contending with the mercenaries of the Pope and the Duke of Savoy, as well as with his countrymen of the League. He had defeated them with awful slaughter at Pontcharra, September 19, 1591, and he carried the war next year into the territories of the Duke of Savoy, seeking help from the Italian Waldenses which he does not seem to have obtained. "Nevertheless the king had still some formidable obstacles to overcome. Three years had run their course since he had promised to become instructed in the Catholic religion, and there were no signs as yet that he was preparing to fulfil this undertaking. The position in which he found himself, and the importance and activity of his military operations, had hitherto been a sufficient explanation of his delay. But the war had now changed its character. The King had gained brilliant successes. There was no longer any large army in the field against him. Nothing seemed to be now in the way to hinder him from fulfilling his promise. And yet he always evaded it. He had to keep on good terms with Elizabeth and the Protestants; he wished to make his abjuration the occasion for an agreement with the Court of Rome, which took no steps to smooth over his difficulties; and lastly, he shrank from taking a step which is always painful when it is not the fruit of honest conviction. This indecision doubled the ardour of his enemies, prevented fresh adhesions, discouraged and divided his old followers. . . . A third party, composed of bishops and Royalist noblemen, drew around the cousins of Henri IV., the Cardinal de Vendôme and the Comte de Soissons. . . . The avowed object of this third party was to raise one of these two Princes to the throne, if the Head of their House did not forthwith enter the bosom of the Catholic Church. And finally, the deputies

of the cities and provinces who had been called to Paris by Mayenne were assembling there for the election of a king. 'The Satire of Ménippée' has handed down the States of the League to immortal ridicule; but however decried that assembly has been, and deserved to be, it decided the conversion of Henri IV.: he does not attempt in his despatches to deny this. . . . In order to take away every excuse for such an election, he entered at once into conference with the Catholic theologians. After some very serious discussion, much deeper than a certain saying which has become a proverb [that 'Paris is certainly worth a Mass'] would seem to imply, he abjured the Protestant religion on the 25th of July, 1593, before the Archbishop of Bourges. The League had received its death-blow."—Duc d'Aumale, *Hist. of the Princes de Condé*, bk. 2, ch. 2 (v. 2).—"The news of the abjuration produced in the minds of honest men, far and near, the most painful impression. Politicians might applaud an act intended to conciliate the favor of the great majority of the nation, and extol the astuteness of the king in choosing the most opportune moment for his change of religion—the moment when he would secure the support of the Roman Catholics, fatigued by the length of the war and too eager for peace to question very closely the sincerity of the king's motives, without forfeiting the support of the Huguenots. But men of conscience, judging Henry's conduct by a standard of morality immutable and eternal, passed a severe sentence of condemnation upon the most flagrant instance of a betrayal of moral convictions which the age had known."—H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, ch. 13 (v. 2).—"What the future history of France would have been if Henry had clung to his integrity, is known only to the Omniscient; but, with the annals of France in our hands, we have no difficulty in perceiving that the day of his impious, because pretended conversion, was among the 'dies nefasti' of his country. It restored peace indeed to that bleeding land, and it gave to himself an undisputed reign of seventeen years; but he found them years replete with cares and terrors, and disgraced by many shameful vices, and at last abruptly terminated by the dagger of an assassin. It rescued France, indeed, from the evils of a disputed succession, but it consigned her to two centuries of despotism and misgovernment. It transmitted the crown, indeed, to seven in succession of the posterity of Henry; but of them one died on the scaffold, three were deposed by insurrections of their subjects, one has left a name pursued by unmitigated and undying infamy, and another lived and died in a monastic melancholy, the feeble slave of his own minister."—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France*, lect. 16.

ALSO IN: P. F. Willert, *Henry of Navarre and the Huguenots of France*, ch. 5-6.

A. D. 1593-1598.—Henry's winning of Paris. —The first attempt upon his life.—Expulsion of Jesuits from Paris.—War with Spain.—The Peace of Vervins.—"A truce of three months had been agreed upon [August 1, 1593], during which many nobles and several important towns made their submissions to the King. Many, however, still held out for the League, and among them Paris, as well as Rheims, by ancient usage the city appropriated to the coronation of the kings of France. Henry IV. deemed that

ceremony indispensable to sanctify his cause in the eyes of the people, and he therefore caused it to be performed at Chartres by the bishop of that place, February 27th 1594. But he could hardly look upon himself as King of France so long as Paris remained in the hands of a faction which disputed his right, and he therefore strained every nerve to get possession of that capital. . . . As he wished to get possession of the city without bloodshed, he determined to attempt it by corrupting the commandant. This was Charles de Cosse, Count of Brissac. . . . Henry promised Brissac, as the price of his admission into Paris, the sum of 200,000 crowns and an annual pension of 20,000, together with the governments of Corbeil and Mantes, and the continuance to him of his marshal's bâton. To the Parisians was offered an amnesty from which only criminals were to be excepted; the confirmation of all their privileges; and the prohibition of the Protestant worship within a radius of ten leagues. . . . Before daybreak on the morning of the 22nd March 1594 Brissac opened the gates of Paris to Henry's troops, who took possession of the city without resistance, except at one of the Spanish guard-houses, where a few soldiers were killed. When all appeared quiet, Henry himself entered, and was astonished at being greeted with joyous cheers. . . . He gave manifold proofs of forbearance and good temper, fulfilled all the conditions of his agreement, and allowed the Spaniards [4,000] to withdraw unmolested." In May, 1594, Henry laid siege to Laon, which surrendered in August. "Its example was soon followed by Chateau Thierry, Amlens, Cambrai and Noyon. The success of the King induced the Duke of Lorraine and the Duke of Guise to make their peace with him." In November, an attempt to kill the King was made by a young man named Jean Chatel, who confessed that he attended the schools of the Jesuits. "All the members of that order were arrested, and their papers examined. One of them, named Jean Guignard, on whom was found a treatise approving the murder of Henry III., and maintaining that his successor deserved a like fate, was condemned to the gallows: and the remainder of the order were banished from Paris, January 8th 1595, as corrupters of youth and enemies of the state. This example, however, was followed only by a few of the provincial cities. The irritation caused by this event seems to have precipitated Henry IV. into a step which he had been some time meditating: a declaration of war against his ancient and most bitter enemy Philip II. (January 17th 1595). The King of Spain, whom the want of money had prevented from giving the League much assistance during the two preceding years, was stung into fury by this challenge; and he immediately ordered Don Fernando de Velasco, constable of Castile, to join Mayenne in Franche Comté with 10,000 men. Velasco, however, was no great captain, and little of importance was done. The only action worth mentioning is an affair of cavalry at Fontaine Française (June 6th 1595), in which Henry displayed his usual bravery, or rather rashness, but came off victorious. He then overran nearly all Franche Comté without meeting with any impediment from Velasco, but retired at the instance of the Swiss, who entreated him to respect the neutrality of that province. Meanwhile Henry had made advances to Mayenne,

who was disgusted with Velasco and the Spaniards, and on the 25th September Mayenne, in the name of the League, signed with the King a truce of three months, with a view to regulate the conditions of future submission. An event had already occurred which placed Henry in a much more favourable position with his Roman Catholic subjects; he had succeeded [September, 1595] in effecting his reconciliation with the Pope. . . . The war on the northern frontiers had not been going on so favourably for the King." In January, 1595, "Philip II. ordered the Spaniard Fuentes, who, till the arrival of Albert [the Archduke], conducted the government of the Netherlands, to invade the north of France; and Fuentes . . . having left Mondragone with sufficient forces to keep Prince Maurice in check, set off with 15,000 men, with the design of recovering Cambrai. Catelet and Doullens yielded to his arms; Ham was betrayed to him by the treachery of the governor, and in August Fuentes sat down before Cambrai. . . . The Duke of Anjou had made over that place to his mother, Catherine de' Medici, who had appointed Balagni to be governor of it. During the civil wars of France, Balagni had established himself there as a little independent sovereign, and called himself Prince of Cambrai; but after the discomfiture of the League he had been compelled to declare himself, and had acknowledged his allegiance to the King of France. His extortion and tyranny having rendered him detested by the inhabitants, they . . . delivered Cambrai to the Spaniards, October 2nd. Fuentes then returned into the Netherlands. . . . The Cardinal Archduke Albert arrived at Brussels in February 1596, when Fuentes resigned his command. . . . Henry IV. had been engaged since the winter in the siege of La Fère, a little town in a strong situation at the junction of the Serre and Oise. He had received reinforcements from England as well as from Germany and Holland. . . . Albert marched to Valenciennes with about 20,000 men, with the avowed intention of relieving La Fère; but instead of attempting that enterprise, he despatched De Rosne, a French renegade . . . with the greater part of the forces, to surprise Calais; and that important place was taken by assault, April 17th, before Henry could arrive for its defence. La Fère surrendered May 22nd; and Henry then marched with his army towards the coast of Picardy, where he endeavoured, but in vain, to provoke the Spaniards to give him battle. After fortifying Calais and Ardres, Albert withdrew again into the Netherlands. . . . Elizabeth, alarmed at the occupation by the Spaniards of a port which afforded such facilities for the invasion of England, soon afterwards concluded another offensive and defensive alliance with Henry IV. (May 24th), in which the contracting parties pledged themselves to make no separate peace or truce with Philip II." The Dutch joined in this treaty; but the Protestant princes of Germany refused to become parties to it. "The treaty, however, had little effect." Early in 1597, the Spaniards dealt Henry an alarming blow, by surprising and capturing the city of Amiens, gaining access to it by an ingenious stratagem. But Henry recovered the place in September, after a vigorous siege. He also put down a rising, under the Duke de Merceur, in Brittany, defeating the rebels at Dinan, while his lieutenant, Lesdiguières, in the

southeast, invaded Savoy once more, taking Maurienne, and paralyzing the hostile designs of its Duke. The malignant Spanish king, suffering and near his end, discouraged and tired of the war, now sought to make peace. Both the Dutch and the English refused to treat with him; but Henry IV., notwithstanding the pledges given in 1596 to his allies, entered into negotiations which resulted in the Treaty of Vervins, signed May 2, 1598. "By the Peace of Vervins the Spaniards restored to France Calais, Ardres, Doullens, La Capelle, and Le Câtelet in Picardy, and Blavet (Port Louis) in Brittany, of all their conquests retaining only the citadel of Cambrai. The rest of the conditions were referred to the treaty of Câteau-Cambrésis, which Henry had stipulated should form the basis of the negotiations. The Duke of Savoy was included in the peace." While this important treaty was pending, in April, 1598, Henry quieted the anxieties of his Huguenot subjects by the famous Edict of Nantes.—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 3, ch. 10-11 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: Lady Jackson, *The First of the Bourbons*, v. 1, ch. 14-18, and v. 2, ch. 1-7.—J. L. Motley, *Hist. of the United Netherlands*, ch. 29-35 (v. 3).—R. Watson, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II.*, bk. 23-24.

A. D. 1598-1599.—The Edict of Nantes.—For the purpose of receiving the submission of the Duke of Mercœur and the Breton insurgents, the king proceeded down the Loire, and "reached the capital of Brittany, the commercial city of Nantes, on the 11th of April, 1598. Two days later he signed the edict which has come to be known as the Edict of Nantes [and which had been under discussion for some months with representatives of a Protestant assembly in session at Châtellerault]. . . . The Edict of Nantes is a long and somewhat complicated document. Besides the edict proper, contained in 95 public articles, there is a further series of 56 'secret' articles, and a 'brevet' or patent of the king, all of which were signed on the 13th of April; and these documents are supplemented by a second set of 23 'secret' articles, dated on the last day of the same month. The first of these four papers is expressly declared to be a 'perpetual and irrevocable edict.' . . . Our chief concern being with the fortunes of the Huguenots, the provisions for the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic worship, wherever in the course of the events of the last 30 years that worship had been interfered with or banished, need not claim our attention. For the benefit of the Protestants the cardinal concession was liberty to dwell anywhere in the royal dominions, without being subjected to inquiry, vexed, molested, or constrained to do anything contrary to their conscience. As respects public worship, while perfect equality was not established, the dispositions were such as to bring it within the power of a Protestant in any part of the kingdom to meet his fellow-believers for the holiest of acts, at least from time to time. To every Protestant nobleman enjoying that extensive authority known as 'haute justice,' and to noblemen in Normandy distinguished as possessors of 'fiefs de haubert,' the permission was granted to have religious services on all occasions and for all comers at their principal residence, as well as on other lands whenever they themselves were present. Noblemen of inferior jurisdiction were allowed to have worship on

their estates, but only for themselves and their families. In addition to these seigniorial rights, the Protestant 'people' received considerable accessions to the cities where they might meet for public religious purposes. The exercise of their worship was authorized in all cities and places where such worship had been held on several occasions in the years 1596 and 1597, up to the month of August; and in all places in which worship had been, or ought to have been, established in accordance with the Edict of 1577 [the edict of Poitiers—see above: A. D. 1577-1578], as interpreted by the Conference of Nérac and the Peace of Fleix [see above: A. D. 1578-1580]. But in addition to these, a fresh gift of a second city in every bailiwick and sénéchaussée of the kingdom greatly increased the facilities enjoyed by the scattered Huguenots for reaching the assemblies of their fellow-believers. . . . Scholars of both religions were to be admitted without distinction of religion to all universities, colleges, and schools throughout France. The same impartiality was to extend to the reception of the sick in the hospitals, and to the poor in the provision made for their relief. More than this, the Protestants were permitted to establish schools of their own in all places where their worship was authorized. . . . The scandal and inhumanity exhibited in the refusal of burial to the Protestant dead, as well in the disinterment of such bodies as had been placed in consecrated ground, was henceforth precluded by the assignment of portions of the public cemeteries or of new cemeteries of their own to the Protestants. The civil equality of the Protestants was assured by an article which declared them to be admissible to all public positions, dignities, offices, and charges, and forbade any other examination into their qualifications, conduct, and morals than those to which their Roman Catholic brethren were subjected. . . . Provision was made for the establishment of a 'chamber of the edict,' as it was styled, in the Parliament of Paris, with six Protestants among its sixteen counsellors, to take cognizance of cases in which Protestants were concerned. A similar chamber was promised in each of the parliaments of Rouen and Rennes. In Southern France three 'chambres mi-parties' were either continued or created, with an equal number of Roman Catholic and Protestant judges." In the "brevet" or patent which accompanied the edict, the king made a secret provision of 45,000 crowns annually from the royal treasury, which was understood to be for the support of Protestant ministers, although that purpose was concealed. In the second series of secret articles, the Protestants were authorized to retain possession for eight years of the "cautionary cities" which they held under former treaties, and provision was made for paying the garrisons. "Such are the main features of a law whose enactment marks an important epoch in the history of jurisprudence. . . . The Edict of Nantes was not at once presented to the parliaments; nor was it, indeed, until early in the following year that the Parliament of Paris formally entered the document upon its registers. . . . There were obstacles from many different quarters to be overcome. The clergy, the parliaments, the university, raised up difficulty after difficulty." But the masterful will of the king bore down all opposition, and the Edict was finally accepted as the law of the land. "On the 17th of March [1599] Henry took

steps for its complete execution throughout France, by the appointment of commissioners—a nobleman and a magistrate from each province—to attend to the work.”—H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, ch. 14 (v. 2).

Also in: C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, 5th series, c. 36.

The full text of the Edict of Nantes will be found in the following named works: C. Weiss, *Hist. of French Protestant Refugees*, v. 2, app.—A. Maury, *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family (J. Fontaine)*, app.

A. D. 1599-1610.—Invasion of Savoy.—Acquisition of the Department of Aisne.—Ten years of peace and prosperity.—The great works of Henry IV.—His foreign policy.—His assassination.—“One thing only the peace of Vervins left unsettled. In the preceding troubles a small Italian appanage, the Marquisate of Saluces, had been seized by Charles Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy, and remained still in his possession. The right of France to it was not disputed, did not admit indeed of dispute; but the Duke was unwilling to part with what constituted one of the keys of Italy. He came to Paris in December 1599 to negotiate the affair in person,” but employed his opportunity to intrigue with certain unaffected nobles, including the Duke of Biron, marshal of France and governor of Burgundy. “Wearied with delays, whose object was transparent, Henry at last had recourse to arms. Savoy was speedily overrun with French troops, and its chief strongholds taken. Spain was not prepared to back her ally, and the affair terminated by Henry’s accepting in lieu of the Marquisate that part of Savoy which now constitutes the Department of Aisne in France.” Biron, whom the King tried hard to save by repeated warnings which were not heeded, paid the penalty of his treasonable schemes at last by losing his head. “The ten years from 1600 to 1610 were years of tranquillity, and gave to Henry the opportunity he had so ardently longed for of restoring and regenerating France.” He applied his energies and his active mind to the reorganization of the disordered finances of the kingdom, to the improvement of agriculture, to the multiplication of industries, to the extending of commerce. He gave the first impulse to silk culture and silk manufacture in France; he founded the great Gobelin manufactory of tapestry at Paris; he built roads and bridges, and encouraged canal projects; he began the creation of a navy; he promoted the colonization of Canada. “It was, however, in the domain of foreign politics that Henry exhibited the acuteness and comprehensiveness of his genius, and his marvellous powers of contrivance, combination, execution. . . . The great political project, to the maturing of which Henry IV. devoted his untiring energies for the last years of his life, was the bringing of the . . . half of Europe into close political alliance, and arming it against the house of Austria, and striking when the fit time came, such a blow at the ambition and intolerance of that house that it might never be able to recover. After innumerable negotiations . . . he had succeeded in forming a coalition of twenty separate States, embracing England, the United Provinces, Denmark, Sweden, Northern Germany, Switzerland. At last the time for action came. The Duke of Cleves died, 25th March 1609. The succession was disputed. One

of the claimants of the Dukedom was supported by the Emperor, another by the Protestant Princes of Germany [see GERMANY: A. D. 1608-1618]. The contest about a small German Duchy presented the opportunity for bringing into action that alliance which Henry had planned and perfected. In the great military movements that were projected he was himself to take the lead. Four French armies, numbering 100,000, were to be launched against the great enemy of European liberty. One of these Henry was to command; even our young Prince of Wales was to bring 6,000 English with him, and make his first essay in arms under the French King. By the end of April, 1610, 35,000 men and 50 pieces of cannon had assembled at Chalons. The 20th May was fixed as the day on which Henry was to place himself at its head.” But on the 16th of May (1610) he was struck down by the hand of an assassin (François Ravalliac), and the whole combination fell to pieces.—W. Hanna, *The Wars of the Huguenots*, ch. 8.—“The Emperor, the King of Spain, the Queen of France, the Duke d’Epernon, the Jesuits, were all in turn suspected of having instigated the crime, because they all profited by it; but the assassin declared that he had no accomplices. . . . He believed that the King was at heart a Huguenot, and thought that in ridding France of this monarch he was rendering a great service to his country.”

—A. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, p. 450.

Also in: M. W. Freer, *The Last Decade of a Glorious Reign.*—Duke of Sully, *Memoirs*, v. 2-5.

—Sir N. W. Wraxall, *Hist. of France*, 1574-1610, v. 5, ch. 7-8, and v. 6.

A. D. 1603-1608.—First settlements in Acadia. See CANADA: A. D. 1603-1605; and 1606-1608.

A. D. 1608-1616.—Champlain’s explorations and settlements in the Valley of the St. Lawrence. See CANADA: A. D. 1608-1611; 1611-1616; 1616-1628.

A. D. 1610.—Accession of King Louis XIII.

A. D. 1610-1619.—The regency of Marie de Medicis.—The reign of favorites and the riot of factions.—Distractions of the kingdom.—The rise of Richelieu.—“After the death of Henry IV. it was seen how much the power, credit, manners, and spirit of a nation frequently depend upon a single man. This prince had by a vigorous, yet gentle administration, kept all orders of the state in union, lulled all factious to sleep, maintained peace between the two religions, and kept his people in plenty. He held the balance of Europe in his hands by his alliance, his riches, and his arms. All these advantages were lost in the very first year of the regency of his widow, Mary of Medicis [whom Henry had married in 1600, the pope granting a divorce from his first wife, Margaret of Valois]. . . . Mary of Medicis . . . appointed regent [during the minority of her son, Louis XIII.], though not mistress of the kingdom, lavished in making of creatures all that Henry the Great had amassed to render his nation powerful. The army he had raised to carry the war into Germany was disbanded, the princes he had taken under his protection were abandoned. Charles Emanuel, duke of Savoy, the new ally of Henry IV., was obliged to ask pardon of Philip III. of Spain for having entered into a treaty with the French king, and sent his son to Madrid to implore the mercy of the Spanish court, and to humble himself as a

subject in his father's name. The princes of Germany, whom Henry had protected with an army of 40,000 men, now found themselves almost without assistance. The state lost all its credit abroad, and was distracted at home. The princes of the blood and the great nobles filled France with factions, as in the times of Francis II., Charles IX. and Henry III., and as afterwards, during the minority of Lewis XIV. At length [1614] an assembly of the general estates was called at Paris, the last that was held in France [prior to the States General which assembled on the eve of the Revolution of 1789]. . . . The result of this assembly was the laying open all the grievances of the kingdom, without being able to redress one. France remained in confusion, and governed by one Concini, a Florentine, who rose to be marshal of France without ever having drawn a sword, and prime minister without knowing anything of the laws. It was sufficient that he was a foreigner for the princes to be displeased with him. Mary of Medicis was in a very unhappy situation, for she could not share her authority with the prince of Condé, chief of the malecontents, without being deprived of it altogether; nor trust it in the hands of Concini, without displeasing the whole kingdom. Henry prince of Condé, father of the great Condé, and son to him who had gained the battle of Coutras in conjunction with Henry IV., put himself at the head of a party, and took up arms. The court made a dissembled peace with him, and afterwards clapt him up in the Bastile. This had been the fate of his father and grandfather, and was afterwards that of his son. His confinement encreased the number of the malecontents. The Guises, who had formerly been implacable enemies to the Condé family, now joined with them. The duke of Vendome, son to Henry IV., the duke of Nevers, of the house of Gonzaga, the marshal de Bouillon, and all the rest of the malecontents, fortified themselves in the provinces, protesting that they continued true to their king, and made war only against the prime minister. Concini, marshal d'Ancre, secure of the queen regent's protection, braved them all. He raised 7,000 men at his own expence, to support the royal authority. . . . A young man of whom he had not the least apprehension, and who was a stranger like himself, caused his ruin, and all the misfortunes of Mary of Medicis. Charles Albert of Luines, born in the county of Avignon, had, with his two brothers, been taken into the number of gentlemen in ordinary to the king, and the companions of his education. He had insinuated himself into the good graces and confidence of the young monarch, by his dexterity in bird-catching. It was never supposed that these childish amusements would end in a bloody revolution. The marshal d'Ancre had given him the government of Amboise, thinking by that to make him his creature; but this young man conceived the design of murdering his benefactor, banishing the queen, and governing himself; all which he accomplished without meeting with any obstacle. He soon found means of persuading the king that he was capable of reigning alone, though he was not then quite 17 years old, and told him that the queen-mother and Concini kept him in confinement. The young king, to whom in his childhood they had given the name of Just, consented to the murder of his prime minister; the marquis of Vitri, captain of

the king's guards, du Hallier his brother, Persan, and others, were sent to dispatch him, who, finding him in the court of the Louvre, shot him dead with their pistols [April 24, 1617]: upon this they cried out, 'Vive le roi,' as if they had gained a battle, and Lewis XIII., appearing at a window, cried out, 'Now I am king.' The queen-mother had her guards taken from her, and was confined to her own apartment, and afterwards banished to Blois. The place of marshal of France, held by Concini, was given to the marquis of Vitri, his murderer." Concini's wife, Eleanor Galigai, was tried on a charge of sorcery and burned, "and the king's favourite, Luines, had the confiscated estates. This unfortunate Galigai was the first promoter of cardinal Richelieu's fortune; while he was yet very young, and called the abbot of Chillon, she procured him the bishopric of Luçon, and at length got him made secretary of state in 1616. He was involved in the disgrace of his protectors, and . . . was now banished . . . to a little priory at the farther end of Anjou. . . . The duke of Epemon, who had caused the queen to be declared regent, went to the castle of Blois [February 22, 1619], whither she had been banished, and carried her to his estate in Angoulême, like a sovereign who rescues his ally. This was manifestly an act of high treason; but a crime that was approved by the whole kingdom." The king presently "sought an opportunity of reconciliation with his mother, and entered into a treaty with the duke of Epemon, as between prince and prince. . . . But the treaty of reconciliation was hardly signed when it was broken again; this was the true spirit of the times. New parties took up arms in favour of the queen, and always to oppose the duke of Luines, as before it had been to oppose the marshal d'Ancre, but never against the king. Every favourite at that time drew after him a civil war. Lewis and his mother in fact made war upon each other. Mary was in Anjou at the head of a small army against her son; they engaged each other on the bridge of Cé, and the kingdom was on the point of ruin. This confusion made the fortune of the famous Richelieu. He was comptroller of the queen-mother's household, and had supplanted all that princess's confidants, as he afterwards did all the king's ministers. His pliable temper and bold disposition must necessarily have acquired for him the first rank everywhere, or have proved his ruin. He brought about the accommodation between the mother and son; and a nomination to the purple, which the queen asked of the king for him, was the reward of his services. The duke of Epemon was the first to lay down arms without making any demands, whilst the rest made the king pay them for having taken up arms against him. The queen-mother and the king her son had an interview at Brisac, where they embraced with a flood of tears, only to quarrel again more violently than ever. The weakness, intrigues, and divisions of the court spread anarchy through the kingdom. All the internal defects with which the state had for a long time been attacked were now encreased, and those which Henry IV. had removed were revived anew."—Voltaire, *Ancient and Modern History*, ch. 145 (works tr. by Smollett, v. 5).

ALSO IN: C. D. Yonge, *Hist. of France under the Bourbons*, v. 1, ch. 5-6.—A. Thierry, *Formation and Progress of the Tiers État in France*, v.

1, *ch.* 7.—S. Menzies, *Royal Favourites*, v. 1, *ch.* 9.

A. D. 1620-1622.—Renewed jealousy of the Huguenots.—Their formidable organization and its political pretensions.—Restoration of Catholicism in Navarre and Béarn.—Their incorporation with France.—The Huguenot revolt.—Treaty of Montpellier.—“The Huguenot question had become a very serious one, and the bigotry of some of the Catholics found its opportunity in the insubordination of many of the Protestants. The Huguenots had undoubtedly many minor causes for discontent. . . . But on the whole the government and the majority of the people were willing to carry out in good faith the provisions of the edict of Nantes. The Protestants, within the limits there laid down, could have worshipped after their own conscience, free from persecution and subject to little molestation. It was, perhaps, all that could be expected in a country where the mass of the population were Catholic, and where religious fanaticism had recently supported the League and fostered the wars of religion. But the Protestant party seem to have desired a separate political power, which almost justifies the charge made against them, that they sought to establish a state within a state, or even to form a separate republic. Their territorial position afforded a certain facility for such endeavors. In the northern provinces their numbers were insignificant. They were found chiefly in the southwestern provinces—Poitou, Saintonge, Guienne, Provence, and Languedoc,—while in Béarn and Navarre they constituted the great majority of the population, and they held for their protection a large number of strongly fortified cities. . . . Though there is nothing to show that a plan for a separate republic was seriously considered, the Huguenots had adopted an organization which naturally excited the jealousy and ill-will of the general government. They had long maintained a system of provincial and general synods for the regulation of their faith and discipline. . . . The assembly which met at Saumur immediately after Henry's death, had carried still further the organization of the members of their faith. From consistories composed of the pastors and certain of the laity, delegates were chosen who formed local consistories. These again chose delegates who met in provincial synods, and from them delegates were sent to the national synod, or general assembly of the church. Here not only matters of faith, but of state, were regulated, and the general assembly finally assumed to declare war, levy taxes, choose generals, and act both as a convocation and a parliament. The assembly of Saumur added a system of division into eight great circles, covering the territory where the Protestants were sufficiently numerous to be important. All but two of these were south of the Loire. They were subsequently organized as military departments, each under the command of some great nobleman. . . . The Huguenots had also shown a willingness to assist those who were in arms against the state, had joined Condé, and contemplated a union with Mary de Medici in the brief insurrection of 1620. A question had now arisen which was regarded by the majority of the party as one of vital importance. The edict of Nantes, which granted privileges to the Huguenots, had granted also to the Catholics the right to the public profession of their religion in

all parts of France. This had formerly been prohibited in Navarre and Béarn, and the population of those provinces had become very largely Protestant. The Catholic clergy had long petitioned the king to enforce the rights which they claimed the edict gave them in Béarn, and to compel also a restitution of some portion of the property, formerly held by their church, which had been taken by Jeanne d'Albret, and the revenues of which the Huguenot clergy still assumed to appropriate entirely to themselves. On July 25, 1617, Louis finally issued an edict directing the free exercise of the Catholic worship in Béarn and the restitution to the clergy of the property that had been taken from them. The edict met with bitter opposition in Béarn and from all the Huguenot party. The Protestants were as unwilling to allow the rites of the Catholic Church in a province which they controlled, as the Catholics to suffer a Huguenot conventicle within the walls of Paris. The persecutions which the Huguenots suffered distressed them less than the toleration which they were obliged to grant. . . . In the wars of religion the Huguenots had been controlled, not always wisely or unselfishly, by the nobles who had espoused their faith, but these were slowly drifting back to Catholicism. . . . The Condés were already Catholics. Lesdiguières was only waiting till the bribe for his conversion should be sufficiently glittering. [He was received into the Church and was made Constable of France in July, 1622.] Bouillon's religion was but a catch-weight in his political intrigues. The grandson of Coligni was soon to receive a marshal's baton for consenting to a peace which was disastrous to his party. Sully, Rohan, Soubise, and La Force still remained; but La Force's zeal moderated when he also was made a marshal, and one hundred years later Rohans and the descendants of Sully wore cardinal's hats. The party, slowly deserted by the great nobles, came more under the leadership of the clergy . . . and under their guidance the party now assumed a political activity which brought on the siege of La Rochelle and which made possible the revocation of the edict of Nantes. Béarn was not only strongly Protestant, but it claimed, with Navarre, to form no part of France, and to be governed only by its own laws. Its States met and declared their local rights were violated by the king's edict; the Parliament of Pau refused to register it, and it was not enforced in the province. . . . The disturbances caused by Mary de Medici had delayed any steps for the enforcement of the edict, but these troubles were ended by the peace of Ponts-de-Cé in 1620. . . . In October, 1620, Louis led his army in Béarn, removed various Huguenot officials, and reestablished the Catholic clergy. . . . On October 20th, an edict was issued by which Navarre and Béarn were declared to be united to France, and a parliament was established for the two provinces on the same model as the other parliaments of the kingdom. . . . A general assembly of Protestants, sympathizing with their brethren of these provinces, was called for November 26, 1620, at La Rochelle. The king declared those guilty of high treason who should join in that meeting. . . . The meeting was held in defiance of the prohibition, and it was there resolved to take up arms. . . . The assembly proceeded in all respects like the legislative body of a separate state. The king prepared for the war

with vigor. . . . He now led his forces into southern France, and after some minor engagements he laid siege to Montauban. A three months' siege resulted disastrously; the campaign closed, and the king returned to Paris. The encouragement that the Huguenots drew from this success proved very brief. The king's armies proceeded again into the south of France in 1622, and met only an irregular and inefficient opposition. . . . Chatillon and La Force each made a separate peace, and each was rewarded by the baton of marshal from the king and by charges of treachery from his associates. . . . The siege of Montpellier led to the peace called by that name, but on terms that were unfavorable to the Huguenots. They abandoned all the fortified cities which they had held for their security except La Rochelle and Montauban; no assemblies could meet without permission of the king, except the local synods for ecclesiastical matters alone, and the interests of Béarn and Navarre were abandoned. In return the edict of Nantes was again confirmed, and their religious privileges left undisturbed. Rohan accepted 800,000 livres for his expenses and governments, and the king agreed that the Fort of St. Louis, which had been built to overawe the turbulence of La Rochelle, should be dismantled. La Rochelle, the great Huguenot stronghold, continued hostilities for some time longer, but at last it made terms. The party was fast losing its power and its overthrow could be easily foretold. La Rochelle was now the only place capable of making a formidable resistance. . . . In the meantime the career of Luines reached its end." He had taken the great office of Constable to himself, incurring much ridicule thereby. "The exposures of the campaign and its disasters had worn upon him; a fever attacked him at the little town of Monheur, and on December 14, 1621, he died."—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin, with a Review of the Administration of Richelieu*, ch. 3 (p. 1).

ALSO IN: W. S. Browning, *Hist. of the Huguenots*, ch. 54-56.

A. D. 1621.—Claims in North America conflicting with England. See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1621-1631.

A. D. 1624-1626.—Richelieu in power.—His combinations against the Austro-Spanish ascendancy.—The Valtelline War.—Huguenots again in revolt.—The second Treaty of Montpellier.—Treaty of Monzon with Spain.—"The King was once more without a guide, without a favourite, but his fate was upon him. A few months more of uncertain drifting and he will fall into the hands of the greatest politician France has ever seen, Cardinal Richelieu; under his hand the King will be effaced, his cold disposition and narrow intelligence will accept and be convinced by the grandeur of his master's views; convinced, he will obey, and we shall enter on the period in which the disruptive forces in France will be coerced, and the elements of freedom and constitutional life stamped down; while patriotism, and a firm belief in the destinies of the nation will be fostered and grow strong; France will assert her high place in Europe. Richelieu, who had already in 1622 received the Cardinal's hat, entered the King's Council on the 13th of April, 1624. . . . La Vieuville, under whose patronage he had been brought forward, welcomed him into the Cabinet. . . . But La Vieu-

ville was not fitted by nature for the chief place; he was rash, violent, unpopular and corrupt. He soon had to give place to Richelieu, henceforth the virtual head of the Council. La Vieuville, thus supplanted, had been the first to reverse the ruinous Spanish policy of the Court; . . . he had promised help to the Dutch, to Mansfield, to the Elector Frederick; in a word, his policy had been the forecast of that of the Cardinal, who owed his rise to him, and now stepped nimbly over his head into his place. England had declared war on Spain: France joined England in renewing the old offensive and defensive alliance with the Dutch, England promising men and France money. . . . The Austro-Spanish power had greatly increased during these years: its successes had enabled it to knit together all the provinces which owed it allegiance. The Palatinate and the Lower Rhine secured their connexion with the Spanish Netherlands, as we may now begin to call them, and threatened the very existence of the Dutch: the Valtelline forts [commanding the valley east of Lake Como, from which one pass communicates with the Engadine and the Grisons, and another with the Tyrol] . . . were the roadway between the Spanish power at Milan and the Austrians on the Danube and in the Tyrol. Richelieu now resolved to attack this threatening combination at both critical points. In the North he did not propose to interfere in arms: there others should fight, and France support them with quiet subsidies and good will. He pressed matters on with the English, the Dutch, the North German Princes; he negotiated with Maximilian of Bavaria and the League, hoping to keep the South German Princes clear of the Imperial policy. . . . The French ambassador at Copenhagen, well supported by the English envoy, Sir Robert Anstruther, at this time organised a Northern League, headed by Christian IV. of Denmark [see GERMANY: A. D. 1624-1626]. . . . The Lutheran Princes, alarmed at the threatening aspect of affairs, were beginning to think that they had made a mistake in leaving the Palatinate to be conquered; and turned a more willing ear to the French and English proposals for this Northern League. . . . By 1625 the Cardinal's plans in the North seemed to be going well: the North-Saxon Princes, though with little heart and much difference of opinion, specially in the cities, had accepted Christian IV. as their leader; and the progress of the Spaniards in the United Provinces was checked. In the other point to which Richelieu's attention was directed, matters had gone still better. [The inhabitants of the Valtelline were mostly Catholics and Italians. They had long been subject to the Protestant Grisons or Graubunden. In 1620 they had risen in revolt, massacred the Protestants of the valley, and formed an independent republic, supported by the Spaniards and Austrians. Spanish and German troops occupied the four strong Valtelline forts, and controlled the important passes above referred to. The Grisons resisted and secured the support of Savoy, Venice and finally France. In 1623 an agreement had been reached, to hand over the Valtelline forts to the pope, in deposit, until some terms could be settled. But in 1625 this agreement had not been carried out, and Richelieu took the affair in hand.] . . . Richelieu, never attacking in full face if he could carry his point by a side-attack, allied himself

with Charles Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy, and with Venice; he easily persuaded the Savoyard to threaten Genoa, the port by which Spain could penetrate into Italy, and her financial mainstay. Meanwhile, the Marquis of Cœuvres had been sent to Switzerland, and, late in 1624, had persuaded the Cantons to arm for the recovery of the Valtelline; then, heading a small army of Swiss and French, he had marched into the Grisons. The upper districts held by the Austrians revolted: the three Leagues declared their freedom, the Austrian troops hastily withdrew. Cœuvres at once secured the Tyrolese passes, and descending from the Engadine by Poschiavo, entered the Valtelline: in a few weeks the Papal and Spanish troops were swept out of the whole valley, abandoning all their forts, though the French general had no siege-artillery with which to reduce them. . . . Early in 1625, the Valtelline being secured to the Grisons and French, the aged Lesdiguières was sent forward to undertake the rest of the plan, the reduction of Genoa. But just as things were going well for the party in Europe opposed to Spain and Austria, an unlucky outburst of Huguenot dissatisfaction marred all: Soubise in the heart of winter had seized the Isle of Ré, and had captured in Blavet harbour on the Breton coast six royal ships; he failed however to take the castle which commanded the place, and was himself blockaded, escaping only with heavy loss. Thence he seized the Isle of Oléron: in May the Huguenots were in revolt in Upper Languedoc, Quercy, and the Cevennes, led by Rohan on land, and Soubise by sea. Their rash outbreak [provoked by alleged breaches of the treaty of Montpellier, especially in the failure of the king to demolish Fort Louis at La Rochelle] came opportunely to the aid of the distressed Austrian power, their true enemy. Although very many of the Huguenots stood aloof and refused to embarrass the government, still enough revolted to cause great uneasiness. The war in the Ligurian mountains was not pushed on with vigour; for Richelieu could not now think of carrying out the large plans which, by his own account, he had already formed, for the erection of an independent Italy. . . . He was for the present content to menace Genoa, without a serious siege. At this time James I. of England died, and the marriage of the young king [Charles I.] with Henriette Marie was pushed on. In May Buckingham went to Paris to carry her over to England; he tried in vain to persuade Richelieu to couple the Palatinate with the Valtelline question. . . . After this the tide of affairs turned sharply against the Cardinal; while Tilly with the troops of the Catholic League, and Wallenstein, the new general of the Emperor, who begins at this moment his brief and marvellous career, easily kept in check the Danes and their halfhearted German allies, Lesdiguières and the Duke of Savoy were forced by the Austrians and Spaniards to give up all thoughts of success in the Genoese country, and the French were even threatened in Piedmont and the Valtelline. But the old Constable of France was worthy of his ancient fame; he drove the Duke of Feria out of Piedmont, and in the Valtelline the Spaniards only succeeded in securing the fortress of Riva. Richelieu felt that the war was more than France could bear, harassed as she was within and without. . . . He was determined to free his hands in Italy, to leave the

war to work itself out in Germany, and to bring the Huguenots to reason. . . . The joint fleets of Soubise and of La Rochelle had driven back the king's ships, and had taken Ré and Oléron; but in their attempt to force an entrance into the harbour of La Rochelle they were defeated by Montmorency, who now commanded the royal fleet: the islands were retaken, and the Huguenots sued for peace. It must be remembered that the bulk of them did not agree with the Rochellois, and were quiet through this time. Early in 1626 the treaty of Montpellier granted a hollow peace on tolerable terms to the reformed churches; and soon after . . . peace was signed with Spain at Monzon in May, 1626. All was done so silently that the interested parties, Savoy, the Venetians, the Grisons, knew nothing of it till all was settled: on Buckingham . . . the news fell like a thunderclap. . . . The Valtelline remained under the Grisons, with guarantees for Catholic worship; France and Spain would jointly see that the inhabitants of the valleys were fairly treated: the Pope was entrusted with the duty of razing the fortresses: Genoa and Savoy were ordered to make peace. It was a treacherous affair; and Richelieu comes out of it but ill. We are bound, however, to remember . . . the desperate straits into which the Cardinal had come. . . . He did but fall back in order to make that wonderful leap forward which changed the whole face of European politics."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France*, bk. 4, ch. 3 and 4 (v. 2-3).

ALSO IN: F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 40-41.—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin [and Richelieu]*, v. 1, ch. 4-5.—G. Masson, *Richelieu*, ch. 5.

A. D. 1627-1628.—War with England, and Huguenot revolt.—Richelieu's siege and capture of La Rochelle.—His great example of magnanimity and toleration.—The end of political Huguenotism.—"Richelieu now found himself dragged into a war against his will, and that with the very power with which, for the furtherance of his other designs, he most desired to continue at peace. James I. of England had been as unable to live except under the dominion of a favourite as Louis. Charles . . . had the same unfortunate weakness; and the Duke of Buckingham, who had long been paramount at the court of the father, retained the same mischievous influence at that of the son. . . . In passing through France in 1623 he [Buckingham] had been presented to the queen [Anne of Austria], and had presumed to address her in the language of love. When sent to Paris to conduct the young Princess Henrietta Maria to England, he had repeated this conduct. . . . There had been some little unpleasantness between the two Courts shortly after the marriage . . . owing to the imprudence of Henrietta," who paraded her Popery too much in the eyes of Protestant England; and there was talk of a renewed treaty, which Buckingham sought to make the pretext for another visit to Paris. But his motives were understood; Louis "refused to receive him as an ambassador, and Buckingham, full of disappointed rage, instigated the Duke de Soubise, who was still in London, to rouse the Huguenots to a fresh outbreak, promising to send an English fleet to Rochelle to assist them. Rochelle was at this time the general head-quarters not only of the Huguenots, but of all those who, on

any account, were discontented with the Government. . . . Soubise . . . embraced the duke's offer with eagerness; and in July, 1627, without any previous declaration of war, an English fleet, with 16,000 men on board, suddenly appeared off Rochelle, and prepared to attack the Isle of Rhé. The Rochellois were very unwilling to co-operate with it"; but they were persuaded, "against their judgment, to connect themselves with what each, individually, felt to be a desperate enterprise; and Richelieu, to whom the prospect thus afforded him of having a fair pretence for crushing the Huguenot party made amends for the disappointment of being wantonly dragged into a war with England, gladly received the intelligence that Rochelle was in rebellion. At first the Duke d'Anjou was sent down to command the army, Louis being detained in Paris by illness; but by October he had recovered, his fondness for military operations revived, and he hastened to the scene of action, accompanied by Richelieu, whose early education had been of a military kind. . . . He at once threw across reinforcements into the Isle of Rhé, where M. Thoiras was holding out a fort known as St. Martin with great resolution, though it was unfinished and incompletely armed. In the beginning of November, Buckingham raised the siege, and returned home, leaving guns, standards and prisoners behind him; and Richelieu, anticipating a renewal of the attack the next year . . . undertook a work designed at once to baffle foreign enemies and to place the city at his mercy. Along the whole front of the port he began to construct a vast wall . . . having only one small opening in the centre which was commanded by small batteries. The work was commenced in November, 1627; and, in spite of a rather severe winter, was carried on with such ceaseless diligence, under the superintending eye of the cardinal himself, that before the return of spring a great portion of it was completed. . . . When, in May, 1628, the British fleet, under Lord Denbigh, the brother-in-law of Buckingham, returned to the attack, they found it unassailable, and returned without striking a blow."—C. D. Yonge, *Hist. of France under the Bourbons*, v. 1, ch. 7.—"Richelieu . . . was his own engineer, general, admiral, prime-minister. While he urged on the army to work upon the dike, he organized a French navy, and in due time brought it around to that coast and anchored it so as to guard the dike and be guarded by it. Yet, daring as all this work was, it was but the smallest part of his work. Richelieu found that his officers were cheating his soldiers in their pay and disheartening them; in face of the enemy he had to reorganize the army and to create a new military system. . . . He found, also, as he afterward said, that he had to conquer not only the Kings of England and Spain, but also the King of France. At the most critical moment of the siege Louis deserted him,—went back to Paris,—allowed courtiers to fill him with suspicions. Not only Richelieu's place, but his life, was in danger, and he well knew it; yet he never left his dike and siege-works, but wrought on steadily until they were done; and then the King, of his own will, in very shame, broke away from his courtiers, and went back to his master. And now a Royal Herald summoned the people of La Rochelle to surrender. But they were not yet half conquered. Even when they had seen two

English fleets, sent to aid them, driven back from Richelieu's dike, they still held out manfully. . . . They were reduced to feed on their horses,—then on bits of filthy shell-fish,—then on stewed leather. They died in multitudes. Guiton, the Mayor, kept a dagger on the city council-table to stab any man who should speak of surrender. . . . But at last even Guiton had to yield. After the siege had lasted more than a year, after 5,000 were found remaining out of 15,000, after a mother had been seen to feed her child with her own blood, the Cardinal's policy became too strong for him. The people yielded [October 27, 1628], and Richelieu entered the city as master. And now the victorious statesman showed a greatness of soul to which all the rest of his life was as nothing. . . . All Europe . . . looked for a retribution more terrible than any in history. Richelieu allowed nothing of the sort. He destroyed the old franchises of the city, for they were incompatible with that royal authority which he so earnestly strove to build. But this was all. He took no vengeance,—he allowed the Protestants to worship as before,—he took many of them into the public service,—and to Guiton he showed marks of respect. He stretched forth that strong arm of his over the city, and warded off all harm. . . . For his leniency Richelieu received the titles of Pope of the Protestants and Patriarch of the Atheists. But he had gained the first great object of his policy, and he would not abuse it; he had crushed the political power of the Huguenots forever."—A. D. White, *The Statesmanship of Richelieu* (*Atlantic Monthly*, May, 1862).—"Whatever the benefit to France of this great feat, the locality was permanently ruined. Two hundred and fifty years after the event the Poitevin peasant is fanatic and superstitious as the Bretons themselves. Catholic Rochelle is still to be seen, with almost one-third less inhabitants to-day than it had in 1627. The cardinal's dyke is still there, but the insects have seized on the city. A plague of white ants, imported from India, have fastened on its timbers."—R. Heath, *The Reformation in France*, v. 1, bk. 2, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of England*, 1603 to 1642, ch. 56, 59-60, and 65.

A. D. 1627-1631.—War with Spain, Savoy and the Empire over the succession to the duchy of Mantua.—Successes of Richelieu. See ITALY: A. D. 1627-1631.

A. D. 1628.—New France placed under the Company of the Hundred Associates. See CANADA: A. D. 1616-1628.

A. D. 1628-1632.—Loss and recovery of New France. See CANADA: A. D. 1628-1635.

A. D. 1630-1632.—The Day of Dupes, and after.—On the return of Richelieu and the king from their Italian expedition, in the beginning of August, 1630, "both the monarch and his minister had passed in safety through a whole tract infected with the plague; but, shortly after their arrival at Lyons, Louis XIII. fell ill, and in a few days his physicians pronounced his case hopeless. It was now that all the hatred which his power had caused to hide its head, rose up openly against Richelieu; and the two queens [Marie de Medicis, the queen-mother, and Anne of Austria, the king's wife], united only in their enmity towards the minister, never quitted the bedside of the king but to form and cement the party which was intended to work the cardinal's

destruction as soon as the monarch should be no more. . . . The bold and the rash joined the faction of the queens; and the prudent waited with wise doubt till they saw the result they hoped for. Happy was it for those who did conceal their feelings; for suddenly the internal abscess, which had nearly reduced the king to the tomb, broke, passed away, and in a very few days he appeared perfectly convalescent. Richelieu might now have triumphed securely; . . . but he acted more prudently. He remembered that the queen-mother, the great mover of the cabal against him, had formerly been his benefactress; and though probably his gratitude was of no very sensitive nature, yet he was wise enough to affect a virtue that he did not possess, and to suffer the offence to be given by her. . . . At Paris [after the return of the court] . . . the queen-mother herself, unable to restrain any longer the violent passions that struggled in her bosom, seemed resolved to keep no terms with the cardinal." At an interview with him, in the king's presence, "the queen forgot the dignity of her station and the softness of her sex, and, in language more fit for the markets than the court, called him rogue, and traitor, and perturber of the public peace; and, turning to the king, she endeavoured to persuade him that Richelieu wished to take the crown from his head, in order to place it on that of the count de Soissons. Had Richelieu been as sure of the king's firmness as he was of his regard, this would have been exactly the conduct which he could have desired the queen to hold; but he knew Louis to be weak and timid, and easily ruled by those who took a tone of authority towards him; and when at length he retired at the command of the monarch . . . he seems to have been so uncertain how the whole would end, that he ordered his papers and most valuable effects to be secured, and preparations to be made for immediate departure. All these proceedings had been watched by the courtiers: Richelieu had been seen to quit the queen's cabinet troubled and gloomy, his niece in tears; and, some time after, the king himself followed in a state of excessive agitation, and . . . left Paris for Versailles without seeing his minister. The whole court thought the rule of Richelieu at an end, and the saloons of the Luxembourg were crowded with eager nobles ready to worship the rising authority of the queen-mother." But the king, when he reached Versailles, sent this message to his minister: "'Tell the cardinal de Richelieu that he has a good master, and bid him come hither to me without delay.'" Richelieu felt that the real power of France was still in his hands; and setting off for Versailles, he found Louis full of expressions of regard and confidence. Rumours every moment reached Versailles of the immense concourse that was flocking to pay court to the queen-mother: the king found himself nearly deserted, and all that Richelieu had said of her ambition was confirmed in the monarch's mind; while his natural good sense told him that a minister who depended solely upon him, and who under him exercised the greatest power in the realm, was not likely to wish his fall. . . . In the mean time, the news of these . . . events spread to Paris: the halls of the Luxembourg, which the day before had been crowded to suffocation, were instantly deserted; and the queen-mother found herself

abandoned by all those fawning sycophants whose confidence and disappointment procured for the day of St. Martin, 1630, the title in French history of The Day of Dupes."—G. P. R. James, *Eminent Foreign Statesmen*, v. 2, pp. 88-92.—The ultimate outcome of The Day of Dupes was the flight of Marie de Medicis, who spent the remainder of her life in the Netherlands and in England; the trial and execution of Marshal de Marillac; the imprisonment or exile and disgrace of Bassompierre and other nobles; a senseless revolt, headed by Gaston, Duke of Orleans, the king's brother, which was crushed in one battle at Castenaudari, September 1, 1632, and which brought the Duke de Montmorency to the block.—C. D. Yonge, *Hist. of France under the Bourbons*, v. 1, ch. 7-8.

ALSO IN: M. W. Freer, *Married Life of Anne of Austria*, v. 1, ch. 4.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos of English History*, 6th series, c. 20.

A. D. 1631.—First Printed Newspaper. See PRINTING AND PRESS: A. D. 1631.

A. D. 1631.—Treaty and negotiations with Gustavus Adolphus. See GERMANY: A. D. 1631 (JANUARY); 1631-1632; and 1632-1634.

A. D. 1632-1641.—War in Lorraine.—Occupation and possession of the duchy. See LORRAINE: A. D. 1624-1663.

A. D. 1635-1638.—Campaigns on the Flemish frontier.—Invasion by the Spaniards.—Paris in Peril. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1635-1638.

A. D. 1635-1639.—Active participation in the Thirty Years War.—Treaties with the Germans, Swedes, and Dutch.—Campaigns of Duke Bernhard in Lorraine, Alsace and Franche-Comté.—The fruit gathered by Richelieu.—Alsace secured. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

A. D. 1635-1642.—The war in northern Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1635-1659.

A. D. 1637-1642.—The war in Spain.—Revolt of Catalonia.—Siege and capture of Perpignan.—Conquest of Roussillon. See SPAIN: A. D. 1637-1640, and 1640-1642.

A. D. 1640-1645.—Campaigns in Germany. See GERMANY: A. D. 1640-1645, and 1643-1644.

A. D. 1641-1642.—The conspiracies of Count de Soissons and Cinq Mars.—Extinction of the Principality of Sedan.—"There were revolts in various quarters to resist [the yoke of Richelieu], but they were quelled with uniform success. Once, and once only, the fate of the Cardinal seemed finally sealed. The Count de Soissons, a prince of the blood, headed the discontented gentry in open war in 1641, and established the headquarters of revolt in the town of Sedan. The Empire and Spain came to his support with promises and money. Twelve thousand men were under his orders, all influenced with rage against Richelieu, and determined to deliver the king from his degrading tutelage. Richelieu was taken unprepared; but delay would have been ruin. He sent the Marshal Chatillon to the borders of Sedan, to watch the proceedings of the confederates, and requested the king to summon fresh troops and go down to the scene of war. While his obedient Majesty was busied in the commission, Chatillon advanced too far. Soissons assaulted him near the banks of the Meuse, at a place called Marfée, and gave him a total and irremediable overthrow. The cavalry on the royalist side retreated at an early part of the

fight, and forced their way through the infantry, not without strong suspicions of collusion with their opponents. Paris itself was in dismay. The King and Cardinal expected to hear every hour of the advance of the rebels; but no step was taken. It was found, when the hurry of battle was over, that Soissons was among the slain. The force of the expedition was in that one man; and the defeat was as useful to the Cardinal as a victory would have been. The malcontents had no leaders of sufficient rank and authority to keep the inferiors in check; for the scaffold had thinned the ranks of the great hereditary chiefs, and no man could take his first open move against the Court without imminent risk to his head. Great men, indeed, were rising into fame, but of a totally different character from their predecessors. Their minds were cast in a monarchical mould from their earliest years. . . . From this time subservience to the king became a sign of noble birth. . . . Richelieu has the boast, if boast it can be called, of having crushed out the last spark of popular independence and patrician pride. . . . One more effort was made [1642] to shake off the trammels of the hated Cardinal. A conspiracy was entered into to deliver the land by the old Roman method of putting the tyrant to death; and the curious part of the design is, that it was formed almost in presence of the king. His favourite friend, young Cinq Mars, son of the Marshal d'Effiat, his brother Gaston of Orleans, and his kinsman the Duke de Bouillon, who were round his person at all hours of the day, were the chief agents of the perilous undertaking. Others, and with them de Thou, the son of the great French historian, entered into the plan, but wished the assassination to be left out. They would arrest and imprison him; but this was evidently not enough. While Richelieu lived, no man could be safe, though the Cardinal were in the deepest dungeon of the Bastille. Death, however, was busy with their victim, without their aid. He was sinking under some deep but partially-concealed illness when the threads of the plot came into his skilful hands. He made the last use of his strength and intelligence in unravelling [it] and punishing the rebels, as he called them, against the king's authority. The paltry and perfidious Gaston was as usual penitent and pardoned, but on Cinq Mars and de Thou the vengeance of the law and the Cardinal had its full force. The triumphant but failing minister reclined in a state barge upon the Rhone, towing his prisoners behind him to certain death. On their arrival at Lyons the process was short and fatal. The young men were executed together, and the account of their behaviour at the block is one of the most affecting narratives in the annals of France."—J. White, *Hist. of France*, ch. 12.—The Duke de Bouillon, implicated in both these conspiracies—that of the Count de Soissons and that of Cinq Mars—saved his life on the latter occasion by surrendering to the crown the sovereignty of Sedan, which belonged to him, and which had been the headquarters of the Soissons revolt. This small independent principality—the town and a little territory around it—had formerly been in the possession of the powerful and troublesome family of La Marck, the last heiress of whom brought it, together with the Duchy of Bouillon, into the family of La Tour d'Auvergne. The Prince and

Duke who lost it was the second of that family who bore the titles. He was the elder brother of the great soldier, Turenne. The Principality of Sedan was extinguished from that time.—T. O. Cockayne, *Life of Turenne*.

Also in: W. Robson, *Life of Richelieu*, ch. 11-12.—M. W. Freer, *Married Life of Anne of Austria*, v. 2, ch. 3.—Miss Pardoe, *Life of Marie de Medicis*, bk. 3, ch. 13 (v. 3).

A. D. 1642-1643.—The death of Richelieu and of Louis XIII.—Regency of Anne of Austria.—Cardinal Mazarin and the party of the Importants.—The victory at Rocroi.—Cardinal Richelieu died on the 4th of December, 1642. "He was dead, but his work survived him. On the very evening of the 3d of December, Louis XIII. called to his council Cardinal Mazarin [whom Richelieu had commended to him]. . . . Scarcely had the most powerful kings yielded up their last breath when their wishes had been at once forgotten: Cardinal Richelieu still governed in his grave." But now, after two and a half centuries, "the castle of Richelieu is well-nigh destroyed; his family, after falling into poverty, is extinct; the Palais-Cardinal [his splendid residence, which he built, and which he gave to the crown] has assumed the name of the Palais-Royal; and pure monarchy, the aim of all his efforts and the work of his whole life, has been swept away by the blast of revolution. Of the cardinal there remains nothing but the great memory of his power and of the services he rendered his country. . . . Richelieu had no conception of that noblest ambition on which a human soul can feed, that of governing a free country, but he was one of the greatest, the most effective, and the boldest, as well as the most prudent servants that France ever had." Louis XIII. survived his great minister less than half a year, dying May 14, 1643. He had never had confidence in Anne of Austria, his wife, and had provided, by a declaration which she had signed and sworn to, for a council (which included Mazarin) to control the queen's regency during the minority of their son, Louis XIV. But the queen contrived very soon to break from this obligation, and she made Cardinal Mazarin her one counselor and supreme minister. "Continuing to humor all parties, and displaying foresight and prudence, the new minister was even now master. Louis XIII., without any personal liking, had been faithful to Richelieu to the death. With different feelings, Anne of Austria was to testify the same constancy towards Mazarin. A stroke of fortune came at the very first to strengthen the regent's position. Since the death of Cardinal Richelieu, the Spaniards, but recently overwhelmed at the close of 1642, had recovered courage and boldness; new counsels prevailed at the court of Philip IV., who had dismissed Olivarez; the House of Austria vigorously resumed the offensive; at the moment of Louis XIII.'s death, Don Francisco de Mello, governor of the Low Countries, had just invaded French territory by way of the Ardennes, and laid siege to Rocroi, on the 12th of May [1643]. The French army was commanded by the young Duke of Enghien [afterwards known as the Great Condé], the prince of Condé's son, scarcely 22 years old; Louis XIII. had given him as his lieutenant and director the veteran Marshal de l'Hôpital; and the latter feared to give battle. The Duke of Enghien, who 'was dying with impatience to

enter the enemy's country, resolved to accomplish by address what he could not carry by authority. He opened his heart to Gassion alone. As he [Gassion, one of the boldest of Condé's officers] was a man who saw nothing but what was easy even in the most dangerous deeds, he had very soon brought matters to the point that the prince desired. Marshal de l'Hôpital found himself imperceptibly so near the Spaniards that it was impossible for him any longer to hinder an engagement. . . . The army was in front of Rocroi, and out of the dangerous defile which led to the place, without any idea on the part of the marshal and the army that Louis XIII. was dead. The Duke of Eughien, who had received the news, had kept it secret. He had merely said in the tone of a master 'that he meant to fight, and would answer for the issue.' The battle, which was fought May 19, 1643, resulted in the destruction, almost total, of the Spanish army. Of 18,000 men who formed its infantry, nearly 9,000 were killed and 7,000 were made prisoners. The whole of the Spanish artillery and 300 of their standards fell into the hands of the victors, who lost, according to their own reports, only 2,000 men, killed and wounded. "The prince was a born captain," said Cardinal de Retz. And all France said so with him on hearing of the victory of Rocroi. The delight was all the keener in the queen's circle, because the house of Condé openly supported Cardinal Mazarin, bitterly attacked as he was by the Importants [a court faction or party so called, which was made up of 'those meddlers of the court at whose head marched the Duke of Beaufort, all puffed up with the confidence lately shown to him by her Majesty,' and all expecting to count importantly among the queen's favorites], who accused him of reviving the tyranny of Richelieu. . . . And, indeed, on pretext offered by a feminine quarrel [August, 1643] between the young Duchess of Longueville, daughter of the prince of Condé, and the Duchess of Montbazon, the Duke of Beaufort and some of his friends resolved to assassinate the cardinal. The attempt was a failure, but the Duke of Beaufort, who was arrested on the 2d of September, was taken to the castle of Vincennes. Madame de Chevreuse, recently returned [after being exiled by Richelieu] to court, where she would fain have exacted from the queen the reward for her services and her past sufferings, was sent into exile, as well as the Duke of Vendôme. Madame d'Hautefort, but lately summoned by Anne of Austria to be near her, was soon involved in the same disgrace. . . . The party of the Importants was dead, and the power of Cardinal Mazarin seemed to be firmly established. 'It was not the thing just then for any decent man to be on bad terms with the court,' says Cardinal de Retz.—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 41-43.—"Cardinal Richelieu was not so much a minister, in the precise sense of the word, as a person invested with the whole power of the crown. His preponderating influence in the council suspended the exercise of the hereditary power, without which the monarchy must cease to exist; and it seems as if that may have taken place in order that the social progress, violently arrested since the last reign, might resume its course at the instigation of a kind of dictator, whose spirit was free from the influences which the interest of family and dynasty exercises over

the characters of kings. By a strange concurrence of circumstances, it happened that the weak prince, whose destiny it was to lend his name to the reign of the great minister, had in his character, his instincts, his good or bad qualities, all that could supply the requirements of such a post. Louis XIII., who had a mind without energy but not without intelligence, could not live without a master; after having possessed and lost many, he took and kept the one, who he found was capable of conducting France to the point, which he himself had a faint glimpse of, and to which he vaguely aspired in his melancholy reveries. . . . In his attempts at innovation, Richelieu, as simple minister, much surpassed the great king who had preceded him, in boldness. He undertook to accelerate the movement towards civil unity and equality so much, and to carry it so far, that hereafter it should be impossible to recede. . . . The work of Louis XI. had been nearly lost in the depth of the troubles of the sixteenth century; and that of Henry IV. was compromised by fifteen years of disorder and weakness. To save it from perishing, three things were necessary: that the high nobility should be constrained to obedience to the king and to the law; that Protestantism should cease to be an armed party in the State; that France should be able to choose her allies freely in behalf of her own interest and in that of European independence. On this triple object the king-minister employed his powerful intellect, his indefatigable activity, ardent passions, and an heroic strength of mind. His daily life was a desperate struggle against the nobles, the royal family, the supreme courts, against all that existed of high institutions, and corporations established in the country. For the purpose of reducing all to the same level of submission and order, he raised the royal power above the ties of family and the tie of precedent; he isolated it in its sphere as a pure idea, the living idea of the public safety and the national interest. . . . He was as destitute of mercy as he was of fear, and trampled under foot the respect due to judicial forms and usages. He had sentences of death pronounced by commissioners of his own selection: at the very foot of the throne he struck the enemies of the public interest, and at the same time of his own fortune, and confounded his personal hatreds with the vengeance of the State. No one can say whether or not there was deceit in that assurance of conscience which he manifested in his last moments: God alone could look into the depth of his mind. We who have gathered the fruit of his labours and of his patriotic devotion at a distance of time—we can only bow before that man of revolution, by whom the ways which led to our present state of society were prepared. But something sad is still attached to his glory: he sacrificed everything to the success of his undertaking; he stifled within himself and crushed down in some noble spirits the eternal principles of morality and humanity. When we look at the great things which he achieved, we admire him with gratitude; we would, but we cannot, love his character."—A. Thierry, *Formation and Progress of the Tiers État or Third Estate in France*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: V. Cousin, *Secret Hist. of the French Court under Richelieu and Mazarin*, ch. 3-4.—The same, *The Youth of Madame de Longueville*.—Lord Mahon, *Life of Louis, Prince of Condé*,

ch. 1.—Cardinal de Retz, *Memoirs*, bk. 1-2.—M'lle de Montpensier, *Memoirs*, ch. 2-3.

A. D. 1643.—Accession of Louis XIV.

A. D. 1643.—Enghien's (Condé's) campaign on the Moselle.—Siege and capture of Thionville.—“On the 20th of May . . . Enghien made his triumphal entry into Rocroy. He allowed his troops to repose for two days, and then it was towards Guise that he directed his steps. He soon heard that Don Francisco de Melo had taken shelter at Phillipeville, that he was trying to rally his cavalry, but that of all his infantry not above 2,000 men remained to him, and they disarmed and nearly naked. No army any longer protected Flanders, and the youthful courage of Enghien already meditated its conquest. But the Court, which had expected to sustain war in its own provinces, was not prepared to carry it into foreign countries. It became necessary to give up all idea of an invasion of Maritime Flanders and the siege of Dunkirk, with which Enghien had at first flattered himself. Then finding that the Spaniards had drawn off their troops from the fortifications on the Moselle, Enghien proposed to march thither, and take possession of them. . . . Although this project was very inferior to his first, its greatness surprised the Council of Ministers: they at first refused their consent, but the Duke insisted—and what could they refuse to the victor of Rocroy? Thionville was at that time considered to be one of the best fortresses in Europe. On arriving before its walls, after a seven days' march, Enghien . . . established his lines, erected bridges, raised redoubts, and opened a double line of trenches on the 25th of June. The French were several times repulsed, but always rallied; and everywhere the presence of Enghien either prevented or repaired the disorder. . . . The obstinate resistance of the garrison obliged the French to have recourse to mines, which, by assiduous labor, they pushed forward under the interior of the town. Then Enghien, wishing to spare bloodshed, sent a flag of truce to the governor, and allowed him a safe conduct to visit the state of the works. This visit convinced the Spaniards of the impossibility of defending themselves any longer. . . . They evacuated the town on the 22d of August. Thionville was then little more than a heap of ruins and ashes. . . . By this conquest Enghien soon became master of the whole course of the Moselle down to the gates of Trèves. Sierch alone ventured to resist him, but was reduced in 24 hours. Then, disposing his army in autumn quarters, he set off for Paris.”—Lord Mahon, *Life of Louis, Prince of Condé*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1644-1646.—Campaigns in Catalonia.—The failures at Lerida. See SPAIN: A. D. 1644-1646.

A. D. 1645-1648.—Campaigns in Flanders.—Capture of Dunkirk.—Loss of the Dutch alliance.—Condé's victory at Lens. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1634-1646; 1646-1648; 1647-1648.

A. D. 1646-1648.—The last campaigns of the Thirty Years War.—Turenne and the Swedes in Germany. See GERMANY: A. D. 1646-1648.

A. D. 1646-1654.—Hostility to the Pope.—Siege of Orbitello.—Attempts to take advantage of the insurrection in Naples. See ITALY: A. D. 1646-1654.

A. D. 1647-1648.—Conflict between Court and Parliament.—The question of the Paulette.—Events leading to the First Fronde.—

“The war was conducted with alternate success and failure, but with an unintermitted waste of the public revenue; and while Guébriant, Turenne, and Condé were maintaining the military renown of France, D'Emery, the superintendent of finance, was struggling with the far severer difficulty of raising her ways and means to the level of her expenditure. The internal history of the first five years of the regency is thenceforward a record of the contest between the court and the Parliament of Paris; between the court, promulgating edicts to replenish the exhausted treasury, and the Parliament, remonstrating in angry addresses against the acceptance of them.” Of the four sovereign courts which had their seat at that time in the Palais de Justice of Paris, and of which the Parliament was the most considerable—the other three being the Chamber ‘des Comptes,’ the Cour des Aides, and the Grand Conseil—the counselors or stipendiary judges held their offices for life. “But, in virtue of the law called Paulette [named from Paulet, its originator, in the reign of Henry IV.] . . . they also held them as an inheritance transmissible to their descendants. The Paulette . . . was a royal ordinance which imposed an annual tax on the stipend of every judge. It was usually passed for a term of nine years only. If the judge died during that term, his heir was entitled to succeed to the vacant office. But if the death of the judge happened when the Paulette was not in force, his heir had no such right. Consequently, the renewal of the tax was always welcome to the stipendiary counselors of the sovereign courts; and, by refusing or delaying to renew it, the king could always exercise a powerful influence over them. In April, 1647, the Paulette had expired, and the queen-mother proposed the revival of it. But, to relieve the necessities of the treasury, she also proposed to increase the annual per centage which it imposed on the stipends of the counselors of the Chamber ‘des Comptes,’ of the Cour des Aides, and of the Grand Conseil. To concert measures of resistance to the contemplated innovation, those counselors held a meeting in the Great Hall of St. Louis; and at their request the Parliament, though not personally and directly interested in the change, joined their assembly.” The queen sarcastically replied to their remonstrances that the “king would not only withdraw his proposal for an increase in the rate of the annual tax on their stipends, but would even graciously relieve them from that burden altogether. . . . Exasperated by the threatened loss of the heritable tenure of their offices, and still more offended by the sarcastic terms in which that menace was conveyed, the judges assembled in the hall of St. Louis with increased zeal, and harangued there with yet more indignant eloquence. Four different times the queen interdicted their meetings, and four different times they answered her by renewed resolutions for the continuance of them. She threatened severe punishments, and they replied by remonstrances. A direct collision of authority had thus occurred, and it behooved either party to look well to their steps.” The queen began to adopt a conciliatory manner. “But the associated magistrates derived new boldness from the lowered tone and apparent fears of the gov-

ernment. Soaring at once above the humble topic on which they had hitherto been engaged into the region of general politics, they passed at a step from the question of the Paulette to a review of all the public grievances under which their fellow subjects were labouring. After having wrought during four successive days in this inexhaustible mine of eloquence, they at length, on the 30th of June, 1648, commenced the adoption of a series of resolutions, which, by the 24th of July, had amounted in number to 27, and which may be said to have laid the basis of a constitutional revolution. . . . Important as these resolutions were in themselves, they were still more important as the assertion, by the associated magistrates, of the right to originate laws affecting all the general interests of the commonwealth. In fact, a new power in the state had suddenly sprung into existence. . . . That was an age in which the minds of men, in every part of Europe, had been rudely awakened to the extent to which the unconstitutional encroachments of popular bodies might be carried. Charles I. was at that time a prisoner in the hands of the English Parliament. Louis XIV. was a boy, unripe for an encounter with any similar antagonists. . . . The queen-mother, therefore, resolved to spare no concessions by which the disaffected magistracy might be conciliated. D'Emery was sacrificed to their displeasure; the renewal of the Paulette on its ancient terms was offered to them; some of the grievances of which they complained were immediately redressed; and the young king appeared before them in person, to promise his assent to their other demands. In return, he stipulated only for the cessation of their combined meetings, and for their desisting from the further promulgation of arrêts, to which they ascribed the force and authority of law. But the authors of this hasty revolution were no longer masters of the spirits whom they had summoned to their aid. . . . With increasing audacity, therefore, they persevered in defying the royal power, and in requiring from all Frenchmen implicit submission to their own. Advancing from one step to another, they adopted, on the 28th of August, 1648, an arrêt in direct conflict with a recent proclamation of the king, and ordered the prosecution of three persons for the offense of presuming to lend him money. At that moment their debates were interrupted by shouts and discharges of cannon, announcing the great victory of Condé at Lens. During the four following days religious festivals and public rejoicings suspended their sittings. But in those four days, the court had arranged their measures for a coup d'état. As the Parliament retired from Notre Dame, where they had attended at a solemn thanksgiving for the triumph of the arms of France, they observed that the soldiery still stood to the posts which, in honour of that ceremonial, had been assigned to them in different quarters of the city. Under the protection of that force, one of the presidents of the Chamber 'des Enquêtes,' and De Broussel, the chief of the parliamentary agitators, were arrested and consigned to different prisons, while three of their colleagues were exiled to remote distances from the capital. At the tidings of this violence, the Parisian populace were seized with a characteristic paroxysm of fury. . . . In less than three hours, Paris had become an entrenched camp.

. . . They dictated their own terms. The exiles were recalled and the prisoners released. . . . Then, at the bidding of the Parliament, the people laid aside their weapons, threw down the barricades, re-opened their shops, and resumed the common business of life as quietly as if nothing had occurred. . . . It was, however, a short-lived triumph. The queen, her son, and Mazarin effected their escape to St. Germain; and there, by the mediation of Condé and of Gaston, duke of Orleans, the uncle of the king, a peace was negotiated. The treaty of St. Germain was regarded by the court with shame, and by the Parliament with exultation." Fresh quarrels over it soon arose. "Condé was a great soldier, but an unskillful and impatient peacemaker. By his advice and aid, the queen-mother and the king once more retired to St. Germain, and commanded the immediate adjournment of the Parliament from Paris to Montargis. To their remonstrances against that order they could obtain no answer, except that if their obedience to it should be any longer deferred, an army of 25,000 men would immediately lay siege to the city. War was thus declared."—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France*, lect. 21.

ALSO IN: Cardinal De Retz, *Memoirs*, bk. 2 (c. 1).

A. D. 1648.—The Peace of Westphalia.—Acquisition of Alsace, etc. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648; and 1648-1715.

A. D. 1649.—The First Fronde.—Doubtful origin of the name.—Siege of Paris by Condé.—Dishonorable conduct of Turenne.—Deserted by his army.—The Peace of Reuil.—"The very name of this movement is obscure, and it is only certain that it was adopted in jest, from a child's game. It was fitting that the struggle which became only a mischievous burlesque on a revolution should be named from the sport of gamins and school-boys. Fronde is the name of a sling, and the boys of the street used this weapon in their mimic contests. How it came to be applied to the opponents of the government is uncertain. Some claimed it was because the members of the Parliament, like the young frondeurs, hurled their weapons at Mazarin, but were ready to fly when the officers of the police appeared. Others said the term had been used by chance by some counsellor, and had been adopted by the writers of epigrams and mazarinades. However derived, it was not ill applied."

—J. B. Perkins, *France Under Mazarin*, ch. 9 (c. 1).

—"Paul de Gondî, Coadjutor of Paris [Coadjutor, that is, of the Archbishop of Paris, who was his uncle], famous afterwards under the name of Cardinal de Retz, placed himself at the head of the revolution. . . . The Prince of Conti, brother of Condé, the Duke of Longueville, the Duke of Beaufort, and the Duke of Bouillon adopted the party of the coadjutor and the parliament. Generals were chosen for an army with which to resist the court. Although taxes levied by Mazarin had been resisted, taxes were freely paid to raise troops—12,000 men were raised; Condé [commanding for the queen] had 8,000 soldiers. These he threw around Paris, and invested 100,000 bourgeois, and threatened to starve the town. The citizens, adorned with feathers and ribbons, made sorties occasionally, but their manoeuvres were the subject of scorn by the soldiers. . . . As Voltaire says, the tone of the civil discords which afflicted England at the same time

mark well the difference between the national characters. The English had thrown into their civil war a balanced fury and a mournful determination. . . . The French on the other hand threw themselves into their civil strife with caprice, laughter, dissolution and debauchery. Women were the leaders of factions—love made and broke cabals. The Duchess of Longueville urged Turenne, only a short time back appointed Marshal of France, to encourage his army to revolt, which he was commanding for his king. Nothing can justify Turenne's action in this matter. Had he laid down his command and taken the side of his brother [the Duke de Bouillon], on account of his family grievance [the loss of the principality of Sedan—see above, A. D. 1641-1642], the feudal spirit which in those days held affection for family higher than affection for country, might have excused him; but, while in the service of a sovereign and intrusted with the command of an army, to endeavour to lead his troops over to the enemy can be regarded as nothing short of the work of a traitor. He himself pleads as his apology that Condé was starving the population of Paris by the investment. . . . As it was he sacrificed his honour, and allowed his fair fame to be tarnished for the sake of a worthless woman who secretly jeered at his passion, and cared nothing for his heart, but merely for his sword for her own worldly advantage. As it was he endeavoured to persuade his army to declare for the parliament, and purposed taking it into Champagne, and marching for the relief of the capital; but the treachery of the marshal was no match for the subtlety of the cardinal. Before Turenne issued his declaration to his troops the colonels of his regiment had already been tampered with. The cardinal's emissaries had promised them pensions, and distributed £800,000 among the officers and soldiers. This was a decisive argument for mercenaries, who taught Turenne by forsaking him that mercenary services can only be commanded by money. D'Erlach had also stood firm. The regiments of Turenne, six German regiments, called by d'Erlach, marched one night to join him at Brisach. Three regiments of infantry threw themselves under the guns of Philipsburg. Only a small force was left to Turenne, who, finding the blow he intended hopeless, sent the troops still with him to join d'Erlach at Brisach, and retired himself with fifteen or twenty of his friends to Heilbron, thence to Holland, where he awaited the termination of the civil war. The news of the abandonment of Turenne was received with despair at Paris, with wild joy at St. Germain. His banishment, however, was not long. The leaders of the parliament became aware that the princes of the Fronde were trying to obtain foreign assistance to overturn the monarchy; that their generals were negotiating a treaty with Spain. They felt that order, peace, and the independence of parliament, which would in this case become dependent upon the nobility, was in danger. They took the patriotic resolution quickly to act of their own accord. A conference had been opened between the parliament and the Court. Peace was concluded at Reuil, which, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Conti [brother of Condé], Bouillon, and the other nobles of the Fronde, was accepted by the whole parliament. Peace was proclaimed in Paris to

the discontent of the populace. . . . Turenne, on the conclusion of the treaty of Reuil, embarked in Zealand, landed at Dieppe, and posted to Paris."—H. M. Hozier, *Turenne*, ch. 6.—"After the signing of the peace, the Château of St. Germain became the resort of many Frondeurs; the Duchess de Longueville, the Prince of Conti, and nearly all the other chiefs of the party, hastened to pay their respects to the Queen. She received everybody without bitterness, some even with friendship; and the Minister on his part affected much general good-will. . . . One of the first effects of the peace between the parties was a reconciliation in the House of Coudé. The Princess Dowager employed herself with zeal and success in reestablishing harmony between her children. Condé, who despised his brother too much to hate him, readily agreed to a reconciliation with him. As to his sister, he had always felt for her great affection and confidence, and she no less for him: these sentiments were revived at their very first interview at Ruel, and he not only gave her back his friendship, but began to enter into her views, and even to be guided by her counsels. The Prince's policy was to make Royalty powerful and respected, but not absolute. He said publicly that he had done what he ought in upholding Mazarin, because he had promised to do so; but for the future, if things took a different line, he should not be bound by the past. . . . A prey to a thousand conflicting feelings, and discontented with everybody, and perhaps with himself, he took the resolution of retiring for several months to his government in Burgundy. On returning from Dijon in the month of August, the Prince found the Queen and the Cardinal at Compiègne, and very much dejected. . . . He . . . pressed her to return to Paris with her Minister, answering for Mazarin's safety, at the risk of his own head. . . . Their entry into Paris took place a few days after."—Lord Mahon, *Life of Louis, Prince of Condé*, ch. 3-4.

ALSO IN: Guy Joli, *Memoirs*, v. 1.—Cardinal De Retz, *Memoirs*, bk. 2.—Miss Pardoe, *Louis XIV.*, ch. 9-11.

A. D. 1650-1651.—The New Fronde, or the Petits Maîtres.—Its alliance with Spain and defeat at Rethel.—Revolt, siege and reduction of Bordeaux.—"Faction, laid asleep for one night, woke again fresh and vigorous next morning. There was a Parliamentary party, a De Retz party, and a Condé party, and each party plotted and schemed unceasingly to discredit the others and to evoke popular feeling against all except itself. . . . Neither of the leaders, each pretending fear of assassination, ever stirred abroad unless in the company of 400 or 500 gentlemen, thus holding the city in hourly peril of an 'émeute.' Condé's arrogance and insolence becoming at last totally unbearable, the Court proceeded to the bold measure of arresting him. New combinations: De Retz and Orleans coalesce once more; De Retz coquets with Mazarin and is promised a cardinal's hat. Wily Mazarin strongly supports De Retz's nomination in public, and privately urges every member of the council to vote against it and to beseech the Queen to refuse the dignity. It was refused; upon which De Retz turned his energies upon a general union of parties for the purpose of effecting the release of Condé and the overthrow of the minister."—*De Retz and the Fronde* (Temple Bar, v. 38, pp. 535-536).—Condé,

his brother Conti, and his brother-in-law Longueville, were arrested and conducted to Vincennes on the 18th of January, 1650. "This was the second crisis of the sedition. The old Fronde had expired; its leaders had sold themselves to the Court; but in its place sprang up the New Fronde, called also, from the affected airs of its leaders, the Petits Maitres. The beautiful Duchess of Longueville was the soul of it, aided by her admirer, Marsillac, afterwards Duke de la Rochefoucauld, and by the Duke of Bouillon. On the arrest of her husband and her brother, the duchess had fled to Holland, and afterwards to Stenai; where she and Bouillon's brother, Turenne, who styled himself the 'King's Lieutenant-General for the liberation of the Princes,' entered into negotiations with the Archduke Leopold. Bouillon himself had retired into Guienne, which province was alienated from the Court because Mazarine maintained as its governor the detested Epernon. In July Bouillon and his allies publicly received a Spanish envoy at Bordeaux. Condé's wife and infant son had been received in that city with enthusiasm. But on the approach of Mazarine with the royal army, the inhabitants of Guienne, alarmed for their vintage, now approaching maturity, showed signs of submission; after a short siege Bordeaux surrendered, on condition of an amnesty, in which Bouillon and La Rochefoucauld were included; and the Princess of Condé was permitted to retire (October 1st 1650). In the north, the Frondeurs, with their Spanish allies, seemed at first more successful. In the summer Leopold had entered Champagne, penetrated to Ferté Milon, and some of his marauding parties had even reached Dammartin. Turenne tried to persuade the Archduke to march to Vincennes and liberate the princes; but while he was hesitating, Gaston transferred the captives to Marcoussis, whence they were soon after conveyed to Havre. Leopold and Turenne, after a vain attempt to rouse the Parisians, retreated to the Meuse and laid siege to Mouzon. The Cardinal himself, like his master Richelieu, now assumed the character of a general. Uniting with his troops in the north the army of Guienne, he took up his quarters at Rethel, which had been captured by Du Plessis Praslin. Hence he ordered an attack to be made on the Spaniards. In the battle which ensued, these were entirely defeated, many of their principal officers were captured, and even Turenne himself narrowly escaped the same fate (December 15th 1650). The Cardinal's elation was unbounded. It was a great thing to have defeated Turenne, and though the victory was Du Plessis', Mazarine assumed all the credit of it. His head began to turn. He forgot that he owed his success to the leaders of the old Fronde, and especially to the Coadjutor; he neglected his promises to that intriguing prelate, though Gondi plainly declared that he must either be a prince of the Church or the head of a faction. Mazarine was also imprudent enough to offend the Parliament; and he compared them with that sitting at London—which indeed was doing them too much honour. The Coadjutor went over to the party of the princes, dragging with him the feeble-minded Orléans, who had himself been insulted by the Queen. Thus was produced a third phase of this singular sedition—the union of the old Fronde with the new. The Parliament now clamoured for the liberation

of the princes. As the Queen hesitated, Gaston bluntly declared that the dismissal of Mazarine was necessary to the restoration of peace; while the Parliament added to their former demand another for the Cardinal's banishment. Mazarine saw his mistake and endeavoured to rectify it. He hastened to Havre in order to liberate the princes in person, and claim the merit of a spontaneous act. But it was too late; it was plain that he was acting only by constraint. The princes were conducted back in triumph to Paris by a large retinue sent to escort them. On February 25th 1651, their innocence was established by a royal declaration, and they were restored to all their dignities and charges. Mazarine, meanwhile, who saw that for the present the game was lost, retired into exile; first into Bouillon, and afterwards to Brühl on the Rhine, where the Elector of Cologne offered him an asylum. From this place he corresponded with the Queen, and continued to direct her counsels. The anarchy and confusion that had ensued in France were such as promised him a speedy return."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 5, ch. 1 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, bk. 4, ch. 4 (v. 2).—Miss Pardoe, *Louis XIV. and the Court of France*, v. 1, ch. 13-15.

A. D. 1651-1652.—The loss of Catalonia. SEC SPAIN: A. D. 1648-1652.

A. D. 1651-1653.—The arrogance of Condé and his renewal of civil war.—The King's majority proclaimed.—General changing of sides.—Battle of Porte St. Antoine and massacre of the Hôtel de Ville.—End of the Fronde.—Condé in the service of Spain.—"The liberated captives were received with every demonstration of joy by all Paris and the Frondeurs, including the Duke of Orleans. The Queen, melancholy, and perhaps really ill, lay in bed to receive their visit of cold ceremony; but the Duke of Orleans gave them a grand supper, and there was universal joy at being rid of Mazarin. . . . There was a promise to assemble the States General, while Condé thought himself governing the kingdom, and as usual his arrogance gave offence in various quarters. One article in the compact which had gained his liberty was that the Prince of Conti should marry Mademoiselle de Chevreuse, but this alliance offended the pride of the elder brother, and he broke the marriage off hastily and haughtily. Madame de Chevreuse, much offended, repented of the aid she had given, went over to the Queen's party, and took with her the coadjutor, who was devoted to the rejected daughter, and could always sway the mob of Paris. So many persons had thus come to desert the cause of the Prince that Anne of Austria thought of again arresting him." Condé, supposing himself in danger, fled from the city on the 6th of July, and "went to his château of St. Maur, where his family and friends joined him, and he held a kind of court. Queen and Parliament both sent entreaties to him to return, but he disdained them all, and made the condition of his return the dismissal of the secretaries whom Mazarin had left. The Queen, most unwillingly, made them retire, and Condé did return for a short time; but he was haughtier than ever, and openly complained of Mazarin's influence, making every preparation for a civil war. Strangely violent scenes took place," between the Prince and the Coadjutor and their respective adherents; and presently the

Prince "quitted Paris, went to Chantilly, and decided on war. Mazarin wrote to the Queen that the most prudent course would be to ally herself with the Parliament to crush the Princes. After they should have been put down the Parliament would be easily dealt with. She acted on this advice. The elections for the States General were beginning, but in order to quash them, and cancel all her promises, the Queen decided on proclaiming the majority of the King, and thus the close of her own regency. It was of course a farce, since he had only just entered his fourteenth year, and his mother still conducted the Government; but it made a new beginning, and was an occasion for stirring up the loyalty of the people. . . . Condé was unwilling to begin a civil war, and was only driven into it by his sister's persuasions and those of his friends. 'Remember,' he said, 'if I once draw the sword, I shall be the last to return it to the scabbard.' On the other side, Anne of Austria said, 'Monsieur le Prince shall perish, or I will.' From Montrond, Condé directed his forces to take possession of the cities in Guyenne, and he afterwards proceeded to Bordeaux. On the other hand, Mazarin repaired to Sedan, and contrived to raise an army in the frontier cities, with which he marched to join the King and Queen at Poitiers. War was raging again, still as the Fronde, though there had been a general change of sides, the Parliament being now for the Court, and the Princes against it, the Duke of Orleans in a state of selfish agitation between the two. Learning that the royal army was advancing to his own appanage of Orleans, and fearing that the city might open its gates to them, he sent off his daughter, Mademoiselle [de Montpensier], to keep the citizens to what he called their duty to himself. She went with only two ladies and her servants . . . and found the gates closed against her." The persevering Mademoiselle succeeded, however, in gaining admission to the town, despite the orders of the magistrates, and she kept out of it the soldiers of both factions in the war. But her own inclinations were strongly towards Condé and his side. "She went out to a little inn to hold a council with the Dukes of Beaufort and Nemours, and had to mediate between them in a violent quarrel. . . . Indeed, Condé's party were ill-agreed; he had even quarreled with his sister, and she had broken with De la Rochefoucauld! The Duke de Bouillon and his brother Turenne were now on the Queen's side, and the command of the royal army was conferred on the Viscount. Condé, with only eight persons, dashed across France, to take the command of the army over which Beaufort and Nemours were disputing. The very morning after he arrived, Turenne saw by the disposition of the troops who must be opposed to him. 'M. le Prince is come,' he said. They were the two greatest captains of the age, and they fought almost in sight of the King and Queen at Bleneau. But though there were skirmishes [including, at the outset, the serious defeat of a division of the royal forces under Hocquincourt], no decisive engagement took place. It was a struggle of manœuvres, and in this Condé had the disadvantage. . . . Week after week the two armies . . . watched one another, till at last Condé was driven up to the walls of Paris, and there the gates were closed against both armies. Condé was at St. Cloud, whence, on the 2nd of July [1652], he endeavoured to lead his

army round to Charenton at the confluence of the Seine and the Loire; but when he came in front of the Porte St. Antoine, he found that a battle was inevitable and that he was caught in a trap, where, unless he could escape through the city, his destruction was inevitable. He barricaded the three streets that met there, heaping up his baggage as a protection, and his friends within, many of them wives of gentlemen in his army, saw the situation with despair." The only one who had energy to act was Mademoiselle. She extorted from her hesitating father an order, by virtue of which she persuaded the magistrates of the city, not only to open the gates to Condé, but to send 2,000 men to the Faubourg St. Antoine. "Mademoiselle now repaired to the top of the great square tower of the Bastille, whence she could see the terrible conflict carried on in the three suburban streets which converged at the Porte St. Antoine." Seeing an opportunity to turn the cannon of the Bastille on the pursuing troops, she did so with effect. "Turenne was obliged to draw back, and at last Condé brought his army into the city, where they encamped in the open space of the Pré des Clercs. . . . Condé unworthily requited the hospitality wrung from the city. He was resolved to overcome the neutrality of the Parliament, and, in concert with Beaufort, instigated the mob to violence. Many soldiers were disguised as artisans, and mingled with the rabble, when, on the 4th of July, he went to the Hôtel de Ville, ostensibly to thank the magistrates, but really to demand their support against the Crown. These loyal men, however, by a majority of votes, decided on a petition to the King to return without Mazarin. On this Condé exclaimed publicly, 'These gentlemen will do nothing for us. They are Mazarinists. Treat them as you please.' Then he retired to the Luxembourg with Gaston, while Beaufort let loose the mob. The Hôtel de Ville was stormed, the rabble poured in at doors and windows, while the disguised soldiers fired from the opposite houses, and the magistrates were threatened and pursued on all sides. They had one advantage, that they knew their way through the intricate passages and the mob did not. The first who got out rushed to the Luxembourg to entreat the Duke and Prince to stop the massacre; but Monsieur only whistled and beat his tattoo, and Condé said he knew nothing about sedition. Nor would Beaufort interfere till the disturbance had lasted many hours; but after all many more of the rabble were killed than of the magistrates. It was the last remarkable scene in the strange drama of the Fronde. The Parliament suspended its sittings, and the King transferred it to Pontoise, whither Molé and all the other Presidents proceeded, leaving Paris in disguise. This last ferocious proceeding of Condé's, though he tried to disavow it, had shocked and alienated every one, and he soon after fell sick of a violent fever. Meanwhile, his castle of Montrond was taken after a year's siege, Nemours was killed in a duel by the Duke of Beaufort, and the party was falling to pieces. . . . Mazarin saw the opportunity, and again left the Court for the German frontier. This was all that was wanting to bring back the malcontents. Condé offered to make terms, but was haughtily answered that it was no time for negotiation, but for submission. Upon this, he proceeded to the Low Countries, and offered his sword to the

Spaniards. The King entered Paris in state and held a bed of justice, in which he proclaimed an amnesty, excepting from it Condé and Conti, and some others of their party, and forbidding the Parliament to interfere in State affairs. The Coadjutor, who had become a Cardinal, was arrested, and imprisoned until he made his escape, dislocating his shoulder in his fall from the window, but finally reaching Rome, where he lived till the Fronde was forgotten, but never becoming Archbishop of Paris. . . . When all was quiet, Mazarin returned, in February, 1653, without the slightest opposition, and thus ended the Fronde, in the entire triumph of the Crown. . . . The misery, distress and disease caused by these wars of the Fronde were unspeakable. There was nothing to eat in the provinces where they had raged but roots, rotten fruit, and bread made of bran. . . . 'Le misère de la Fronde' was long a proverbial expression in France."—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from English History*, c. 15.

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon, *Life of Condé*, ch. 8-9. —G. P. R. James, *Life and Times of Louis XIV.*, ch. 11-12.—Cardinal de Retz, *Memoirs*, bk. 3-4 (v. 2-3).—Mlle de Montpensier, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 11-17.

A. D. 1652.—Loss of Gravelines and Dunkirk.—Spanish invasion of Picardy.—"In the spring of 1652, the Spanish forces, under the command of the archduke, had undertaken the siege of Gravelines, which was obliged to capitulate on the 18th of May. The archduke next undertook the siege of Dunkirk, but, at the earnest desire of the princes, he merely blockaded the place, and sent Fuensaldaña with about 14,000 men into Picardy to their assistance. . . . The court, in great alarm, sought first a retreat in Normandy, but the Duke of Longueville, who still held the government of that province, refused to receive Mazarin. The fears of the court were not lessened by this proceeding, and it was even proposed to carry the king to Lyons; but the wiser counsels of Turenne finally prevailed, and it was resolved to establish the army at Compiègne, and lodge the court at Pontoise. Fuensaldaña forced the passage of the Oise at Chauni, and then joined the duke of Lorraine at Fismes, on the 29th of July, when their joint forces amounted to full 20,000 men, while Turenne had not more than 9,000 to oppose to them. But the Spaniards were, as usual, only pursuing a selfish policy, and Fuensaldaña, in pursuance of the archduke's orders, left a body of 3,000 cavalry to reinforce the duke of Lorraine, and returned with the rest of his troops to assist in the siege of Dunkirk," which soon surrendered to his arms.—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, v. 2, p. 89.

A. D. 1652-1653.—Last phase of the Fronde at Bordeaux.—Attempted revolution by the Society of the Ormée. See BORDEAUX: A. D. 1652-1653.

A. D. 1653-1656.—Condé's campaigns against his own country, in the service of Spain.—"Condé, unfortunately for his fame, made no attempts at reconciliation, and retired to the Spaniards—an enemy of his country! He captured several small places on the [Flemish] frontier, and hoped to return in spring victorious. A few days after the entry into Paris, Turenne set out to oppose him; and, retaking some towns, had the satisfaction of compelling him to seek

winter quarters beyond the limits of France. . . . Condé persuaded the Spanish to bring 30,000 men into the field for the next campaign: Turenne and La Ferté had but 13,000. To paralyze the plans of the enemy, the Viscount proposed, and his proposal was allowed, to be always threatening their rear and communications; to occupy posts they would not dare to attack, and so to avoid fighting, at the same time hindering them from all important undertakings. He began by throwing himself between two corps of their army, at the point where they expected to effect a junction; and in the eight or nine days thus gained, he recovered Rhétel, without which it would have been, as he declares himself, impossible to defend Picardy and Champagne. Rhétel, so much an object of anxiety, was taken in three days. Baffled in their original purposes, and at a loss, the Spanish expected a large convoy from Cambray, escorted by 3,000 horse. Turenne got news of this, and, posting himself near Peronne to intercept it, drove it back to Cambray [August 11, 1653]. There Condé and Fuensaldaña turned upon him; but he took up a position, which they watched for three or four days, and there defied their attack. They refused the challenge. Thence the enemy drew off," with designs on Guise, which Turenne frustrated. "Condé then laid siege to Rocroi, where his own first glory had been gained; and this place is so hemmed in by woods and defiles, that the relief of it was impossible. But Turenne compensated for the loss of it by the equally valuable recapture of Mouson. Thus the whole year was spent in marches and countermarches, in gains and losses, which had no influence on events. By this time the malcontents were so prostrate that Condé's brother, the Prince de Conti, and his sister, the Duchesse de Longueville, made their peace with the court. . . . The year 1654 opened with the siege of Stenay by the young king in person, who was carried thither by Mazarin, to overawe Condé's governor with the royal name and majesty. That officer was more true to his trust than to his allegiance, and Stenay cost a siege. . . . Condé could do no better than imitate Turenne's policy of the previous year, and besiege Arras as an equivalent for Stenay; to which end he mustered 32,000 men. Arras was a town of some value. Condé had caught it at disadvantage; the governor, Mondejeu . . . was put on his defence with 2,500 foot and 100 horse. To reinforce this slender garrison was the first care of Turenne. . . . Mazarin was anxious for Arras, and offered Turenne to break up the siege of Stenay, for the sake of reinforcing the army of relief. This proposal the Viscount declined. He must have been very confident of his own capacity; for he could collect only 14,000 men to hover around the enemy's camp. . . . He proposed no attempt upon the intrenchments till he had the aid of the troops from Stenay . . . ; but he disposed his parties around so as to prevent the enemy's convoys from reaching them." Stenay surrendered on the 6th of August, and Turenne, with reinforcements from its besiegers, attacked the Spanish lines at Arras on the night of the 24th, with complete success. The Spaniards raised the siege and retreated to Cambray, leaving 3,000 prisoners and 63 pieces of cannon in the hands of the French. "The capture of Quesnoy and Binches filled up the rest of the year; the places were weak and the garrisons feeble. Nor

did the next season, 1655, offer anything of interest. Turenne reduced Landrecies, Condé, and Guislain, while his active opponent was sometimes foiled by his precautions, and sometimes baffled by the absurd behaviour of the Spanish authorities. . . . The great event of 1656 was the siege of Valenciennes. This place . . . was invested by Turenne about the middle of June: but hardly had his camp been intrenched before he repented of his undertaking. The Scheldt flows through the town, and by reservoirs and sluices was flooded at the will of the enemy. Turenne's camp was largely inundated. . . . He had overestimated his means: so great was the circle of his circumvallation that he had not men enough to guard it adequately, when Condé and the Spanish appeared with 20,000 men to the relief of the place." They broke through his lines and forced him to retreat, with a heavy loss of prisoners taken. "The Viscount retrieved his credit by the bold stand he made after the defeat."—T. O. Cockayne, *Life of Marshal Turenne*, pp. 58-60.

ALSO IN: Lord Mahon, *Life of Condé*, ch. 10.—J. B. Perkins, *France under Mazarin*, ch. 16-17 (v. 2).

A. D. 1653-1660.—First persecution of the Jansenists. See PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSENISTS.

A. D. 1655-1658.—Alliance with the English Commonwealth against Spain.—The taking of Dunkirk for England and Gravelines for France.—End of the war.—"Mazarin was now bent upon an enterprise which, if successful, must finish the war. A deadly blow would be struck at the strength of Spain if Dunkirk, Mardyck, and Gravelines—the possession of which was of vital importance to her communication with Flanders, as well as enabling her to ruin French commerce on that coast—could be wrested from her. For this the coöperation of some maritime power was necessary, and Mazarin determined at all costs to secure England. With Cromwell, the only diplomatist by whose astuteness he confessed himself baffled, he had been negotiating since 1651. . . . At length on November 3, 1655, a treaty was signed at Westminster, based upon freedom of commerce and an engagement that neither country should assist the enemies or rebels of the other; Mazarin consented to expel Charles II., James, and twenty named royalists from France. Cromwell similarly agreed to dismiss from England the emissaries of Condé. But Mazarin was soon anxious for a more effectual bond. . . . Cromwell had equally good reasons for drawing closer to France, for Spain was preparing actively to assist Charles II. French and English interests thus coinciding, an alliance was signed at Paris on March 23, 1657 [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1655-1658]. Gravelines and Dunkirk were to be at once besieged both by land and sea. England was to send 6,000 men to assist the French army. Gravelines was to become French and Dunkirk English; should the former fall first it was to be held by England until Dunkirk too was taken. . . . The alliance was not a moment too soon. The campaign of 1657 had opened disastrously. The tide was however turned by the arrival of the English contingent. Montmédy was immediately besieged, and capitulated on August 4. The effect was again to make Mazarin hang back from further effort, since it seemed possible now to make peace

with Spain, and thereby avoid an English occupation of Dunkirk. But Cromwell would stand no trifling, and his threats were so clear that Mazarin determined to act loyally and without delay. On September 30, Turenne laid siege to Mardyck, which protected Dunkirk, and took it in four days. It was at once handed over to the English." In the spring of 1658 the siege of Dunkirk was begun. The Spaniards, under Don John of Austria and Condé, attempting to relieve the place, were defeated (June 13) in the battle of the Dunes, by Turenne and Cromwell's Ironsides (see ENGLAND: A. D. 1655-1658). "Dunkirk immediately surrendered, and on the 25th was in Cromwell's possession. Two months later Gravelines also fell. A short and brilliant campaign followed, in which Don John and Condé, shut up in Brussels and Tournai respectively, were compelled to remain inactive while fortress after fortress fell into French hands. A few days after the fall of Gravelines Cromwell died; but Mazarin was now near his goal. Utterly defeated on her own soil, beaten, too, by the Portuguese at Elvas, and threatened in Milan, her army ruined, her treasury bankrupt, without a single ally in Europe, Spain stood at last powerless before him."—O. Ayr, *The English Restoration and Louis XIV.*, ch. 6.

A. D. 1657.—Candidacy of Louis XIV. for the imperial crown. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648-1705.

A. D. 1659-1661.—The treaty of the Pyrenees.—Marriage of Louis XIV. to the Spanish Infanta.—"The Spaniards could struggle no longer: they sued for peace. Things were prepared for it on every hand: Spain was desperate; matters far from settled or safe in France; in England the Protector's death had come very opportunely for Mazarin; the strong man was no longer there to hold the balance between the European powers. Questions as to a Spanish marriage and the Spanish succession had been before men since 1648; the Spaniards had disliked the match, thinking that in the end it must subject them to France. But things were changed: Philip IV. now had an heir, so that the nations might hope to remain under two distinct crowns; moreover, the needs of Spain were far greater than in 1648, while the demands of France were less. So negotiation between Mazarin and Louis de Haro on the little Isle of Pheasants in the Bidassoa, under the very shadow of the Pyrenees, went on prosperously; even the proposal that Louis XIV. should espouse the Infanta of Spain, Maria Theresa, was at last agreed to at Madrid. The only remaining difficulty arose from" the fact that the young King, Louis XIV., had fallen in love with Maria Mancini, Cardinal Mazarin's niece, and wished to marry her. "The King at last abandoned his youthful and pure passion, and signed the Treaty of the Pyrenees [concluded November 7, 1659], condemning himself to a marriage of state, which exalted high the dignity of the French Crown, only to plunge it in the end into the troubles and disasters of the Succession War. The treaty of peace begins with articles on trade and navigation; then follow cessions, restitutions, and exchanges of territories. 1. On the Northern frontier Spain ceded all she had in Artois, with exception of Aire and S. Omer; in Flanders itself France got Gravelines and its outer defences. In Hainault she became mistress of the important towns,

Landrecies, Quesnoy, and Avesnes, and also strengthened her position by some exchanges: in Luxemburg she retained Thionville, Montmédy, and several lesser places; so that over her whole northern border France advanced her frontier along a line answering to her old limits. . . . In return she restored to Spain several of her latest conquests in Flanders: Ypres, Oudenarde, Dixmûden, Furnes, and other cities. In Condé's country France recovered Rocroy, Le Câtelet and Linchamp, occupied by the Prince's soldiers; and so secured the safety and defences of Champagne and Paris. 2. More to the East, the Duke of Lorraine, having submitted with such good grace as might be, was reinstated in his Duchy. . . . But France received her price here also, the Duchy of Bar, the County of Clermont on the edge of Champagne, Stenay, Dun, Jametz, Moyenvic, became hers. The fortifications of Nancy were to be rased for ever; the Duke of Lorraine bound himself to peace, and agreed to give France free passage to the Bishopricks and Alsace. This was the more necessary, because Franche-Comté, the other highway into Alsace, was left to the Spaniards, and such places in it as were in the King's hands were restored to them. Far out in Germany Louis XIV. replaced Jülich in the hands of the Duke of Neuberg; and that element of controversy, the germ or pretext of these long wars, was extinct for ever. On the Savoyard border France retained Pinerolo, with all the means and temptations of offence which it involved: she restored to the Duke her other conquests within his territories, and to the Spaniards whatever she held in Lombardy; she also honourably obtained an amnesty for those subjects of Spain, Neapolitans or Catalans, who had sided with France. Lastly, the Pyrenees became the final, as it was the natural, boundary between the two Latin kingdoms. . . . Roussillon and Conflans became French: all French conquests to the south of the Pyrenees were restored to Spain. The Spanish King renounced all claims on Alsace or Breisach: on the other hand the submission of the great Condé was accepted; he was restored to all his domains; his son, the young Duke of Enghien, being made Grand Master of France, and he himself appointed Governor of Burgundy and Bresse: his friends and followers were included in the amnesty. Some lesser stipulations, with a view to the peace of Europe, for the settlement of the differences between Spain and Portugal, between the Dukes of Savoy and Mantua, between the Catholic and the Protestant Cantons of Switzerland, and an agreement to help forward peace between the Northern Courts, worthily close this great document, this weighty appendix to the Treaties of Westphalia. A separate act, as was fitting, regulated all questions bearing on the great marriage. It contains a solemn renunciation, intended to bar for ever the union of the two Crowns under one sceptre, or the absorption into France of Flanders, Burgundy, or Charolais. It was a renunciation which, as Mazarin foresaw long before, would never hold firm against the temptations and exigencies of time. The King's marriage with the Infanta Maria Theresa of Spain did not take place till the next year, by which time Mazarin's work in life seemed well nigh over; racked with gout, he had little enjoyment of his triumphs. . . . He betook himself to the arrangement of his own affairs: his physicians giving

him, early in 1661, no hopes of recovery. . . . These things arranged, the Cardinal resigned himself to die 'with a serenity more philosophic than Christian'; and passed away on the 8th of March, 1661."—G. W. Kitchin, *Hist. of France*, bk. 4, ch. 8 (v. 3).—"The Treaty of the Pyrenees, which completed the great work of pacification that had commenced at Munster, is justly celebrated as having put an end to such bitter and useless animosities. But, it is more famous, as having introduced a new æra in European politics. In its provisions all the leading events of a century to come had their origin—the wars which terminated with the Treaties of Aix-la-Chapelle, Nimègue, and Ryswick, and that concerning the Spanish succession. So great an epoch in history has the Pyrenean Treaty been accounted by politicians, that Lord Bolingbroke was of opinion, 'That the only part of history necessary to be thoroughly studied, goes no farther back than this treaty, since, from that period, a new set of motives and principles have prevailed all over Europe.'"—J. Dunlop, *Memoirs of Spain during the Reigns of Philip IV. and Charles II.*, v. 1, ch. 11.

A. D. 1660-1688.—A footing gained in Newfoundland. See NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1660-1688.

A. D. 1661.—Personal assumption of the government by Louis XIV.—The extraordinary characteristics of the reign of the Grand Monarch, now begun.—On the death of Mazarin Louis XIV., then twenty-three years old, announced to his council his intention of taking the government solely upon himself. His ministers were henceforward to receive instructions from him in person; there was to be no premier at their head. The reign which then began "was the culminating epoch in the history of the French Monarchy. What the age of Pericles was in the history of the Athenian Democracy, what the age of the Scipios was in the history of the Roman Republic, that was the reign of Louis XIV. in the history of the old Monarchy of France. . . . It is not only the most conspicuous reign in the history of France—it is the most conspicuous reign in the history of Monarchy in general. Of the very many kings whom history mentions, who have striven to exalt the monarchical principle, none of them achieved a success remotely comparable to his. . . . They may have ruled over wider dominions, but they never attained the exceptional position of power and prestige which he enjoyed for more than half a century. They never were obeyed so submissively at home, nor so dreaded, and even respected, abroad. For Louis XIV. carried off that last reward of complete success, that he for a time silenced even envy, and turned it into admiration. We who can examine with cold scrutiny the make and composition of this Colossus of a French Monarchy; who can perceive how much the brass and clay in it exceeded the gold; who know how it afterwards fell with a resounding ruin, the last echoes of which have scarcely died away, have difficulty in realising the fascination it exercised upon contemporaries who witnessed its first setting up. Louis XIV.'s reign was the very triumph of commonplace greatness, of external magnificence and success, such as the vulgar among mankind can best and most sincerely appreciate. . . . His qualities were on the surface, visible and comprehensible to all.

... He was indefatigably industrious: worked on an average eight hours a day for fifty-four years; had great tenacity of will; that kind of solid judgment which comes of slowness of brain, and withal a most majestic port and great dignity of manners. He had also as much kindness of nature as the very great can be expected to have. ... He must have had great original fineness of tact, though it was in the end nearly extinguished by adulation and incense. His court was an extraordinary creation, and the greatest thing he achieved. He made it the microcosm of all that was most brilliant and prominent in France. Every order of merit was invited there, and received courteous welcome. To no circumstance did he so much owe his enduring popularity. By its means he impressed into his service that galaxy of great writers, the first and the last classic authors of France, whose calm and serene lustre will for ever illumine the epoch of his existence. It may even be admitted that his share in that lustre was not so accidental and undeserved as certain king-haters have supposed. That subtle critic, M. Ste. Beuve, thinks he can trace a marked rise even in Bossuet's style from the moment he became a courtier of Louis XIV. The king brought men together, placed them in a position where they were induced and urged to bring their talents to a focus. His Court was alternately a high-bred gala and a stately university. ... But Louis XIV.'s reign has better titles than the adulations of courtiers and the eulogies of wits and poets to the attention of posterity. It marks one of the most memorable epochs in the annals of mankind. It stretches across history like a great mountain-range, separating ancient France from the France of modern times. On the farther slope are Catholicism and feudalism in their various stages of splendour and decay—the France of crusade and chivalry, of St. Louis and Bayard. On the hither side are free-thought, industry, and centralization—the France of Voltaire, Turgot and Condorcet. When Louis came to the throne, the Thirty Years' War still wanted six years of its end, and the heat of theological strife was at its intensest glow. When he died, the religious temperature had cooled nearly to freezing-point, and a new vegetation of science and positive inquiry was overspreading the world. This amounts to saying that his reign covers the greatest epoch of mental transition through which the human mind has hitherto passed, excepting the transition we are witnessing in the day which now is. We need but recall the names of the writers and thinkers who arose during Louis XIV.'s reign, and shed their seminal ideas broadcast upon the air, to realise how full a period it was, both of birth and decay; of the passing away of the old and the uprising of the new forms of thought. To mention only the greatest;—the following are among the chiefs who helped to transform the mental fabric of Europe in the age of Louis XIV.:—Descartes, Newton, Leibnitz, Locke, Boyle. ... But the chief interest which the reign of Louis XIV. offers to the student of history has yet to be mentioned. It was the great turning-point in the history of the French people. The triumph of the Monarchical principle was so complete under him, independence and self-reliance were so effectually crushed, both in localities and individuals, that a permanent bent was given to the national mind—a habit of looking to the

Government for all action and initiative permanently established. Before the reign of Louis XIV. it was a question which might fairly be considered undecided, whether the country would be able or not, willing or not, to co-operate with its rulers in the work of the Government and the reform of abuses. On more than one occasion such co-operation did not seem entirely impossible or improbable. ... After the reign of Louis XIV. such co-operation of the ruler and the ruled became impossible. The Government of France had become a machine depending upon the action of a single spring. Spontaneity in the population at large was extinct, and whatever there was to do must be done by the central authority. As long as the Government could correct abuses it was well; if it ceased to be equal to this task they must go uncorrected. When at last the reform of secular and gigantic abuses presented itself with imperious urgency, the alternative before the Monarchy was either to carry the reform with a high hand, or perish in the failure to do so. We know how signal the failure was, and could not help being, under the circumstances; and through having placed the Monarchy between these alternatives, it is no paradox to say that Louis XIV. was one of the most direct ancestors of the Great Revolution."—J. C. Morrison, *The Reign of Louis XIV.* (*Fortnightly Rev.*, March, 1874).

ALSO IN: J. I. von Döllinger, *The Policy of Louis XIV.* (*Studies in European History*, ch. 11).

A. D. 1661-1680.—Revived and growing persecution of the Huguenots.—“One of the King's first acts, on assuming the supreme control of affairs at the death of Mazarin, was significant of his future policy with regard to the Huguenots. Among the representatives of the various public bodies who came to tender him their congratulations, there appeared a deputation of Protestant ministers, headed by their president Vignole; but the King refused to receive them, and directed that they should be ordered to leave Paris forthwith. Louis was not slow to follow up this intimation by measures of a more positive kind, for he had been carefully taught to hate Protestantism; and, now that he possessed unrestrained power, he flattered himself with the idea of compelling the Huguenots to abandon their convictions and adopt his own. His minister Louvois wrote to the governors throughout the provinces that ‘his majesty will not suffer any person in his kingdom but those who are of his religion.’ ... A series of edicts was accordingly published with the object of carrying the King's purposes into effect. The conferences of the Protestants were declared to be suppressed. Though worship was still permitted in their churches, the singing of psalms in private dwellings was declared to be forbidden. ... Protestant children were invited to declare themselves against the religion of their parents. Boys of fourteen and girls of twelve years old might, on embracing Roman Catholicism, become enfranchised and entirely free from parental control. ... The Huguenots were again debarred from holding public offices, though a few, such as Marshal Turenne and Admiral Duquesne, who were Protestants, broke through this barrier by the splendor of their services to the state. In some provinces, the exclusion was so severe that a profession of the Roman Catholic faith was required from simple artisans. ... Colbert, while he

lived, endeavored to restrain the King, and to abate these intolerable persecutions. . . . He took the opportunity of cautioning the King lest the measures he was enforcing might tend, if carried out, to the impoverishment of France and the aggrandizement of her rivals. . . . But all Colbert's expostulations were in vain; the Jesuits were stronger than he was, and the King was in their hands; besides, Colbert's power was on the decline. . . . In 1666 the queen-mother died, leaving to her son, as her last bequest, that he should suppress and exterminate heresy within his dominions. . . . The Bishop of Meaux exhorted him to press on in the path his sainted mother had pointed out to him. . . . The Huguenots had already taken alarm at the renewal of the persecution, and such of them as could readily dispose of their property and goods were beginning to leave the kingdom in considerable numbers for the purpose of establishing themselves in foreign countries. To prevent this, the King issued an edict forbidding French subjects from proceeding abroad without express permission, under penalty of confiscation of their goods and property. This was followed by a succession of severe measures for the conversion or extirpation of such of the Protestants—in numbers about a million and a half—as had not by this time contrived to make their escape from the kingdom. The kidnapping of Protestant children was actively set on foot by the agents of the Roman Catholic priests, and their parents were subjected to heavy penalties if they ventured to complain. Orders were issued to pull down the Protestant places of worship, and as many as eighty were shortly destroyed in one diocese. . . . Protestants were forbidden to print books without the authority of magistrates of the Romish communion. Protestant teachers were interdicted from teaching children any thing more than reading, writing, and arithmetic. . . . Protestants were only allowed to bury their dead at daybreak or at nightfall. They were prohibited from singing psalms on land or on water, in workshops or in dwellings. If a priestly procession passed one of their churches while the psalms were being sung, they must stop instantly on pain of the fine or imprisonment of the officiating minister. In short, from the pettiest annoyance to the most exasperating cruelty, nothing was wanting on the part of the 'Most Christian King' and his abettors."—S. Smiles, *The Huguenots*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: A. Maury, *Memoirs of a Huguenot Family* (Fontaine), ch. 4-7.—W. S. Browning, *Hist. of the Huguenots*, ch. 59-60.

A. D. 1661-1683.—The administration of Colbert.—His economic system and its results.—"With Colbert the spirit of the great Cardinal came back to power. Born at Reims on the 29th of August, 1619, Colbert was educated by the Jesuits, and at the early age of nineteen entered the War Office, in which department Le Tellier, a connection of his family by marriage, filled the post of Under-Secretary of State. From the first Colbert distinguished himself by his abnormal powers of work, by his extraordinary zeal in the public service, and by an equal devotion to his own interests. His Jesuit training showed fruit in his dealings with all those who, like Le Tellier or Mazarin, could be of use to him on his road to power, whilst the old tradition of his Scotch blood is favoured by a certain 'dourness'

of character which rendered him in general difficult of access. His marvellous strength of brain, seconded by rare powers of endurance, enabled him to work habitually fourteen hours a day, to enter into every detail of every branch of the administration, whilst at the same time he never lost sight of that noble project of universal reform which he had conceived, and which embraced both Church and State. . . . Qualified in every way for the work of administration, absolutely indifferent to popularity, Colbert seemed destined by nature to lead the final charge against the surviving forces of the feudal system. After the troubles of the Fronde had died away and the death of Mazarin had left Louis XIV. a king in deed as well as in name, these forces of the past were personified by Fouquet, and the duel between Fouquet and Colbert was the dramatic close of a struggle predestined to end in the complete triumph of absolutism. The magnificent and brilliant Fouquet, who for years past had taken advantage of his position as 'Surintendant des Finances' to lavish the resources of the State on his private pleasures, was plainly marked out as the object of Colbert's hostility. . . . On the losing side were ranged all the spendthrift princes and facile beauties of the Court, all the greedy recipients of Fouquet's ostentatious bounties. He had reckoned that the greatest names in France would be compromised by his fall, and that by their danger his own safety was assured. He had reckoned without Colbert; he had reckoned without that power which had been steadily growing throughout all vicissitudes of fate during the last two generations, and which was now centred in the King. No stranger turn of fortune can be pictured than that which, on the threshold of the modern era, linked the nobles of France in their last struggle for independence with the fortunes of a rapacious and fraudulent financier, nor can anything be more suggestive of the character of the coming epoch than the sight of this last battle fought, not in the field of arms, but before a court of law. To Colbert, the fall of Fouquet was but the necessary preliminary to that reform of every branch of the administration which had been ripening in his mind ever since he had entered the public service. To bring the financial situation into order, it was necessary first to call Fouquet to account. . . . The fall of the chief offender, Fouquet, having been brought about, it was easy to force all those who had been guilty of similar malversations on a minor scale to run the gauntlet of the High Commission. Restitution and confiscation became the order of the day, and when the Chamber of Justice was finally dissolved in 1669, far beyond any advantage which might be reckoned to the Treasury from these sources was the gain to the nation in the general sense of security and confidence. It was felt that the days of wholesale dishonesty and embezzlement were at an end. . . . Colbert went forward from this moment without hesitation, devoting his whole energies to the gigantic task of re-shaping the whole internal economy of France. . . . Backed by despotic power, his achievements in these directions have to an incredible extent determined the destinies of modern industry, and have given origin to the whole system of modern administration, not only in France, but throughout Europe. In the teeth of a lavish expenditure which he was utterly unable

to check, once and again did Colbert succeed in establishing a financial equilibrium when the fortunes of France seemed desperate. . . . He aimed . . . at the fostering of home production by an elaborate system of protection, whilst at the same time the markets of other countries were to be forced open and flooded with French goods. Any attempt on the part of a weaker power to imitate his own policy, such for instance as that made in the papal states by Alexander VII. and Clement IX., was instantly repressed with a high hand. . . . His leading idea was to lower all export dues on national produce and manufactures, and, whilst diminishing import duties on such raw materials as were required for French manufactures, to raise them until they became prohibitive on all foreign goods [see TARIFF LEGISLATION: A. D. 1664-1667 (FRANCE)]. The success of the tariff of 1664 misled Colbert. That tariff was a splendidly statesmanlike attempt to put an end to the conflict and confusion of the duties, dues, and customs then existing in the different provinces and ports of France, and it was in effect a tariff calculated for purely fiscal purposes. Far other were the considerations embodied in the tariff of 1667, which led to the Dutch and English wars, and which, having been enacted in the supposed interests of home industry, eventually stimulated production in other countries. . . . If, however, the industrial policy of Colbert cannot be said to have realised his expectations, since it neither brought about a great increase in the number of home manufactures nor succeeded in securing a larger share of foreign trade, there is not a doubt that, in spite even of the disastrous wars which it provoked, it powerfully contributed, on the whole, to place France in the front rank as a commercial nation. . . . The pitiless and despotic Louvois, who had succeeded his father, Colbert's old patron Le Tellier, as Secretary of State for War, played on the imperious vanity of King Louis, and engaged him in wars big and little, which in most cases wanted even the shade of a pretext. . . . All the zeal of the great Minister's strict economy could only stay for a while the sure approach of national distress. . . . When Colbert died, on 6th September, 1683, the misery of France, exhausted by oppressive taxation, and depopulated by armies kept constantly on foot, cried out against the Minister who, rather than fall from power, had lent himself to measures which he heartily condemned. For the moment men forgot how numerous were the benefits which he had conferred . . . and remembered only the harshness with which he had dealt justice and stinted mercy. Yet order reigned where, before his advent, all had been corruption and confusion; the navy of France had been created, her colonies fostered, her forests saved from destruction; justice and the authority of the law had been carried into the darkest corners of the land; religious toleration, socially if not politically, had been advocated; whilst the encroachments of the Church had been more or less steadfastly opposed. To the material prosperity of the nation — even after we have made all possible deductions for the evils arising from an exaggerated system of protection — an immense and enduring impulse had been given; and although it is true that, with the death of Colbert, many parts of his splendid scheme fell to the ground, yet it must be confessed that the spirit in which

it was originated and improved still animates France."—Lady Dilke, *France under Colbert* (*Fortnightly Rev.*, Feb., 1886).

ALSO IN: H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 1, ch. 1-7.—See, also, TAILLE AND GABELLE.

A. D. 1662.—The purchase of Dunkirk from Charles II. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1662.

A. D. 1663-1674.—New France made a Royal Province.—The French West India Company. See CANADA: A. D. 1663-1674.

A. D. 1664.—Aid given to Austria against the Turks.—The victory of St. Gothard. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1660-1664.

A. D. 1664-1666.—War with the piratical Barbary States.—The Jijeli expedition.—Treaties with Tunis and Algiers. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1664-1684.

A. D. 1664-1690.—The building of Versailles. See VERSAILLES.

A. D. 1665.—The Great Days of Auvergne. —"We must read the curious account of the Great Days of Auvergne, written by Fléchier in his youth, if we would form an idea of the barbarism in which certain provinces of France were still plunged, in the midst of the brilliant civilization of the 17th century, and would know how a large number of those seigniors, who showed themselves so gallant and tender in the boudoirs of Paris, lived on their estates, in the midst of their subjects: we might imagine ourselves in the midst of feudalism. A moment bewildered by the hammer of the great demolisher [Richelieu], which had battered down so many Châteaux, the mountain squires of Auvergne, Limousin, Marche and Forez had resumed their habits under the feeble government of Mazarin. Protected by their remoteness from Paris and the parliament, and by the nature of the country they inhabited, they intimidated or gained over the subaltern judges, and committed with impunity every species of violence and exaction. A single feature will enable us to comprehend the state of these provinces. There were still, in the remoter parts of Auvergne, seigniors who claimed to use the wedding right (*droit de jambage*), or, at the least, to sell exemption from this right at a high price to bridegrooms. Serfhood of the glebe still existed in some districts. August 31, 1665, a royal declaration, for which ample and noble reasons were given, ordered the holding of a jurisdiction or court 'commonly called the Great Days,' in the city of Clermont, for Auvergne, Bourbonnais, Nivernais, Forez, Beaujolais, Lyonnais, Combrailles, Marche, and Berry. A president of parliament, a master of requests, sixteen councillors, an attorney-general, and a deputy procurator-general, were designated to hold these extraordinary assizes. Their powers were almost absolute. They were to judge without appeal all civil and criminal cases, to punish the 'abuses and delinquencies of officers of the said districts,' to reform bad usages, as well in the style of procedure as in the preparation and expedition of trials, and to try all criminal cases first. It was enjoined on bailiffs, seneschals, their lieutenants and all other judges, to give constant information of all kinds of crimes, in order to prepare matter for the Great Days. A second declaration ordered that a posse should be put into the houses of the contumacious, that the châteaux where the least resistance was made to the law should be razed; and forbade, under

penalty of death, the contumacious to be received or assisted. The publication of the royal edicts, and the prompt arrival of Messieurs of the Great Days at Clermont, produced an extraordinary commotion in all those regions. The people welcomed the Parisian magistrates as liberators, and a remarkable monument of their joy has been preserved, the popular song or Christmas hymn of the Great Days. Terror, on the contrary, hovered over the châteaux; a multitude of noblemen left the province and France, or concealed themselves in the mountains; others endeavored to conciliate their peasants. . . . The Great Days at least did with vigor what it was their mission to do: neither dignities, nor titles, nor high connections preserved the guilty. . . . The Court of Great Days was not content with punishing evil; it undertook to prevent its return by wise regulations: first, against the abuses of seigniorial courts; second, against the vexations of seigniors on account of feudal service due them; third, concerning the mode and abbreviation of trials; and lastly, concerning the reformation of the clergy, who had no less need of being reformed than the nobility. The Great Days were brought to a close after three months of assizes (end of October, 1665—end of January, 1666), and their recollection was consecrated by a medal."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: The Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 1, ch. 2.

A. D. 1665-1670.—The East India Company. See INDIA: A. D. 1665-1743.

A. D. 1666.—Alliance with Holland against England. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1665-1666.

A. D. 1667.—The War of the Queen's Rights.—Conquests in the Spanish Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS (SPANISH PROVINCES): A. D. 1667.

A. D. 1668.—The king's conquests in Flanders checked by the Triple Alliance. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1668.

A. D. 1670.—The secret treaty of Dover.—The buying of the English king. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1668-1670.

A. D. 1672-1678.—War with Holland and the Austro-Spanish Coalition. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1672-1714; and NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1672-1674, and 1674-1678.

A. D. 1673-1682.—Discovery and exploration of the Mississippi by Marquette and La Salle.—Possession taken of Louisiana. See CANADA: A. D. 1634-1673, and 1669-1687.

A. D. 1678-1679.—The Peace of Nimeguen. See NIMEGUEN, PEACE OF.

A. D. 1679-1681.—Complete absorption of Les Trois-Evêchés and Alsace.—Assumption of entire sovereignty by Louis XIV.—Encroachments of the Chambers of Reannexation.—The seizure of Strasburg.—"The Lorraine Trois-Evêchés, recovered by France from the Holy Roman Empire, had remained in an equivocal position, as to public law, during nearly a century, between their old and new ties: the treaty of Westphalia had cut the knot by the formal renunciation of the Empire to all rights over these countries; difficulties nevertheless still subsisted relative to the fiefs and the pendencies of Trois-Evêchés possessed by members of the Empire. Alsace, in its turn, from the treaty of Westphalia to the peace of Nimeguen, had offered analogous and still greater difficulties, this province of Teutonic tongue never having accepted the annexation to France as easily as the

Walloon province of Trois-Evêchés, and the treaty of Westphalia presenting two contradictory clauses, one of which ceded to France all the rights of the Emperor and the Empire, and the other of which reserved the 'immediateness' of the lords and the ten cities of the prefecture of Alsace towards the Empire [see GERMANY: A. D. 1648]. . . . At last, on the complaints carried to the Germanic Diet by the ten Alsacian cities, joined by the German feudatories of Trois-Evêchés, Louis, who was then very conciliatory towards the Diet, consented to take for arbiters the King of Sweden and some princes and towns of Germany (1665). The arbitration was protracted for more than six years. In the beginning of 1672, the arbiters rendered an ambiguous decision which decided nothing and satisfied no one. War with Holland broke out meanwhile and changed all the relations of France with Germany. . . . Louis XIV. disarmed or took military occupation of the ten cities and silenced all opposition. . . . In the conferences of Nimeguen, the representatives of the Emperor and the Empire endeavored to return to the 'immediateness,' but the King would not listen to a renewal of the arbitration, and declared all debate superfluous. 'Not only,' said the French plenipotentiaries, 'ought the King to exercise, as in fact he does exercise, sovereign domain over the ten cities, but he might also extend it over Strasburg, for the treaty of Münster furnishes to this city no special title guaranteeing its independence better than that of the other cities.' It was the first time that Louis had disclosed this bold claim, resting on an inaccurate assertion. The Imperialists, terrified, yielded as regarded the ten cities, and Alsace was not called in question in the treaty of Nimeguen. Only the Imperialists protested, by a separate act, against the conclusions which might be drawn from this omission. The ten cities submitted and took to the King an oath of fidelity, without reservation towards the Empire; their submission was celebrated by a medal bearing the device: 'Alsatia in provinciam reducta' (1680). The treaty of Nimeguen was followed by divers measures destined to win the Alsacian population. . . . This wise policy bore its fruits, and Alsace, tranquilized, gave no more cause of anxiety to the French government. France was thenceforth complete mistress of the possessions which had been ceded to her by the Empire; this was only the first part of the work; the point in question now was, to complete these possessions by joining to them their natural appendages which the Empire had not alienated. The boundaries of Lower Alsace and the Messin district were ill defined, encroached upon, entangled, on the Rhine, on the Sarre, and in the Vosges, by the fiefs of a host of petty princes and German nobles. This could not be called a frontier. Besides, in the very heart of Alsace, the great city of Strasburg preserved its independence towards France and its connection with the Empire. A pacific method was invented to proceed to aggrandizements which it would seem could only be demanded by arms; a pacific method, provided that France could count on the weakness and irresolution of her neighbors; this was to investigate and revendicate everything which, by any title and at any epoch whatsoever, had been dependent on Alsace and Trois-Evêchés. We may comprehend whether this would lead, thanks to the complications of the

feudal epoch; and it was not even designed to stop at the feudal system, but to go back to the times of the Frankish kings! Chambers of 'reannexation' were therefore instituted, in 1679, in the Parliament of Metz, and in the sovereign council of Alsace, with a mission which their title sufficiently indicated. . . . Among the nobles summoned, figured the Elector of Treves, for Oberstein, Falkenburg, etc.; the Landgrave of Hesse, for divers fiefs; the Elector Palatine, for Seltz and the canton situated between the Lauter and the Keich (Hogenbach, Germersheim, etc.); another prince palatine for the county of Veldentz; the Bishop of Speyer, for a part of his bishopric; the city of Strasburg, for the domains which it possessed beyond the Rhine (Wasselonne and Marlenheim); lastly, the King of Sweden, for the duchy of Deux-Ponts or Zweibrücken, a territory of considerable extent and of irregular form, which intersected the cis-Rhenish Palatinate. . . . By divers decrees rendered in March, August, and October, 1680, the sovereign council of Alsace adjudged to the King the sovereignty of all the Alsacian seigniories. The nobles and inhabitants were summoned to swear fidelity to the King, and the nobles were required to recognize the sovereign council as judge in last resort. The chamber of Metz acted on a still larger scale than the chamber of Breisach. April 12, 1680, it united to Trois-Évêchés more than 80 fiefs, the Lorraine marquisate of Pont-à-Mousson, the principality of Salm, the counties of Saarbrück and Veldentz, the seigniories of Sarrebourg, Bitche, Homburg, etc. The foundation of the new town of Sarre-Louis and the fortification of Bitche consolidated this new frontier; and not only was the course of the Sarre secured to France, but France, crossing the Sarre, encroached deeply on the Palatinate and the Electorate of Treves, posted herself on the Nahe and the Blies, and threw, as an advance-guard, on a peninsula of the Moselle, the fortress of Mont-Royal, half-way from Treves to Coblenz, on the territories of the county of Veldentz. The parliament of Franche-Comté, newly French as it was, zealously followed the example of the two neighboring courts. There was also a frontier to round towards the Jura. . . . The Duke of Würtemberg was required to swear allegiance to the King for his county of Montbéliard. . . . The acquisitions made were trifling compared with those which remained to be made. He [Louis XIV.] was not sure of the Rhine, not sure of Alsace, so long as he had not Strasburg, the great city always ready to throw upon the French bank of the river the armies of the Empire. France had long aimed at this conquest. As soon as she possessed Metz she had dreamed of Strasburg. . . . Though the King and Louvois had prevented Créqui from besieging the place during the war, it was because they counted on surprising it after peace. This great enterprise was most ably manœuvred." The members of the regency of the city were gained over, one by one. "The Imperial troops had evacuated the city pursuant to the treaty of Nimègue; the magistrates dismissed 1,200 Swiss which the city had in its pay; then, on the threatening demands of the French, they demolished anew Fort Kehl, which they had rebuilt since its destruction by Créqui. When the fruit seemed ripe, Louis stretched out his hand to gather it. In the latter part of September, 1681, the garrisons of Lorraine, Franche-Comté, and

Alsace put themselves in motion. . . . The 28th, 35,000 men were found assembled before the city; Baron de Montclar, who commanded this army, informed the magistrates that 'the sovereign chamber of Breisach having adjudged to the king the sovereignty of all Alsace, of which Strasburg was a member, his Majesty desired that they should recognize him as their sovereign lord, and receive a garrison.' On the 30th the capitulation of the city was signed; on the 23d of October the King was received as its sovereign. —H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 1, ch. 7. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648-1715.

A. D. 1680.—Imprisonment of the "Man in the Iron Mask." See IRON MASK.

A. D. 1681-1684.—Threatening relations with the Turks.—War with the Barbary States.—Destructive bombardment of Algiers. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1664-1684.

A. D. 1681-1698.—Climax of the persecution of the Huguenots.—The Dragoonades.—The revocation of the Edict of Nantes.—The great exodus of French Protestants and the consequent national loss.—"Love and war suspended for a considerable time" the ambition of the king to extinguish heresy in his dominions and establish uniformity of religious worship; "but when Louis became satiated at once with glory and pleasure, and when Madame de Maintenon, the Duke de Beauvilliers, the Duke de Montausier, Bossuet, the Archbishop of Rheims, the Chancellor Letellier, and all the religious portion of the court, began to direct his now unoccupied and scrupulous mind to the interests of religion, Louis XIV. returned to his plans with renewed ardor. From bribery they proceeded to compulsion. Missionaries, escorted by dragoons, spread themselves at the instigation of Bossuet, and even of Fénelon, over the western, southern and eastern provinces, and particularly in those districts throughout which Protestantism, more firmly rooted among a more tenacious people, had as yet resisted all attempts at conversion by preaching. . . . Children from above seven years of age were authorized to abjure legally the religion of their fathers. The houses of those parents who refused to deliver up their sons and daughters were invaded and laid under contributions by the royal troops. The expropriation of their homes, and the tearing asunder of families, compelled the people to fly from persecution. The king, uneasy at this growing depopulation, pronounced the punishment of the galleys against those who sought liberty in flight; he also ordered the confiscation of all the lands and houses which were sold by those proprietors who were preparing to quit the kingdom. . . . Very soon the proscription was organized en masse: all the cavalry in the kingdom, who, on account of the peace, were unemployed, were placed at the disposal of the preachers and bishops, to uphold their missions [known as the dragoonades] with the sabre. . . . Bossuet approved of these persecutions. Religious and political faith, in his eyes, justified their necessity. His correspondence is full of evidence, while his actions prove that he was an accomplice: even his eloquence . . . overflowed with approbation of, and enthusiasm for, these oppressions of the soul and terrors of heresy."—A. de Lamartine, *Memoirs of Celebrated Characters*, v. 3: Bossuet.—"The heroism of conviction, it has been truly said, was now displayed, not in resistance, but, if the para-

dox may be admitted, in flight. The outflow was for the moment arrested at the remonstrance of Colbert, now for the last time listened to in the royal councils, and by reason of the sympathy aroused by the fugitives in England: but not before 3,000 families had left the country. The retirement and death of the great minister were the signal for revived action, wherever an assembly of huguenots larger than usual might warrant or colour a suspicion of rebellion. In such excuses, not as yet an avowed crusade, the troopers of the duke de Noailles were called in at Grenoble, Bourdeaux, and Nîmes. Full forty churches were demolished in 1683, more than a hundred in 1684. But the system of military missions was not organized until in 1685 the defence of the Spanish frontier offered the opportunity for a final subjugation of the huguenots of Béarn. The dragonnade passed through the land like a pestilence. From Guienne to Dauphiné, from Poitou to Upper Languedoc, no place was spared. Then it pervaded the south-east country, about the Cevennes and Provence, and ravaged Lyons and the Pays de Gex. In the end, the whole of the north was assailed, and the failing edict of Nantes was annulled on the 1st of October. The sombre mind of Madame de Maintenon had postulated the Recall as a preliminary to the marriage which the king had already conceded. On the 21st of the month the great church at Charenton was doomed; and on the 22nd the 'unadvised and precipitate' Edict of Revocation was registered in the Chambre des Vacations. . . . The year 1685 is fitly identified with the depopulation of France. And yet, with a blindness that appears to us incredible, the government refused to believe in the desire or the possibility of escape. The penalties attached to capture on the road,—the galleys or the nunnery,—the vigilant watch at the frontier, the frigates cruising by every coast, all these difficulties seem to have persuaded Louis that few would persist in risking flight. What these measures actually effected was doubtless to diminish the exodus, but in no marked degree. At length, it came to be thought that the emigration was due to its prohibition, as though the huguenots must do a thing from mere perverseness. The watch was relaxed, and a result unlooked for issued. It was the signal of the greatest of the emigrations, that of 1688. . . . In the statistical question [as to the total number of the Huguenot exiles from France after the revocation of the edict of Nantes] it is impossible to arrive at a certain result; and the range which calculation or conjecture has allowed to successive historians may make one pause before attempting a dogmatic solution. Basnage, a year after the Recall, reckoned the emigrants above 150,000: next year Jurieu raised the total above 200,000. Writing later Basnage found between 300,000 and 400,000; and the estimate has been accepted by Sismondi. Lastly Voltaire, followed in our own day by Hase, counted 500,000. These are a few of the sober calculations, and their mean will perhaps supply the ultimate figure. I need only mention, among impossible guesses, that of Limiers, which raises the account to 800,000, because it has been taken up by the Prussian statesman Von Dohm. . . . The only historian who professes to have pursued the enquiry in exact detail is Capefigue; and from his minute scrutiny of the cartons des

généralités, as prepared in the closing years of the 17th century, he obtains a computation of 225,000 or 230,000. Such a result must be accepted as the absolute minimum; for it was the plain interest of the intendants who drew up the returns, to put all the facts which revealed the folly of the king's action at the lowest cipher. And allowing the accuracy of Capefigue's work, there are other reasons for increasing his total. . . . We cannot set the emigration at a lower fraction than one-fifth of the total huguenot society. If the body numbered two millions, the outflow will be 400,000. If this appear an extreme estimate, it must be remembered that one-fifth is also extreme on the other side. Reducing the former aggregate to 1,500,000, it will be clearly within the bounds of moderation to leave the total exodus a range between 300,000 and 350,000. How are we to distribute this immense aggregation? Holland certainly claims near 100,000; England, with Ireland and America, probably 80,000. Switzerland must have received 25,000; and Germany, including Brandenburg, thrice that number. The remainder will be made up from the north of Europe, and from the exiles whom commerce or other causes carried in isolated households elsewhere, and of whom no record is preserved to us. . . . The tale then of the emigrants was above 300,000. It follows to ask what was the material loss involved in their exodus. Caveirac is again the lowest in his estimate: he will not grant the export of more than 250,000 livres. He might have learnt from Count d'Avaux himself, that those least likely to magnify the sum confessed that by the very year of the Recall twenty million livres had gone out of the country; and it is certain that the wealthier merchants deferred their departure in order to carry as much as they could with them. Two hundred and fifty traders are said to have quitted Rouen in 1687 and 1688. Probably the actual amount was very far in excess of these twenty millions: and a calculation is cited by Macpherson which even affirms that every individual refugee in England brought with him on an average money or effects to the value of £60. . . . It will be needless to add many statistics of the injury caused by their withdrawal from France. Two great instances are typical of the rest. Lyons which had employed 18,000 silks, had but 4,000 remaining by the end of the century. Tours with the same interest had had 800 mills, 80,000 looms, and perhaps 4,000 work-people. Of its 3,000 ribbon-factories only sixty remained. Equally significant was the ruin of the woollen trade of Poitou. Little was left of the drugget-manufacture of Coulonges and Châtaigneraie, or of the industry in serges and bombazines at Thouars; and the export traffic between Châtaigneraie and Canada, by way of La Rochelle, was in the last year of the century absolutely extinct."—R. L. Poole, *Hist. of the Huguenots of the Dispersion*, ch. 3 and 15.

Also in: C. Weiss, *Hist. of the French Protestant Refugees*.—N. Peyrat, *The Pastors in the Wilderness*, v. 1, ch. 5-7.—J. I. von Döllinger, *Studies in European History*, ch. 11-12.—C. W. Baird, *Hist. of the Huguenot Emigration to Am.*, ch. 4-8 (v. 1-2).

A. D. 1682-1693.—Contest with the Papacy. See PAPACY: A. D. 1682-1693.

A. D. 1686.—Claims upon the Palatinate. See GERMANY: A. D. 1686.

A. D. 1689-1690.—War of the League of Augsburg.—The second devastation of the Palatinate.—“The interference of Lewis in Ireland on behalf of James [the Second, the de-throned Stuart king] caused William [Prince of Orange, now King of England] to mature his plans for a great Continental confederacy against France. On May 12, 1689, William, as Stadtholder of the United Provinces, had entered into an offensive and defensive alliance with the Emperor against Lewis. On May 17, as King of England, he declared war against France; and on December 30 joined the alliance between the Emperor and the Dutch. His example was followed on June 6, 1690, by the King of Spain, and on October 20 of the same year by Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy. This confederation was called the ‘Grand Alliance.’ Its main object was declared to be to curb the power and ambition of Lewis XIV.; to force him to surrender his conquests, and to confine his territories to the limits agreed upon between him and the Emperor at the treaty of Westphalia (1648), and between France and Spain at the treaty of the Pyrenees (1659). The League of Augsburg, which William had with so much trouble brought about, had now successfully developed into the Grand Alliance.”—E. Hale, *The Fall of the Stuarts and Western Europe*, ch. 14, sect. 5.—“The work at which William had toiled indefatigably during many gloomy and anxious years was at length accomplished. The great coalition was formed. It was plain that a desperate conflict was at hand. The oppressor of Europe would have to defend himself against England allied with Charles the Second King of Spain, with the Emperor Leopold, and with the Germanic and Batavian federations, and was likely to have no ally except the Sultan, who was waging war against the House of Austria on the Danube. Lewis had, towards the close of the preceding year, taken his enemies at a disadvantage, and had struck the first blow before they were prepared to parry it. But that blow, though heavy, was not aimed at the part where it might have been mortal. Had hostilities been commenced on the Batavian frontier, William and his army would probably have been detained on the continent, and James might have continued to govern England. Happily, Lewis, under an infatuation which many pious Protestants confidently ascribed to the righteous judgment of God, had neglected the point on which the fate of the whole civilised world depended, and had made a great display of power, promptitude, and energy, in a quarter where the most splendid achievements could produce nothing more than an illumination and a *Te Deum*. A French army under the command of Marshal Duras had invaded the Palatinate and some of the neighbouring principalities. But this expedition, though it had been completely successful, and though the skill and vigour with which it had been conducted had excited general admiration, could not perceptibly affect the event of the tremendous struggle which was approaching. France would soon be attacked on every side. It would be impossible for Duras long to retain possession of the provinces which he had surprised and overrun. An atrocious thought rose in the mind of Louvois, who, in military affairs, had the chief sway at Versailles. . . . The ironhearted statesman submitted his plan, probably with much management and with some

disguise, to Lewis; and Lewis, in an evil hour for his fame, assented. Duras received orders to turn one of the fairest regions of Europe into a wilderness. Fifteen years had elapsed since Turenne had ravaged part of that fine country. But the ravages committed by Turenne, though they have left a deep stain on his glory, were mere sport in comparison with the horrors of this second devastation. The French commander announced to near half a million of human beings that he granted them three days of grace, and that, within that time, they must shift for themselves. Soon the roads and fields, which then lay deep in snow, were blackened by innumerable multitudes of men, women, and children flying from their homes. Many died of cold and hunger: but enough survived to fill the streets of all the cities of Europe with lean and squalid beggars, who had once been thriving farmers and shopkeepers. Meanwhile the work of destruction began. The flames went up from every marketplace, every hamlet, every parish church, every country seat, within the devoted provinces. The fields where the corn had been sown were ploughed up. The orchards were hewn down. No promise of a harvest was left on the fertile plains near what had once been Frankenthal. Not a vine, not an almond tree, was to be seen on the slopes of the sunny hills round what had once been Heidelberg. No respect was shown to palaces, to temples, to monasteries, to infirmaries, to beautiful works of art, to monuments of the illustrious dead. The famed castle of the Elector Palatine was turned into a heap of ruins. The adjoining hospital was sacked. The provisions, the medicines, the pallets on which the sick lay, were destroyed. The very stones on which Manheim had been built were flung into the Rhine. The magnificent Cathedral of Spire perished, and with it the marble sepulchres of eight Cæsars. The coffins were broken open. The ashes were scattered to the winds. Treves, with its fair bridge, its Roman baths and amphitheatre, its venerable churches, convents, and colleges, was doomed to the same fate. But, before this last crime had been perpetrated, Lewis was recalled to a better mind by the execrations of all the neighbouring nations, by the silence and confusion of his flatterers, and by the expostulations of his wife. . . . He relented; and Treves was spared. In truth he could hardly fail to perceive that he had committed a great error. The devastation of the Palatinate, while it had not in any sensible degree lessened the power of his enemies, had inflamed their animosity, and had furnished them with inexhaustible matter for invective. The cry of vengeance rose on every side. Whatever scruple either branch of the House of Austria might have felt about coalescing with Protestants was completely removed.”—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.* (trans. by M. L. Booth), v. 2, ch. 2.—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Ger. Empire*, bk. 3, ch. 3 (v. 3).—See, also, CANADA: A. D. 1689-1690.

A. D. 1689-1691.—Aid to James II. in Ireland. See IRELAND: A. D. 1689-1691.

A. D. 1689-1691.—Campaigns in the Netherlands and in Savoy.—“Our limits will not permit us to describe at any length the war between Louis XIV. and the Grand Alliance, which lasted till the Peace of Ryswick, in 1697, but only to

note some of the chief incidents of the different campaigns. The Imperialists had, in 1689, notwithstanding the efforts it was still necessary to make against the Turks, brought an army of 80,000 men into the field, which was divided into three bodies under the command of the Duke of Lorraine, the Elector of Bavaria, and the Elector of Brandenburg; while the Prince of Waldeck, in the Netherlands, was at the head of a large Dutch and Spanish force, composed, however, in great part of German mercenaries. In this quarter, Marshal d'Humières was opposed to Waldeck, while Duras commanded the French army on the Rhine. In the south, the Duke of Noailles maintained a French force in Catalonia. Nothing of much importance was done this year; but on the whole the war went in favour of the Imperialists, who succeeded in recovering Mentz and Bonn. 1690: This year, Marshal d'Humières was superseded by the Duke of Luxembourg, who infused more vigour into the French operations. . . . Catinat was sent this year into Dauphiné to watch the movements of the Duke of Savoy, who was suspected by the French Court, and not without reason, of favouring the Grand Alliance. The extravagant demands of Louis, who required Victor Amadeus to unite his troops with the army of Catinat, and to admit a French garrison into Vercelli, Verrua, and even the citadel of Turin itself, till a general peace should be effected, caused the Duke to enter into treaties with Spain and the Emperor, June 3d and 4th; and on October 20th, he joined the Grand Alliance by a treaty concluded at the Hague with England and the States-General. This last step was taken by Victor Amadeus in consequence of his reverses. He had sustained from Catinat in the battle of Staffarda (August 17th) a defeat which only the skill of a youthful general, his cousin the Prince Eugene, had saved from becoming a total rout. As the fruits of this victory, Catinat occupied Saluzzo, Susa, and all the country from the Alps to the Tanaro. During these operations another French division had reduced, without much resistance, the whole of Savoy, except the fortress of Montmélian. The only other event of importance during this campaign was the decisive victory gained by Luxembourg over Prince Waldeck at Fleurus, July 1st. The captured standards, more than a hundred in number, which Luxembourg sent to Paris on this occasion, obtained for him the name of the 'Tapassier de Nôtre Dame.' Luxembourg was, however, prevented from following up his victory by the orders of Louvois, who forbade him to lay siege to Namur or Charleroi. Thus, in this campaign, France maintained her preponderance on land as well as at sea by the victory off Beachy Head [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1690]. . . . The Imperialists had this year lost one of their best leaders by the death of the Duke of Lorraine (April). He was succeeded as commander-in-chief by Maximilian Emanuel, Elector of Bavaria; but nothing of importance took place upon the Rhine. 1691: The campaign of this year was singularly barren of events, though both the French and English kings took a personal part in it. In March, Louis and Luxembourg, laid siege to Mons, the capital of Hainault, which surrendered in less than three weeks. King William, who was in the neighbourhood, could not muster sufficient troops to venture on its relief. Nothing further of impor-

tance was done in this quarter, and the campaign in Germany was equally a blank. On the side of Piedmont, Catinat took Nice, but, being confronted by superior numbers, was forced to evacuate Piedmont; though, by way of compensation, he completed the conquest of Savoy by the capture of Montmélian. Noailles gained some trifling successes in Spain; and the celebrated French corsair, Jean Bart, distinguished himself by his enterprises at sea. One of the most remarkable events of the year was a domestic occurrence, the death of Louvois."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 5, ch. 5 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 44 (v. 5).

A. D. 1692.—The taking of Namur and the victory of Steinkirk, or Steenkerke.—“Never perhaps in the whole course of his unresting life were the energies of William [of Orange] more severely taxed, and never did his great moral and intellectual qualities shine forth with a brighter lustre, than in the years 1692-93. The great victory of La Hogue [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1692] and the destruction of the flower of the French fleet did, it is true, relieve England of any immediate dread either of insurrection or invasion, and so far the prospect before him acquired a slight improvement towards the summer of 1692. But this was the only gleam of light in the horizon. . . . The great coalition of Powers which he had succeeded in forming to resist the ambition of Louis was never nearer dissolution than in the spring of 1692. The Scandinavian states, who had held aloof from it from the first, were now rapidly changing the benevolence of their neutrality into something not easily distinguishable from its reverse. The new Pope Innocent XII. showed himself far less amicably disposed towards William than his two predecessors. The decrepitude of Spain and the arrogant self-will of Austria were displaying themselves more conspicuously than ever. Savoy was ruled by a duke who was more than half suspected of being a traitor. . . . William did succeed in saving the league from dissolution, and in getting their armies once more into the field. But not, unfortunately, to any purpose. The campaign of the present year was destined to repeat the errors of the last, and these errors were to be paid for at a heavier cost. . . . The French king was bent upon the capture of the great stronghold of Namur, and the enemy, as in the case of Mons, were too slow in their movements and too ineffective in their dispositions to prevent it. Marching to the assault of the doomed city, with a magnificence of courtly pageantry which had never before been witnessed in warfare, Louis sat down before Namur, and in eight days its faint-hearted governor, the nominee of the Spanish viceroy of the Netherlands, surrendered at discretion. Having accomplished, or rather having graciously condescended to witness the accomplishment of this feat of arms, Louis returned to Versailles, leaving his army under the command of Luxembourg. The fall of Namur was a severe blow to the hopes of William, but yet worse disasters were in store for him. He was now pitted against one who enjoyed the reputation of the greatest general of the age, and William, a fair but by no means brilliant strategist, was unequal to the contest with his accomplished adversary. Luxembourg lay at Steinkirk, and William approaching him from a place

named Lambeque, opened his attack upon him by a well-conceived surprise which promised at first to throw the French army into complete disorder. Luxembourg's resource and energy, however, were equal to the emergency. He rallied and steadied his troops with astonishing speed, and the nature of the ground preventing the allies from advancing as rapidly as they had expected, they found the enemy in a posture to receive them. The British forces were in the front, commanded by Count Solmes, the division of Mackay, a name now honourable for many generations in the annals of continental, no less than of Scottish, warfare, leading the way. These heroes, for so, though as yet untried soldiers, they approved themselves, were to have been supported by Count Solmes with a strong body of cavalry and infantry, but at the critical moment he failed them miserably, and his failure decided the fortunes of the day. . . . The division was practically annihilated. Its five regiments, 'Cutt's, Mackay's, Angus's, Graham's, and Leven's, all,' as Corporal Trim relates pathetically, 'cut to pieces, and so had the English Life-guards been too, had it not been for some regiments on the right, who marched up boldly to their relief, and received the enemy's fire in their faces, before any one of their own platoons discharged a musket.' Bitter was the resentment in the English army at the desertion of these gallant troops by Count de Solmes, and William gave vent to one of his rare outbursts of anger at the sight. We have it indeed on the authority above quoted—unimpeachable as first-hand tradition, for Sterne had heard the story of these wars at the knees of an eye-witness of and actor in them—that the King 'would not suffer the Count to come into his presence for many months after.' The destruction of Mackay's division had indeed decided the issue of the struggle. Luxembourg's army was being rapidly strengthened by reinforcements from that of Boufflers, and there was nothing for it but retreat. The loss on both sides had been great, but the moral effect of the victory was still greater. William's reputation for generalship, perhaps unduly raised by his recent exploits in Ireland, underwent a serious decline."—H. D. Traill, *William the Third*, ch. 10.—On the Rhine and on the Spanish frontier nothing of importance occurred during 1693. The Duke of Savoy gained some advantages on his side and invaded Dauphiny, without any material result. The invasion called into action a young heroine, Mademoiselle de La Tour-du-Pin, whose portrait has a place at Saint-Denis by the side of that of Jeanne D'Arc.—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 2, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: W. H. Torriano, *William the Third*, ch. 20.

A. D. 1693 (July).—The Battle of Neerwinden, or Landen.—"Lewis had determined not to make any advance towards a reconciliation with the new government of England till the whole strength of his realm had been put forth in one more effort. A mighty effort in truth it was, but too exhausting to be repeated. He made an immense display of force at once on the Pyrenees and on the Alps, on the Rhine and on the Meuse, in the Atlantic and in the Mediterranean. That nothing might be wanting which could excite the martial ardour of a nation eminently high-spirited, he instituted, a few days before he left his

palace for the camp, a new military order of knighthood, and placed it under the protection of his own sainted ancestor and patron. The cross of Saint Lewis shone on the breasts of the gentlemen who had been conspicuous in the trenches before Mons and Namur, and on the fields of Fleurus and Steinkirk. . . . On the 18th of May Lewis left Versailles. Early in June he was under the walls of Namur. The Princesses, who had accompanied him, held their court within the fortress. He took under his immediate command the army of Boufflers, which was encamped at Gembloux. Little more than a mile off lay the army of Luxembourg. The force collected in that neighbourhood under the French lilies did not amount to less than 120,000 men. Lewis had flattered himself that he should be able to repeat in 1693 the stratagem by which Mons had been taken in 1691 and Namur in 1692; and he had determined that either Liege or Brussels should be his prey. But William had this year been able to assemble in good time a force, inferior indeed to that which was opposed to him, but still formidable. With this force he took his post near Louvain, on the road between the two threatened cities, and watched every movement of the enemy. . . . Just at this conjuncture Lewis announced his intention to return instantly to Versailles, and to send the Dauphin and Boufflers, with part of the army which was assembled near Namur, to join Marshal Lorges who commanded in the Palatinate. Luxembourg was thunderstruck. He expostulated boldly and earnestly. Never, he said, was such an opportunity thrown away. . . . The Marshal reasoned: he implored: he went on his knees: but all was vain; and he quitted the royal presence in the deepest dejection. Lewis left the camp a week after he had joined it, and never afterwards made war in person. . . . Though the French army in the Netherlands had been weakened by the departure of the forces commanded by the Dauphin and Boufflers, and though the allied army was daily strengthened by the arrival of fresh troops, Luxembourg still had a superiority of force; and that superiority he increased by an adroit stratagem." He succeeded by a feint in inducing William to detach 20,000 men from his army and to send them to Liege. He then moved suddenly upon the camp of the allies, with 80,000 men, and found but 50,000 to oppose him. "It was still in the [English] King's power, by a hasty retreat, to put between his army and the enemy the narrow, but deep, waters of the Gette, which had lately been swollen by rains. But the site which he occupied was strong; and it could easily be made still stronger. He set all his troops to work. Ditches were dug, mounds thrown up, palisades fixed in the earth. In a few hours the ground wore a new aspect; and the King trusted that he should be able to repel the attack even of a force greatly outnumbering his own. . . . On the left flank, the village of Romsdorff rose close to the little stream of Landen, from which the English have named the disastrous day. On the right was the village of Neerwinden. Both villages were, after the fashion of the Low Countries, surrounded by moats and fences." Notwithstanding the strength of the position held by the allies, and the valor with which they defended it, they were driven out of Neerwinden [July 29]—but only after the shattered village had been five times taken

and retaken—and across the Gette, in confusion and with heavy loss. “The French were victorious; but they had bought their victory dear. More than 10,000 of the best troops of Lewis had fallen. Neerwinden was a spectacle at which the oldest soldiers stood aghast. The streets were piled breast high with corpses. Among the slain were some great lords and some renowned warriors. . . . The region, renowned as the battle field, through many ages, of the greatest powers of Europe, has seen only two more terrible days, the day of Malplaquet and the day of Waterloo. . . . There was no pursuit, though the sun was still high in the heaven when William crossed the Gette. The conquerors were so much exhausted by marching and fighting that they could scarcely move. . . . A very short delay was enough for William. . . . Three weeks after his defeat he held a review a few miles from Brussels. The number of men under arms was greater than on the morning of the bloody day of Landen: their appearance was soldierlike; and their spirit seemed unbroken. William now wrote to Heinsius that the worst was over. ‘The crisis,’ he said, ‘has been a terrible one. Thank God that it has ended thus.’ He did not, however, think it prudent to try at that time the event of another pitched field. He therefore suffered the French to besiege and take Charleroi; and this was the only advantage which they derived from the most sanguinary battle fought in Europe during the seventeenth century.”—Lord Macaulay, *Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 20 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: G. Burnet, *Hist. of My Own Time*, bk. 5 (1693), v. 4.—Duc de Saint-Simon, *Memoirs* (tr. by St. John), v. 1, ch. 4.

A. D. 1693 (October).—Defeat of the Duke of Savoy at Marsaglia.—“The great efforts made by Louis in the north prevented him from strengthening the army of Catinat sufficiently to act with energy against the Savoyard prince, and it was determined to restrict the campaign of 1693 to the defensive on the part of France. The forces of the duke had in the meantime been reinforced from Germany, and he opened the campaign with a brilliant and successful movement against Pignerol. . . . He is said to have entertained hopes of carrying the war in that one campaign to the very gates of Lyons; but the successes which inspired him with such expectations alarmed the court of France, and Louis detached in haste a large body of cavalry to reinforce Catinat. That general marched at once to fight the Duke of Savoy, who, presuming on his strength, suffered the French to pour out from the valley of Suza into the plain of Piedmont, abandoned the heights, and was consequently defeated at Marsaglia on the 4th of October. Catinat, however, could not profit by his victory; he was too ill supplied in every respect to undertake the siege of Coni, and the state of the French armies at this time marks as plainly that Louvois was dead, as the state of the finances speaks the loss of Colbert.”—G. P. R. James, *Life and Times of Louis XIV.*, v. 2, ch. 11.

A. D. 1694.—Campaigns without battles.—Operations at sea.—In 1694, King William was “in a position to keep an army afoot in the Netherlands stronger than any had hitherto been. It was reckoned at 31,800 horse, including a corps of dragoons, and 58,000 foot; so great a force had never been seen within the memory of

man. All the best-known generals, who had hitherto taken part in the wars of western Europe, were gathered round him with their troops. The French army, with which the Dauphin, but not the King, was present, was not much smaller; it was once more led by Marshal Luxembourg. These two hosts lay over against one another in their camps for a couple of months; neither offered battle to the other. . . . This campaign is notable in the annals of the art of war for the skill with which each force pursued or evaded the other; but the results were limited to the recovery by the allies of that unimportant place, Huy. William had thought himself fortunate in having come out of the previous campaign without disaster: in this campaign the French were proud to have held their lines in presence of a superior force. On the coast also the French were successful in repelling a most vehement and perilous attack. They had been warned that the English were going to fall on Brest, and Vauban was sent down there in haste to organise the defence; and in this he was thoroughly successful. When the English landed on the coast in Camaret Bay (for the fort of that name had first to be taken) they were saluted by two batteries, which they had never detected, and which were so well placed that every shot told, and the grape-shot wounded almost every man who had ventured ashore. The gallant General, Talmash, was also hit, and ere long died of his wounds. The English fleet, which had come to bombard Brest, was itself bombarded from the walls. But though this great effort failed, the English fleet still held the mastery of the Channel: it also blockaded the northern coast of France. After Brest it attacked Dieppe, laying it almost entirely in ashes; thence it sailed to Havre, and St. Malo, to Calais, and Dunkirk. This was of great use in the conduct of the war. King William observes that had not the coasts been kept in a state of alarm, all the forces detained there for defensive purposes would have been thrown on the Netherlands. . . . But the most important result of the maritime war lay on another side. In May, 1694, Noailles pushed into Catalonia, supported by Tourville, who lay at anchor with the fleet in the Bay of Rosas. . . . It was of incalculable importance to Spain to be in alliance with the maritime powers. Strengthened by a Dutch fleet and some Spanish ships, Admiral Russell now appeared in the Mediterranean. He secured Barcelona from the French, who would never have been kept out of the city by the Spaniards alone. The approach of the English fleet had at this time the greatest influence in keeping the Duke of Savoy staunch to the confederation. In Germany the rise of the house of Hanover to the Electoral dignity had now caused most unpleasant complications. A shoal of German princes, headed by the King of Denmark, as a Prince of the Empire, and offended by the preference shown to Hanover, inclined, if not to alliance with France, at least to neutrality. . . . We can have no conception, and in this place we cannot possibly investigate, with what unbroken watchfulness King William, supported by Heinsius, looked after the German and the Northern courts, so as to keep their irritation from reacting on the course of the great war. . . . When the French, in June, 1694, crossed the Rhine, meaning, as they boasted with true Gallic arrogance, soon to dip their swords in the Danube,

they found the Prince of Baden so well prepared, and posted so strongly near Wisloch, that they did not venture to attack him. . . . The general result is this: neither side was as yet really superior to the other; but the French power was everywhere checked and held within bounds by the arms and influence of William III."—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng., 17th Century, bk. 20, ch. 6* (v. 5).

A. D. 1695-1696.—The end of the War of the League of Augsburg.—Loss of Namur.—Terms with Savoy.—The Peace of Ryswick.—"Military and naval efforts were relaxed on all sides; on the Rhine the Prince of Baden and the Maréchal de Lorges, both ill in health, did little but observe each other; and though the Duke of Savoy made himself master of Casal on the 11th July, 1695, no other military event of any consequence took place on the side of Italy, where Louis entered into negotiations with the duke, and succeeded, in the following year, in detaching him from the league of Augsburg. As the price of his defection the whole of his territories were to be restored to him, with the exception of Suza, Nice, and Montmeillan, which were promised to be delivered also on the signature of a general peace. Money was added to render the consent of a needy prince more ready. . . . The duke promised to obtain from the emperor a pledge that Italy should be considered as neutral ground, and if the allies refused such a pledge, then to join the forces of Savoy to those of France, and give a free passage to the French through his dominions. In consequence of this treaty . . . he applied to the emperor for a recognition of the neutrality of Italy, and was refused. He then hastened, with a facility which distinguished him through life, to abandon his friends and join his enemies, and within one month was generalissimo for the emperor in Italy fighting against France, and generalissimo for the King of France in Italy fighting against the emperor. Previous to this change, however, the King of England opened the campaign of 1695 in the Netherlands by the siege of Namur. The death of Luxemburg had placed the French army of Flanders under the command of the incapable Marshal Villeroy; and William, feeling that his enemy was no longer to be much respected, assumed at once the offensive. He concealed his design upon Namur under a variety of manœuvres which kept the French generals in suspense; and, then leaving the Prince of Vaudemont to protect the principal Spanish towns in Flanders, he collected his troops suddenly; and while the Duke of Bavaria invested Namur, he covered the operations of the siege with a considerable force. Villeroy now determined to attack the Prince of Vaudemont, but twice suffered him to escape; and then, after having apparently hesitated for some time how to drive or draw the King of England from the attack upon Namur, he resolved to bombard the city of Brussels, never pretending to besiege it, but alleging as his motive for a proceeding which was merely destructive, the bombardment of the maritime towns of France by the English. During three days he continued to fire upon the city, ruining a great part thereof, and then withdrew to witness the surrender of the citadel of Namur on the 2nd September, the town itself having capitulated on the 4th of the preceding month. As some compensation, though but a

poor one, for the loss of Namur, and the disgrace of the French arms in suffering such a city to be captured in the presence of 80,000 men, Montal took Dixmude and Deynse in the course of June. . . . The only after-event of any importance which occurred in Flanders during this war, was the capture of Ath by the French, in the year 1697, while negotiations for peace were going on with activity at Ryswick. . . . Regular communications regarding peace having been once established, Ryswick, near the Hague, was appointed for the meeting of plenipotentiaries; and Harlay, Torci, and Callières appeared at that place as representatives of Louis. The articles which had been formerly sketched out at Utrecht formed the base of the treaties now agreed upon; and Louis yielded far more than could have been expected from one so proud and so successful."—G. P. R. James, *Life and Times of Louis XIV., v. 2, ch. 11*.

Also in: T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe, v. 3, ch. 5*.—Sir J. Dalrymple, *Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland, pt. 3, bk. 4* (v. 3).

A. D. 1697 (April).—The sacking of Carthage. See CARTHAGENA: A. D. 1697.

A. D. 1697.—The Peace of Ryswick.—"The Congress for the treaty or series of treaties that was to terminate the great European war, which had now lasted for upwards of nine years, was held at Ryswick, a château near the Hague. The conferences were opened in May, 1697. Among the countries represented were Sweden, Austria, France, Spain, England, Holland, Denmark and the various States of the German Empire. The treaties were signed, in severalty, between the different States, except Austria, in September and October, 1697, and with the Emperor, in November. The principal features of the treaty were, as between France and Spain, that, the former country was to deliver to Spain Barcelona, and other places in Catalonia; also various places which France had taken in the Spanish Netherlands, during the war, including Luxemburg and its Duchy, Charleroi, Mons and Courtrai. Various others were excepted, to be retained by France, as dependencies of French possessions. The principal stipulations of the treaty, as between France and Great Britain, were that France formally recognized William III. as lawful king of Great Britain, and agreed not to trouble him in the possession of his dominions, and not to assist his enemies, directly or indirectly. This article had particular relation to the partisans of the exiled Stuart king, then living in France. By another article, all places taken by either country in America, during the war, were to be relinquished, and the Principality of Orange and its estates situated in the south of France were to be restored to William. In the treaty with Holland, certain possessions in the East Indies were to be restored to the Dutch East India Company: and important articles of commerce were appended, among which the principle was laid down that free ships should make free goods, not contraband of war. By the treaty with the Emperor and the German States, the Treaties of Westphalia and Nymeguen were recognized as the basis of the Treaty of Ryswick, with such exceptions only as were to be provided in the latter treaty. France also was to give up all territory she had occupied or controlled before or during the war under the name of 'reunions,' outside of Alsace,

but the Roman Catholic religion was to be preserved in Alsace as it then existed. This concession by France included among other places Freiburg, Brisach, and Treves; and certain restitutions were to be made by France, in favor of Spire, the Electors of Treves, and Brandenburg and the Palatinate; also, others in favor of certain of the smaller German Princes. The city of Strasburg, in return, was formally ceded to France, . . . and the important fort of Kehl was yielded to the Empire. The navigation of the Rhine was to be free to all persons. The Duke of Lorraine was to be restored to his possessions with such exceptions as were provided in the treaty. By the terms of this treaty, a more advantageous peace was given to Spain than she had any expectation of. . . . Not only were the places taken in Spain, including the numerous fortified places in Catalonia, yielded up, but also, with some exceptions, those in the Spanish Netherlands, and also the important territory of Luxembourg; some places were even yielded to Spain that France had gained under former treaties."—J. W. Gerard, *The Peace of Utrecht*, ch. 4.—"The restitutions and cessions [from France to Germany] comprised Treves, Germersheim, Deux-Ponts, Veldentz, Montbéliard, Kehl, Freiburg, Breisach, Philippsburg, the Emperor and the Empire ceding in exchange Strasbourg to the King of France in complete sovereignty. . . . Louis XIV. had consented somewhat to relax the rigor of the treaty of Nimeguen towards the heir of the Duchy of Lorraine, nephew of the Emperor by his mother; he restored to the young Duke Leopold his inheritance in the condition in which Charles IV. had possessed it before the French conquest of 1670; that is to say, he restored Nancy, allowing only the ramparts of the Old Town to remain, and razing all the rest of the fortifications without the power of restoring them; he kept Marsal, an interior place calculated to hold Lorraine in check, and also Sarrelouis, a frontier-place which separated Lorraine from the Germanic provinces; he restored Bitche and Homburg dismantled, without power to re-establish them, and kept Longwy in exchange for a domain of similar value in one of the Trois-Évêchés; finally, he no longer demanded, as at Nimeguen, four great strategic routes through Lorraine, and consented that the passage should always be open to his troops. The House of Lorraine was thus re-established in its estates after twenty-seven years of exile."—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 2, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, 17th Century, bk. 20, ch. 11 (v. 5).—See, also, CANADA: A. D. 1692-1697; and NEWFOUNDLAND: A. D. 1694-1697.

A. D. 1698-1712.—The colonization of Louisiana.—Broad claims to the whole valley of the Mississippi. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1698-1712.

A. D. 1700.—Bequest of the Spanish crown to a French royal prince. See SPAIN: A. D. 1698-1700.

A. D. 1701-1702.—Provocation of the Second Grand Alliance and War of the Spanish Succession. See SPAIN: A. D. 1701-1702, and ENGLAND: A. D. 1701-1702.

A. D. 1702-1710.—The Camisard rising of the French Protestants in the Cévennes.—"The movement known as the War of the Camisards is an episode of the history of Protestantism in France which, though rarely studied in detail

and perhaps but partially understood, was not devoid of significance. When it occurred, in the summer of 1702, a period of little less than 17 years had elapsed since Louis XIV., by his edict of Fontainebleau, October, 1685, solemnly revoked the great and fundamental law enacted by his grandfather, Henry IV., for the protection of the adherents of the Reformed faith, known in history as the Edict of Nantes. During the whole of that period the Protestants had submitted, with scarcely an attempt at armed resistance, to the proscription of their tenets. . . . The majority, unable to escape from the land of oppression, remained at home . . . nearly all of them cherishing the confident hope that the king's delusion would be short-lived, and that the edict under which they and their ancestors had lived for three generations would, before long, be restored to them with the greater part, if not the whole, of its beneficent provisions. Meanwhile, all the Protestant ministers having been expelled from France by the same law that prohibited the expatriation of any of the laity, the people of the Reformed faith found themselves destitute of the spiritual food they craved. True, the new legislation affected to regard that faith as dead, and designated all the former adherents of Protestantism, without distinction, as the 'New Converts,' 'Nouveaux Convertis.' And, in point of fact, the great majority had so far yielded to the terrible pressure of the violent measures brought to bear upon them . . . that they had consented to sign a promise to be 're-united' to the Roman Catholic Church, or had gone at least once to mass. But they were still Protestants at heart. . . . Under these circumstances, feeling more than ever the need of religious comfort, now that remorse arose for a weak betrayal of conscientious conviction, the proscribed Protestants, especially in the south of France, began to meet clandestinely for divine worship in such retired places as seemed most likely to escape the notice of their vigilant enemies. . . . It was not strange that in so exceptional a situation, a phase of religious life and feeling equally exceptional should manifest itself. I refer to that appearance of prophetic inspiration which attracted to the province of Vivarais and to the Cévennes Mountains the attention of all Europe. . . . Historically . . . the influence of the prophets of the Cévennes was an important factor in the Protestant problem of the end of the 17th and the commencement of the 18th centuries. . . . Various methods were adopted to put an end to the prophets with their prophecies, which were for the most part denunciatory of Rome as Antichrist and foreshadowed the approaching fall of the papacy. But this form of enthusiasm had struck a deep root and it was hard to eradicate it. Imprisonment, in convent or jail, was the most common punishment, especially in the case of women. Not infrequently to imprisonment was added corporal chastisement, and the prophets, male and female, were flogged until they might be regarded as fully cured of their delusion. . . . But no utterances of prophets, however fervid and impassioned, would have sufficed to occasion an uprising of the inhabitants of the Cévennes Mountains, had it not been for the virulent persecution to which the latter found themselves exposed at the hands of the provincial authorities directly instigated thereto by the clergy of the established church. For it must

be noticed that a large part of the population of the Cévennes was still Protestant, and made no concealment of the fact, even though the king's ministers affected to call them 'New Catholics,' or 'New Converts.' The region over which the Camisard war extended with more or less violence comprised six episcopal dioceses, which, in 1698, had an aggregate population of about two-thirds of a million of souls. Of these souls, though Protestantism had been dead in the eye of the law for 13 years, fully one-fourth were still Protestant. . . . The war may be said to have begun on the 24th of July, 1702, when the Abbé du Chayla, a noted persecutor, was killed in his house, at Pont de Montvert, by a band of 40 or 50 of the 'Nouveaux Convertis,' whom he had driven to desperation by his cruelty to their fellow believers. If we regard its termination to be the submission of Jean Cavalier, the most picturesque and, in some regards, the most able of the leaders, in the month of May, 1704, the war lasted a little less than two years. But, although the French government had succeeded, rather by craft than by force, in getting rid of the most formidable of its opponents . . . it was not until five or six years later—that is, until 1709 or 1710—that . . . comparative peace was finally restored. . . . During the first months of the insurrection the exploits of the malcontents were confined to deeds of destruction accomplished by companies of venturesome men, who almost everywhere eluded the pursuit of the enemy by their superior knowledge of the intricacies of the mountain woods and paths. The track of these companies could easily be made out; for it was marked by the destruction of vicarages and rectories, by the smoke of burned churches, too often by the corpses of slain priests. The perpetrators of these acts of violence soon won for themselves some special designations, to distinguish them from the more passive Protestants who remained in their homes, taking no open part in the struggle. . . . About the close of 1702, however, or the first months of 1703, a new word was coined for the fresh emergency, and the armed Protestants received the appellation under which they have passed into history—the Camisards. Passing by all the strange and fanciful derivations of the word which seem to have no claim upon our notice, unless it be their evident absurdity, we have no difficulty in connecting it with those nocturnal expeditions which were styled 'Camisades'; because the warriors who took advantage of the darkness of the night to ride out and explore or force the enemy's entrenchments, sometimes threw over their armor a shirt that might enable them to recognize each other. Others will have it that, though the name was derived from the same article of apparel—the 'camisa' or shirt—it was applied to the Cévenol bands for another reason, namely, "that when they found opportunities, they carried off clean linen from the villages and left their soiled garments in exchange. The final overthrow of the Camisards "was not accomplished without the employment of 100,000 troops, certainly far more than ten times the total number ever brought into the field by the Camisards. . . . Not less than three officers of the highest grade in the service, marshals of France, were successively appointed to put down a revolt which it might have been expected a simple colonel could suffice to quell—M. de Broglie

being succeeded by the Marshal de Montrevel, the Marshal de Montrevel by the Marshal de Villars, and the Marshal de Villars by the Marshal de Berwick."—H. M. Baird, *The Camisard Uprising* (Papers of the Am. Soc. of Church Hist., v. 2, pp. 13-34).

ALSO IN: Mrs. Bray, *The Revolt of the Protestants of the Cévennes*.—N. Peyrat, *The Pastors in the Wilderness*.—S. Smiles, *The Huguenots in France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*, ch. 5-8.

A. D. 1702-1711.—The War of the Spanish Succession in America (called Queen Anne's War). See NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1702-1710; and CANADA: A. D. 1711-1713.

A. D. 1702-1713.—The War of the Spanish Succession in Europe. See ITALY: A. D. 1701-1713; SPAIN: A. D. 1702, to 1707-1710; GERMANY: A. D. 1702, to 1706-1711; NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702-1704, to 1710-1712.

A. D. 1702-1715.—Renewed Jesuitical persecution of the Jansenists.—The odious Bull *Unigenitus* and its tyrannical enforcement. See PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSENISTS: A. D. 1702-1715.

A. D. 1710.—The War of the Spanish Succession: Misery of the nation.—Overtures for Peace.—Conferences at Gertruydenberg.—"France was still reduced to extreme and abject wretchedness. Her finances were ruined. Her people were half starving. Marlborough declared that in the villages through which he passed in the summer of 1710, at least half the inhabitants had perished since the beginning of the preceding winter, and the rest looked as if they had come out of their graves. All the old dreams of French conquests in the Spanish Netherlands, in Italy, and in Germany were dispelled, and the French generals were now struggling desperately and skillfully to defend their own frontier. . . . In 1710, while the Whig ministry [in England] was still in power, but at a time when it was manifestly tottering to its fall, Lewis had made one more attempt to obtain peace by the most ample concessions. The conferences were held at the Dutch fortress of Gertruydenberg. Lewis declared himself ready to accept the conditions exacted as preliminaries of peace in the preceding year, with the exception of the article compelling Philip within two months to cede the Spanish throne. He consented, in the course of the negotiations, to grant to the Dutch nearly all the fortresses of the French and Spanish Netherlands, including among others Ypres, Tournay, Lille, Furnes, and even Valenciennes, to cede Alsace to the Duke of Lorraine, to destroy the fortifications of Dunkirk, and those on the Rhine from Bâle to Philipsburg. The main difficulty was on the question of the Spanish succession. . . . The French troops had already been recalled from Spain, and Lewis consented to recognise the Archduke as the sovereign, to engage to give no more assistance to his grandchild, to place four cautionary towns in the hands of the Dutch as a pledge for the fulfilment of the treaty, and even to pay a subsidy to the allies for the continuance of the war against Philip. The allies, however, insisted that he should join with them in driving his grandson by force of arms from Spain, and on this article the negotiations were broken off."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 1.—See ENGLAND: A. D. 1710-1712.

A. D. 1713-1714.—Ending of the War of the Spanish Succession.—The Peace of Utrecht and the Treaty of Rastadt. See **UTRECHT:** A. D. 1712-1714.

A. D. 1714.—The desertion of the Catalans. See **SPAIN:** A. D. 1713-1714.

A. D. 1715.—Death of Louis XIV.—The character of his reign.—Louis XIV. died September 1, 1715, at the age of 77 years, having reigned 72 years. "Richelieu, and after him Mazarin, governing as if they had been dictators of a republic, had extinguished, if I may use the expression, their personality in the idea and service of the state. Possessing only the exercise of authority, they both conducted themselves as responsible agents towards the sovereign and before the judgment of the country; while Louis XIV., combining the exercise with the right, considered himself exempted from all rule but that of his own will, and acknowledged no responsibility for his actions except to his own conscience. It was this conviction of his universal power, a conviction genuine and sincere, excluding both scruples and remorse, which made him upset one after the other the twofold system founded by Henry IV., of religious liberty at home, and abroad of a national preponderance resting upon a generous protection of the independence of states and European civilisation. At the personal accession of Louis XIV., more than fifty years had passed since France had pursued the work of her policy in Europe, impartial towards the various communions of Christians, the different forms of governments, and the internal revolutions of the states. Although France was catholic and monarchical, her alliances were, in the first place, with the Protestant states of Germany and with republican Holland; she had even made friendly terms with regicide England. No other interest but that of the well-understood development of the national resources had weight in her councils, and directed the internal action of her government. But all was changed by Louis XIV., and special interests, the spawn of royal personality, of the principle of the hereditary monarchy, or that of the state religion, were admitted, soon to fly upward in the scale. Thence resulted the overthrow of the system of the balance of power in Europe, which might be justly called the French system, and the abandonment of it for dreams of an universal monarchy, revived after the example of Charles V. and Philip II. Thence a succession of enterprises, formed in opposition to the policy of the country, such as the war with Holland, the factions made with a view to the Imperial crown, the support given to James II. and the counter-revolution in England, the acceptance of the throne of Spain for a son of France, preserving his rights to the Crown. These causes of misfortune, under which the kingdom was obliged to succumb, all issued from the circumstance applauded by the nation and conformable to the spirit of its tendencies, which, after royalty had attained its highest degree of power under two ministers, delivered it unlimited into the hands of a prince endowed with qualities at once brilliant and solid, an object of enthusiastic affection and legitimate admiration. When the reign, which was to crown under such auspices the ascendant march of the French monarchy, had falsified the unbounded hopes which its commencement had excited; when in the midst of

fruitless victories and continually increasing reverses, the people beheld progress in all the branches of public economy changed into distress,—the ruin of the finances, industry, and agriculture—the exhaustion of all the resources of the country,—the impoverishment of all classes of the nation, the dreadful misery of the population, they were seized with a bitter disappointment of spirit, which took the place of the enthusiasm of their confidence and love."—A. Thierry, *Formation and Progress of the Tiers' Etat or Third Estate in France*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1715.—Accession of King Louis XV.

A. D. 1715-1723.—State of the kingdom at the death of Louis XIV.—The minority of Louis XV. and Regency of the Duke of Orleans.—"Louis XIV. . . . left France excessively exhausted. The State was ruined, and seemed to have no resource but bankruptcy. This trouble seemed especially imminent in 1715, after the war, during which the government had been obliged to borrow at 400 per cent., to create new taxes, to spend in advance the revenue of two years, and to increase the public debt to 2,400 millions. The acquisition of two provinces (Flanders, Franche-Comté) and a few cities (Strassburg, Landau, and Dunkirk) was no compensation for such terrible poverty. Succeeding generations have remembered only the numerous victories, Europe defied, France for twenty years preponderant, and the incomparable splendor of the court of Versailles, with its marvels of letters and arts, which have given to the 17th century the name of the age of Louis XIV. It is for history to show the price which France has paid for her king's vain attempts abroad to rule over Europe, and at home to enslave the wills and consciences of men. . . . The weight of the authority of Louis XIV. had been crushing during his last years. When the nation felt it lifted, it breathed more freely; the court and the city burst into disrespectful demonstrations of joy; the very coffin of the great king was insulted. The new king [Louis XV., great-grandson of Louis XIV.] was five years old. Who was to govern? Louis XIV. had indeed left a will, but he had not deceived himself with regard to the value of it. 'As soon as I am dead, it will be disregarded; I know too well what became of the will of the king, my father!' As after the death of Henry IV. and Louis XIII. there was a moment of feudal reaction; but the decline of the nobility may be measured by the successive weakening of its efforts in each case. Under Mary de' Medici it was still able to make a civil war; under Anne of Austria it produced the Fronde; after Louis XIV. it only produced memorials. The Duke of Saint-Simon desired that the first prince of the blood, Philip of Orleans, to whom the will left only a shadow of power, should demand the regency from the dukes and peers, as heirs and representatives of the ancient grand vassals. But the Duke of Orleans convoked Parliament in order to break down the posthumous despotism of the old king, feigning that the king had committed the government to his hands. The regency, with the right to appoint the council of regency as he would, was conferred upon him, and the command of the royal household was taken from the Duke of Maine [one of the bastard sons of Louis XIV.], who yielded this important prerogative only after a violent altercation. As a reward for the services

of his two allies, the Duke of Orleans called the high nobility into affairs, by substituting for the ministries six councils, in which they occupied almost all the places, and accorded to Parliament the right of remonstrance. But two years had hardly passed when the ministries were re-established, and the Parliament again condemned to silence. It was plain that neither nobility nor Parliament were to be the heirs of the absolute monarchy. . . . Debauchery had, until then, kept within certain limits; cynicism of manners as well as of thought was now adopted openly. The regent set the example. There had never been seen such frivolity of conduct nor such licentious wit as that exhibited in the wild meetings of the *roués* of the Duke of Orleans. There had been formerly but one salon in France, that of the king; a thousand were now open to a society which, no longer occupied with religious questions, or with war, or the grave futilities of etiquette, felt that pleasure and change were necessities. . . . Louis XV. attained his majority February 13, 1723, being then 13 years old. This terminated the regency of the Duke of Orleans. But the king was still to remain a long time under tutelage; the duke, in order to retain the power after resigning the regency, had in advance given [Cardinal] Dubois the title of prime minister. At the death of the wretched Dubois he took the office himself, but held it only four months, dying of apoplexy in December, 1723."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of France*, ch. 52 and 55.

ALSO IN: W. C. Taylor, *Memoirs of the House of Orleans*, v. 1, ch. 11-17, and v. 2, ch. 1-3.—F. Rocquain, *The Revolutionary Spirit preceding the French Rev.*, ch. 1.—J. B. Perkins, *France under the Regency*.

A. D. 1717-1719.—The Triple Alliance.—The Quadruple Alliance.—War with Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725; also, ITALY: A. D. 1715-1735.

A. D. 1717-1720.—John Law and his Mississippi Scheme.—"When the Regent Orleans assumed the government of France, he found its affairs in frightful confusion. The public debt was three hundred millions; putting the debt on one side, the expenditure was only just covered by the revenue. St. Simon advised him to declare a national bankruptcy. De Noailles, less scrupulous, proposed to debase the coinage. . . . In such desperate circumstances, it was no wonder that the regent was ready to catch eagerly at any prospect of success. A remedy was proposed to him by the famous John Law of Lauriston. This new light of finance had gambled in, and been banished from, half the courts of Europe; he had figured in the English 'Hue and Cry,' as 'a very tall, black, lean man, well-shaped, above six feet high, large pock-holes in his face, big-nosed, speaks broad and loud.' He was a big, masterful, bullying man, one of keen intellect as well; the hero of a hundred romantic stories. . . . He studied finance at Amsterdam, then the great school of commerce, and offered his services and the 'system' which he had invented, first to Godolphin, when that nobleman was at the head of affairs in England, then to Victor Amadeus, duke of Savoy, then to Louis XIV., who, as the story goes, refused any credit to a heretic. He invented a new combination at cards, which became the despair of all the croupiers in Europe: so successful was this last in-

vention, that he arrived for the second time at Versailles, in the early days of the regency, with upwards of £120,000 at his disposal, and a copy of his 'system' in his pocket. . . . There was a dash of daring in the scheme which suited well with the regent's peculiar turn of mind; it was gambling on a gigantic scale. . . . Besides, the scheme was plausible and to a certain point correct. The regent, with all his faults, was too clever a man not to recognize the genius which gleamed in Law's dark eyes. Law showed that the trade and commerce of every country was crippled by the want of a circulating medium; specie was not to be had in sufficient quantities; paper, backed by the credit of the state, was the grand secret. He adduced the examples of Great Britain, of Genoa, and of Amsterdam to prove the advantage of a paper currency; he proposed to institute a bank, to be called the 'Bank of France,' and to issue notes guaranteed by the government and secured on the crown lands, exchangeable at sight for specie, and receivable in payment of taxes; the bank was to be conducted in the king's name, and to be managed by commissioners appointed by the States-General. The scheme of Law was based on principles which are now admitted as economical axioms; the danger lay in the enormous extent to which it was intended to push the scheme. . . . While the bank was in the hands of Law himself, it appears to have been managed with consummate skill; the notes bore some proportion to the amount of available specie; they contained a promise to pay in silver of the same standard and weight as that which existed at the time. A large dividend was declared; then the regent stepped in. The name of the bank was changed to that of the Royal Bank of France, the promise to pay in silver of a certain weight and standard was dropped, and a promise substituted to pay 'in silver coin.' This omission, on the part of a prince who had already resorted to the expedient of debasing the currency, was ominous, and did much to shake public confidence; the intelligence that in the first year of the new bank 1,000,000,000 of livres were fabricated, was not calculated to restore it. But these trifles were forgotten in the mad excitement which followed. Law had long been elaborating a scheme which is for ever associated with his name, and beside which the Bank of France sank into insignificance. In 1717, the year before the bank had been adopted by the regent, the *billets d'état* of 500 livres each were worth about 160 livres in the market. Law, with the assent of the regent, proposed to establish a company which should engross all the trade of the kingdom, and all the revenues of the crown, should carry on the business of merchants in every part of the world, and monopolize the farming of the taxes and the coining of money; the stock was to be divided into 200,000 shares of 500 livres each. The regent nearly marred the scheme at starting by inserting a proviso that the depreciated *billets d'état* were to be received at par in payment for the new stock, on which four per cent. was guaranteed by the State." Law's company was formed, under the name of the Company of the West, and obtained for the basis of its operations a monopoly of the trade of that vast territory of France in the valley of the Mississippi which bore the name of Louisiana. The same monopoly had been held for five years by one Crozat, who

now resigned it because he found it unprofitable; but the fact received little attention (see LOUISIANA: A. D. 1717-1718). "Louisiana was described as a paradise. . . . Shareholders in the company were told that they would enjoy the monopoly of trade throughout French North America, and the produce of a country rich in every kind of mineral wealth. Billets d'état were restored to their nominal value; stock in the Mississippi scheme was sold at fabulous prices; ingots of gold, which were declared to have come from the mines of St. Barbe, were taken with great pomp to the mint; 6,000 of the poor of Paris were sent out as miners, and provided with tools to work in the new diggings. New issues of shares were made; first 50,000, then 50,000 more; both at an enormous premium. The jobbers of the rue Quincampoix found ordinary language inadequate to express their delight: they invented a new slang for the occasion, and called the new shares 'les filles,' and 'les petites filles,' respectively. Paris was divided between the 'Anti-system' party who opposed Law, and the Mississippians who supported him. The State borrowed from the company fifteen hundred millions; government paid its creditors in warrants on the company. To meet them, Law issued 100,000 new shares; which came out at a premium of 1,000 per cent. The Mississippians went mad with joy — they invented another new slang phrase; the 'cinq cents' eclipsed the filles and the petites filles in favour. The gates of Law's hotel had to be guarded by a detachment of archers; the cashiers were mobbed in their bureaux; applicants for shares sat in the ante-rooms; a select body slept for several nights on the stairs; gentlemen disguised themselves in Law's livery to obtain access to the great man. . . . By this time the charter of the company of Senegal had been merged in the bank, which also became sole farmer of the tobacco duties; the East India Company had been abolished, and the exclusive privilege of trading to the East Indies, China, and the South Seas, together with all the possessions of Colbert's company were transferred to Law. The bank now assumed the style of the Company of the Indies. Before the year [1719] was out the regent had transferred to it the exclusive privilege of the mint, and the contract of all the great farms. Almost every branch of industry in France, its trade, its revenue, its police, were now in the hands of Law. Every fresh privilege was followed by a new issue of shares. . . . The shares of 500 francs were now worth 10,000. The rue Quincampoix became impassable, and an army of stockjobbers camped in tents in the Place Vendôme. . . . The excitement spread to England [where the South Sea Bubble was inflated by the madness of the hour — see SOUTH SEA BUBBLE]. . . . Law's system and the South Sea scheme both went down together. Both were calculated to last so long, and so long only, as universal confidence existed; when it began to be whispered that those in the secret were realizing their profits and getting out of the impending ruin, the whole edifice came down with a crash. . . . No sooner was it evident that the system was about to break down, than Law, the only man who could at least have mitigated the blow, was banished."—Viscount Bury, *Exodus of the Western Nations*, v. 2, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: C. Mackay, *Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions*, v. 1, ch. 1.—A. Thiers. *The*

Mississippi Bubble.—W. C. Taylor, *Memoirs of the House of Orleans*, v. 2, ch. 2.—C. Gayarre, *Hist. of Louisiana*, second series, lect. 1.—Duke de Saint-Simon, *Memoirs: abridged trans. by St. John*, v. 3, ch. 25, and v. 4, ch. 4, and 13-15.

A. D. 1720.—The fortifying of Louisbourg. See CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1720-1745.

A. D. 1723-1774.—Character and reign of Louis XV.—The King's mistresses and their courtiers who conducted the government.—State and feeling of the nation.—After the death of the Duke of Orleans, "a short period of about two years and a-half comprehends the administration of the Duke of Bourbon, or rather of his mistress, la Marquise de Prie. Fleury [Cardinal] then appears on the stage, and dies in 1743. He was, therefore, minister of France for seventeen years. On his death, the king (Louis XV.) undertook to be his own prime minister; an unpromising experiment for a country at any time. In this instance the result was only that the king's mistress, Madame de Chateauroux, became the ruler of France, and soon after Madame de Pompadour, another mistress, whose reign was prolonged from 1745 to 1763. Different courtiers and prelates were seen to hold the first offices of the state during this apparent premiership of the monarch. The ladies seem to have chosen or tolerated Cardinal Tencin, Argençon, Orsy, Mauripaux, and Amelot, who, with the Dukes Noailles and Richelieu, succeeded to Fleury. Afterwards, we have Argençon and Machault, and then come the most celebrated of the ministers or favourites of Madame de Pompadour, the Abbé de Bernis and the Duc de Choiseul. The last is the most distinguished minister after Fleury. He continued in favour from 1758, not only to 1763, when Madame de Pompadour died, but for a few years after. He was at length disgraced by la Comtesse Dubarri, who had become the king's mistress soon after the death of Madame de Pompadour, and remained so, nearly to the death of the monarch himself, in 1774."—W. Smyth, *Lect's on the Hist. of the French Revolution*, lect. 3.—"The regency of the Duke of Orleans lasted only eight years, but it was not without a considerable effect upon the destinies of the country. It was a break in the political and the religious traditions of the reign of Louis XIV. The new activity imparted to business during this period was an event of equal importance. Nothing is more erroneous than to suppose that constantly increasing misery at last excited revolt against the government and the institutions of the old régime. The Revolution in France at the close of the eighteenth century was possible, not because the condition of the people had grown worse, but because it had become better. The material development of that country, during the fifty years that preceded the convocation of the States General, had no parallel in its past history. Neither the weight of taxation, nor the extravagance of the court, nor the bankruptcy of the government, checked an increase in wealth that made France in 1789 seem like a different land from France in 1715. The lot of large classes was still miserable, the burden of taxation upon a large part of the population was still grievous, there were sections where Arthur Young could truly say that he found only poverty and privileges, but the country as a whole was more prosperous than Germany or Spain; it was far more prosperous than it had

been under Louis XIV. . . . Such an improvement in material conditions necessitated both social and political changes. . . . But while social conditions had altered, political institutions remained unchanged. New wine had been poured in, but the old bottles were still used. Tailles and corvées were no more severe in the eighteenth than in the fifteenth century, but they were more odious. A feudal privilege, which had then been accepted as a part of the law of nature, was now regarded as contrary to nature. . . . A demand for social equality, for the abolition of privileges and immunities by which any class profited at the expense of others, was fostered by economical changes. It received an additional impetus from the writings of theorists, philosophers, and political reformers. The influence of literature in France during the eighteenth century was important, yet it is possible to overestimate it. The seed of political and social change was shown by the writers of the period, but the soil was already prepared to receive it. . . . The course of events, the conduct of their rulers, prepared the minds of the French people for political change, and accounted for the influence which literature acquired. The doctrines of philosophers found easy access to the hearts of a people with whom reverence for royalty and a tranquil acceptance of an established government had been succeeded by contempt for the king and hatred for the régime under which they lived. We can trace this change of sentiment during the reign of Louis XV. The popular affection which encircled his cradle accompanied him when he had grown to be a man. . . . Few events are more noticeable in the history of the age than the extraordinary expressions of grief and affection that were excited by the illness of Louis XV. in 1744. . . . A preacher hailed him as Louis the well beloved, and all the nation adopted the title. 'What have I done to be so loved?' the king himself asked. Certainly he had done nothing, but the explanation was correctly given. 'Louis XV. is dear to his people, without having done anything for them, because the French are, of all nations, most inclined to love their king.' This affection, the result of centuries of fidelity and zeal for monarchical institutions, and for the sovereigns by whom they were personified, was wholly destroyed by Louis's subsequent career. The vices to which he became addicted were those which arouse feelings not only of reprobation, but of loathing. They excited both aversion and contempt. The administration of the country was as despicable as the character of the sovereign. Under Louis XIV. there had been suffering and there had been disaster, but France had always preserved a commanding position in Europe. . . . But now defeat and dishonor were the fate of a people alike powerful and proud. . . . The low profligacy into which the king had sunk, the nullity of his character, the turpitude of his mistress, the weakness of his administration, the failure of all his plans, went far toward destroying the feelings of loyalty that had so long existed in the hearts of the French people. Some curious figures mark the decline in the estimation in which the king was held. In 1744, six thousand masses were said at Notre Dame for the restoration of Louis XV. to health; in 1757, after the attempted assassination by Damiens, there were six hundred; when the king actually

lay dying, in 1774, there were only three. The fall from six thousand to three measures the decline in the affection and respect of the French people for their sovereign. It was with a public whose sentiments had thus altered that the new philosophy found acceptance."—J. B. Perkins, *France under the Regency*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: F. Rocquain, *The Revolutionary Spirit preceding the Fr. Rev.*, ch. 2-8.—J. Murray, *French Finance and Financiers under Louis XV.*

A. D. 1725.—The alliance of Hanover. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725.

A. D. 1727-1731.—Ineffectual congress at Soissons.—The Treaty of Seville, with Spain and England.—The Second Treaty of Vienna. See SPAIN: A. D. 1726-1731.

A. D. 1733.—The First Family Compact of the Bourbons (France and Spain).—"The two lines of the house of Bourbon [in France and in Spain] once more became in the highest degree prominent. . . . As early as November 1733 a Family Compact (the first of the series) was concluded between them, in which they contemplated the possibility of a war against England, but without waiting for it entered into an agreement against the maritime supremacy of that power. . . . The commercial privileges granted to the English in the Peace of Utrecht seemed to both courts to be intolerable."—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of Eng.*, bk. 22, ch. 4 (v. 5).—"It is hardly too much to say that the Family Compact of 1733, though even yet not generally known to exist, is the most important document of the middle period of the 18th century and the most indispensable to history. If that period seems to us confused, if we lose ourselves in the medley of its wars—war of the Polish election, war of Jenkins's ears, war of the Austrian succession, colonial war of 1756—the simple reason is that we do not know this treaty, which furnishes the clue. From it we may learn that in this period, as in that of Louis XIV. and in that of Napoleon, Europe struggled against the ambitious and deliberately laid design of an ascendant power, with this difference, that those aggressors were manifest to all the world and their aims not difficult to understand, whereas this aggression proceeded by ambuscade, and, being the aggression not of a single state but of an alliance, and a secret alliance, did not become clearly manifest to Europe even when it had to a considerable extent attained its objects. . . . The first two articles define the nature of the alliance, that it involves a mutual guarantee of all possessions, and has for its object, first, the honour, glory, and interests of both powers, and, secondly, their defence against all damage, vexation, and prejudice that may threaten them." The first declared object of the Compact is to secure the position of Don Carlos, the Infant of Spain, afterwards Charles III., in Italy, and "to obtain for him the succession in Tuscany, protecting him against any attack that may be attempted by the Emperor or by England. Next, France undertakes to 'aid Spain with all her forces by land or sea, if Spain should suspend England's enjoyment of commerce and her other advantages, and England out of revenge should resort to hostilities and insults in the dominions and states of the crown of Spain, whether within or outside of Europe.'" Further articles provide for the making of efforts to induce Great Britain to restore Gibraltar to Spain; set forth "that the

foreign policy of both states is to be guided exclusively by the interests of the house"; denounce the Austrian Pragmatic as "opposed to the security of the house of Bourbon." "The King of France engages to send 32,000 infantry and 8,000 cavalry into Italy, and to maintain other armies on his other frontiers; also to have a squadron ready at Toulon, either to join the Spanish fleet or to act separately, and another squadron at Brest, 'to keep the English in fear and jealousy'; also, in case of war with England breaking out, to commission the largest possible number of privateers. Spain also promises a fixed number of troops. The 11th and 12th articles lay the foundation of a close commercial alliance to be formed between France and Spain. Article 13 runs as follows:—'His Catholic majesty, recognising all the abuses which have been introduced into commerce, chiefly by the British nation, in the eradication of which the French and Spanish nations are equally interested, has determined to bring everything back within rule and into agreement with the letter of treaties'"—to which end the two kings make common cause. "Finally the 14th article provides that the present treaty shall remain profoundly secret as long as the contracting parties shall judge it agreeable to their interests, and shall be regarded from this day as an eternal and irrevocable Family Compact. . . . Here is the explanation of the war which furnished the immediate occasion of the first Compact, a war most misleadingly named from the Polish election which afforded an ostensible pretext for it, and deserving better to be called the Bourbon invasion of Italy. Here too is sketched out the course which was afterwards taken by the Bourbon courts in the matter of the Pragmatic Sanction. Thirdly, here most manifestly is the explanation of that war of Jenkins's ears, which we have a habit of representing as forced upon Spain by English commercial cupidity, but which appears here as deliberately planned in concert by the Bourbon courts in order to eradicate the 'abuses which have been allowed to creep into trade.'"—J. R. Seeley, *The House of Bourbon* (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Jan., 1886).

ALSO IN: J. McCarthy, *Hist. of the Four Georges*, ch. 22 (v. 2).

A. D. 1733-1735.—War with Austria, in Germany and Italy.—Final acquisition of Lorraine.—Naples and Sicily transferred to Spain.—In the war with Austria which was brought about by the question of the Polish succession (see POLAND: A. D. 1732-1733), the French "struck at the Rhine and at Italy, while the other powers looked on unmoved; Spain watching her moment, at which she might safely interfere for her own interests in Italy. The army of the Rhine, which reached Strasburg in autumn 1733, was commanded by Marshal Berwick, who had been called away from eight years of happy and charming leisure at Fitz-James. With him served for the first time in the French army their one great general of the coming age, and he too a foreigner, Maurice, son of Augustus II. of Poland and the lovely Countess of Königsmark. . . . He is best known to us as Marshal Saxe. It was too late to accomplish much in 1733, and the French had to content themselves with the capture of Kehl: in the winter the Imperialists constructed strong lines at Ettlingen, a little place not far from Carlsruhe, between Kehl,

which the French held, and Philippsburg, at which they were aiming. In the spring of 1734 French preparations were slow and feeble: a new power had sprung up at Paris in the person of Belle-Isle, Fouquet's grandson, who had much of the persuasive ambition of his grandfather. He was full of schemes, and induced the aged Fleury to believe him to be the coming genius of French generalship; the careful views of Marshal Berwick suited ill his soaring spirit; he wanted to march headlong into Saxony and Bohemia. Berwick would not allow so reckless a scheme to be adopted; still Belle-Isle, as lieutenant-general with an almost independent command, was sent to besiege Trarbach on the Moselle, an operation which delayed the French advance on the Rhine. At last, however, Berwick moved forwards. By skilful arrangements he neutralised the Ettlingen lines, and without a battle forced the Germans to abandon them. Their army withdrew to Heilbronn, where it was joined by Prince Eugene. Berwick, freed from their immediate presence, and having a great preponderance in force, at once sat down before Philippsburg. There, on the 12th of June, as he visited the trenches, he was struck by a ball and fell dead. So passed away the last but one of the great generals of Louis XIV.: France never again saw his like till the genius of the Revolution evoked a new race of heroes. It was thought at first that Berwick's death, like Turenne's, would end the campaign, and that the French army must get back across the Rhine. The position seemed critical, Philippsburg in front, and Prince Eugene watching without. The Princes of the Empire, however, had not put out any strength in this war, regarding it chiefly as an Austrian affair; and the Marquis d'Asfeld, who took the command of the French forces, was able to hold on, and in July to reduce the great fortress of Philippsburg. Therewith the campaign of the Rhine closed. In Italy things had been carried on with more vigour and variety. The veteran Villars, now 81 years old, was in command, under Charles-Emmanuel, King of Sardinia. . . . Villars found it quite easy to occupy all the Milanese: farther he could not go; for Charles-Emmanuel, after the manner of his family, at once began to deal behind his back with the Imperialists and the campaign dragged. The old Marshal, little brooking interference and delay, for he still was full of fire, threw up his command, and started for France: on the way he was seized with illness at Turin, and died there five days after Berwick had been killed at Philippsburg. With them the long series of the generals of Louis XIV. comes to an end. Coigny and the Duke de Broglie succeeded to the command. Not far from Parma they fought a murderous battle with the Austrians, hotly contested, and a Cadmean victory for the French: it arrested their forward movement, and two months were spent in enforced idleness. In September 1734 the Imperialists inflicted a heavy check on the French at the Secchia; afterwards however emboldened by this success, they fought a pitched battle at Guastalla, in which, after a fierce struggle, the French remained masters of the field. Their losses, the advanced time of the year, and the uncertainty as to the King of Sardinia's movements and intentions, rendered the rest of the campaign unimportant. As however the Imperialists, in order to make head against the French in the valley of the Po, had drawn

all their available force out of the Neapolitan territory, the Spaniards were able to slip in behind them, and to secure that great prize. Don Carlos landed at Naples and was received with transports of joy: the Austrians were defeated at Bitonto; the Spaniards then crossed into Sicily, which also welcomed them gladly; the two kingdoms passed willingly under the rule of the Spaniards. In 1735 Austria made advances in the direction of peace; for the French had stirred up their old friend the Turk, who, in order to save Poland, proposed to invade Hungary. Fleury, no lover of war, and aware that England's neutrality could not last forever, was not unwilling to treat: a Congress at Vienna followed, and before the end of 1735 peace again reigned in Europe. The terms of the Treaty of Vienna (3 Oct. 1735) were very favourable to France. Austria ceded Naples and Sicily, Elba, and the States degli Presidii to Spain, to be erected into a separate kingdom for Don Carlos: France obtained Lorraine and Bar, which were given to Stanislaus Leczinski on condition that he should renounce all claim to the Polish Crown; they were to be governed by him under French administration: Francis Stephen, the former Duke, obtained, as an indemnity, the reversion of Tuscany, which fell to him in the following year. Parma and Piacenza returned to the Emperor, who also obtained from France a guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction. Thus France at last got firm hold of the much-desired Lorraine country, though it was not absolutely united to her till the death of Stanislaus in 1766."—G. W. Kitchen, *Hist. of France*, bk. 6, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 52 (v. 6).

A. D. 1738-1740.—The Question of the Austrian Succession.—Guarantee of the Pragmatic Sanction. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1718-1738, and 1740.

A. D. 1738-1770.—The fatal policy in Europe which lost to the French their opportunity for colonial aggrandizement.—“Louis XIV. had made France odious to her neighbors and suspected by all Europe. Those who succeeded him required much prudence and wisdom to diminish the feelings of fear and jealousy which this long reign of wars and conquests had inspired. They were fortunate in that the moderation demanded of them was for France the most skilful and advantageous policy. France kept Alsace, Franche-Comté, Flanders, Roussillon, and beyond this enlarged frontier she was no longer menaced by the same enemies. The treaty of Utrecht had modified the entire balance of power. There is henceforward no house of Austria excepting in Germany. . . . Spain is no longer to be feared; she is weakened, she is becoming dependent. A cadet of France, a Bourbon, reigns at Madrid. . . . It seems that henceforward France has only to conserve on the continent. She presents to it the most compact power. Her principal enemy in it is greatly reduced. She is surrounded by states, weaker than she, who defer to her and fear her; she can resume that fine rôle of moderator and guardian of the peace of Europe which Richelieu had prepared for her, and bear elsewhere, into the other hemisphere, the superabundance of her forces and that excess of vigor which in great nations is precisely the condition of health. The future of her grandeur is henceforward in the colonies. There she will en-

counter England. Upon this new stage their rivalry will be revived, more ardent than in the days of the hundred years war. To maintain this struggle which extends over the entire world, France will not be too strong with all her resources. When she is engaged in Canada and the Indies at the same time, she will not need to carry her armies across the Rhine. Peace on the continent is the condition necessary to the magnificent fortune which awaits her in America and Asia. If she wishes to obtain it she must renounce continental ambitions. She can do it; her defense is formidable. No one about her would dare to fire a gun without her permission. But, alas! she is far removed from this wisdom, and, in attempting to establish colonies, and make changes in the kingdoms of Europe at the same time, she will compromise her power in both worlds at once. The French desire colonial conquests, but they cannot abstain from European conquests, and England profits by it. Austria becomes her natural ally against France. These powerful diversions keep the French on the ground. However, they can yet curb Austria; they have Prussia, Savoy, Poland and Turkey if necessary. Diplomacy is sufficient for this game; but this game is not sufficient for the French politicians. The hatred of the house of Austria survives the causes of rivalry. This house seems always ‘the monster’ of which Balzac speaks. One is not satisfied to have chained it; one can cease only after having annihilated it. ‘There is always,’ writes Argenson, ‘for politicians a fundamental rule of reducing this power to the point where the Emperor will not be a greater landholder than the richest elector.’ Charles VI. dies in 1740; he leaves only a daughter; the opportunity seems favorable, and noisily sounding the death-cry (l'hallali) they take the field at the head of all the hunters by inheritance [see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1740-1741, and after; ITALY: A. D. 1741-1743 to 1746-1747; NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1745, and 1746-1747]. They go ‘to make an emperor, to conquer kingdoms!’ The Bavarian whom they crown is a stage emperor, and, as for conquests, they are considered only too fortunate that Maurice of Saxe preserves to France those of Louis XIV. The coalition has no other result than to enlarge Prussia [see AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: A. D. 1748; and NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1745-1748]. Meanwhile France is beaten on the sea and abandons solely to the resources of his genius Dupleix, who with a handful of men was founding an empire [see INDIA: A. D. 1743-1752]. There was besides another small matter; after having exposed Canada [see NEW ENGLAND: A. D. 1744 and 1745] in order to conquer Silesia for the king of Prussia, it was lost in order to have the pleasure of giving back that province to the queen of Hungary. France had played the game of England in the war of the succession of Austria, she played that of Austria in the seven years war [see GERMANY: A. D. 1755-1756, and after; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1754-1755]. Frederick was the most equivocal of allies. In 1755, he deserted cynically and passed over to the English, who had just recommenced war against France. England having Prussia, it was important, in order to maintain the equilibrium, that France have Austria. Maria Theresa offered her alliance and France accepted it. Thus was concluded the famous treaty of May 1, 1756. The object of

this alliance was entirely defensive. This is what France did not understand, and she did not cease to be a dupe for having changed partners. Louis XV. made himself the defender of Austria with the same blindness as he had made himself her adversary. The continental war which was only the accessory became the principal. From a ruling power, France fell to the rank of a subordinate. She did not even attain the indirect result to which she sacrificed her most precious interests. Frederick kept Silesia. France lost Canada and abandoned Louisiana; the empire of the Indies passed to the English [see CANADA: A. D. 1750-1753 to 1760; NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1749-1755, and 1755; OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1748-1754, and after; CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1758-1760; INDIA: A. D. 1758-1761]. Louis XV. had thus directed a policy the sole reason for which was the defeat of England, in such a way as to assure the triumph of that country. 'Above all,' wrote Bernis to Choiseul, then ambassador at Vienna, 'arrange matters in such a way that the king will not remain in servile dependence on his allies. That state would be the worst of all.' It was the state of France during the last years of the reign of Louis XV. The alliance of 1756, which had been at its beginning and under its first form, a skilful expedient, became a political system, and the most disastrous of all. Without gaining anything in territory, France lost her consideration in Europe. She had formerly grouped around her all those who were disturbed by the power of Austria; forced to choose between them and Austria, she allowed the Austrians to do as they chose. To crown the humiliation, immediately after a war in which she had lost everything to serve the hatred of Maria Theresa for Frederick, she saw those unreconcilable Germans draw together without her knowledge, come to an understanding at her expense, and, in concert with Russia, divide the spoil of one of the oldest clients of the French monarchy, Poland. There remained to France but one ally, Spain. They were united in 1761 by the Family Pact, the only beneficial work which had been accomplished in these years of disaster. . . . To the anger of having felt herself made use of during the war, to the rancor of having seen herself duped during the peace, was joined the fear of being despoiled one day by an ally so greedy and so little scrupulous. 'I foresee,' wrote Mably some years later, 'that the Emperor will demand of us again Lorraine, Alsace and everything which may please him.'—'Who can guaranty France, if she should experience a complicated and unfortunate war,' said one of the ministers of Louis XVI., 'that the Emperor would not reclaim Alsace and even other provinces?' It was in this way that the abuse made by Austria of the alliance revived all the traditions of rivalry. Add that Maria Theresa was devout, that she was known to be a friend of the Jesuits, an enemy of the philosophers, and that at the King's court, the favorites were accounted as acquired from Austria: everything thus contributed to render odious to public opinion the alliance which, in itself, already seemed detestable. At the time when they were beginning to style the partisans of new ideas 'patriots,' they were in the habit of confounding all the adversaries of these ideas with the 'Austrian party.'

. . . The marriage of Marie Antoinette with the

Dauphin was destined to seal forever the alliance of 1756. The unfortunate princess accumulated on her head the hatreds and prejudices heaped up by three centuries of rivalry and excessively stimulated by the still smarting impression of recent wrongs. Even the cause of her coming to France rendered her suspected by the French; they imputed to her as a crime her attachment to the alliance which was, notwithstanding, the very reason of her marriage. To understand the prodigious unpopularity which pursued her in France, it is necessary to measure the violence of the passions raised up against her mother and her country; it was summed up, long before the Revolution, in that word which became for Marie Antoinette a decree of forfeiture and of death; the Austrian."—A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution française* (trans. from the French), pt. 1, pp. 288-297.

A. D. 1743 (October).—The Second Family Compact of the Bourbon kings.—"France and Spain signed a secret treaty of perpetual alliance at Fontainebleau, October 25th, 1743. The treaty is remarkable as the precursor of the celebrated Family Compact between the French and Spanish Bourbons. The Spaniards, indeed, call it the Second Family Compact, the first being the Treaty of November 7th, 1733, of which, with regard to colonial affairs, it was a renewal. But this treaty had a more special reference to Italy. Louis XV. engaged to declare war against Sardinia, and to aid Spain in conquering the Milanese. Philip V. transferred his claims to that duchy to his son, the Infant Don Philip, who was also to be put in possession of Parma and Piacenza. All the possessions ceded by France to the King of Sardinia, by the Treaty of Utrecht, were to be again wrested from him. A public alliance was to be formed, to which the Emperor Charles VII. was to accede; whose states, and even something more, were to be recovered for him. Under certain circumstances war was to be declared against England; in which case France was to assist in the recovery of Gibraltar, and also, if possible, of Minorca. The new colony of Georgia was to be destroyed, the Asiento withdrawn from England, &c."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 6, ch. 4 (v. 3).

A. D. 1754-1756.—The Seven Years War.—Its Causes and Provocations. See GERMANY: A. D. 1755-1756; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1754-1755.

A. D. 1756 (May).—The Seven Years War: Minorca wrested from England. See MINORCA: A. D. 1756.

A. D. 1761 (August).—The Third Family Compact of the Bourbon kings.—"On the 15th of August [1761] . . . Grimaldi [Spanish ambassador at the French court] and Choiseul [the ruling minister, at the time, in France] signed the celebrated Family Compact. By this treaty the Kings of France and Spain agreed for the future to consider every Power as their enemy which might become the enemy of either, and to guarantee the respective dominions in all parts of the world which they might possess at the next conclusion of peace. Mutual succours by sea and land were stipulated, and no proposal of peace to their common enemies was to be made, nor negotiation entered upon, unless by common consent. The subjects of each residing in the European dominions of the other were to enjoy the same commercial privileges as the natives. Moreover, the King of Spain stipulated the

accession of his son, the King of Naples, to this alliance; but it was agreed that no prince or potentate, except of the House of Bourbon, should ever be admitted to its participation. Besides this treaty, which in its words at least applied only to future and contingent wars, and which was intended to be ultimately published, there was also signed on the same day a special and secret convention. This imported, that in case England and France should still be engaged in hostilities on the 1st of May 1762 Spain should on that day declare war against England, and that France should at the same period restore Minorca to Spain. . . . Not only the terms but the existence of a Family Compact were for some time kept scrupulously secret. Mr. Stanley, however, gleaned some information from the scattered hints of the Duke de Choiseul, and these were confirmed to Pitt from several other quarters." As the result of the Family Compact, England declared war against Spain on the 4th of January, 1762. Pitt had gone out of office in October because his colleagues and the King would not then consent to a declaration of war against the Spanish Bourbons (see ENGLAND: A. D. 1760-1763). The force of circumstances soon brought them to the measure.—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 37 (v. 4).

A. D. 1761-1764.—Proceedings against the Jesuits.—Their expulsion from the kingdom. See JESUITS: A. D. 1761-1769.

A. D. 1763.—The end and results of the Seven Years War.—The Peace of Paris.—America lost, nothing gained. See SEVEN YEARS WAR: A. D. 1763.

A. D. 1763.—Rights in the North American fisheries secured by the Treaty of Paris. See FISHERIES, NORTH AMERICAN: A. D. 1763.

A. D. 1768.—Acquisition of Corsica. See CORSICA: A. D. 1729-1769.

A. D. 1774-1788.—The Court and Government of Louis XVI., his inheritance of troubles, his vacillations, his helpless ministers.—Turgot, Necker, Calonne, Brienne.—Blind selfishness of the privileged orders.—The Assembly of Notables.—The Parliament of Paris.—"Louis XVI., an equitable prince, moderate in his propensities, carelessly educated, but naturally of a good disposition, ascended the throne [May 11, 1774] at a very early age. He called to his side an old courtier, and consigned to him the care of his kingdom; and divided his confidence between Maurepas and the Queen, an Austrian princess [Marie Antoinette], young, lively, and amiable, who possessed a complete ascendancy over him. Maurepas and the Queen were not good friends. The King, sometimes giving way to his minister, at others to his consort, began at an early period the long career of his vacillations. . . . The public voice, which was loudly expressed, called for Turgot, one of the class of economists, an honest, virtuous man, endowed with firmness of character, a slow genius, but obstinate and profound. Convinced of his probity, delighted with his plans of reform, Louis XVI. frequently repeated: 'There are none besides myself and Turgot who are friends of the people.' Turgot's reforms were thwarted by the opposition of the highest orders in the state, who were interested in maintaining all kinds of abuses, which the austere minister proposed to suppress. Louis XVI. dismissed him [1776] with regret. During his whole life, which was only

a long martyrdom, he had the mortification to discern what was right, to wish it sincerely, but to lack the energy requisite for carrying it into execution. The King, placed between the court, the parliaments, and the people, exposed to intrigues and to suggestions of all sorts, repeatedly changed his ministers. Yielding once more to the public voice, and to the necessity for reform, he summoned to the finance department Necker, a native of Geneva, who had amassed wealth as a banker, a partisan and disciple of Colbert, as Turgot was of Sully; an economical and upright financier, but a vain man, fond of setting himself up for arbitrator in everything. . . . Necker re-established order in the finances, and found means to defray the heavy expenses of the American war. . . . But it required something more than financial artifices to put an end to the embarrassments of the exchequer, and he had recourse to reform. He found the higher orders not less adverse to him than they had been to Turgot; the parliaments, apprised of his plans, combined against him, and obliged him to retire [1781]. The conviction of the existence of abuses was universal; everybody admitted it. . . . The courtiers, who derived advantage from these abuses, would have been glad to see an end put to the embarrassments of the exchequer, but without its costing them a single sacrifice. . . . The parliaments also talked of the interests of the people, loudly insisted on the sufferings of the poor, and yet opposed the equalization of the taxes, as well as the abolition of the remains of feudal barbarism. All talked of the public weal, few desired it; and the people, not yet knowing who were its true friends, applauded all those who resisted power, its most obvious enemy. By the removal of Turgot and Necker, the state of affairs was not changed: the distress of the treasury remained the same. . . . An intrigue brought forward M. de Calonne [in 1783, after brief careers in office of M. de Fleury and M. d'Ormesson]. . . . Calonne, clever, brilliant, fertile in resources, relied upon his genius, upon fortune, and upon men, and awaited the future with the most extraordinary apathy. . . . That future which had been counted upon now approached: it became necessary at length to adopt decisive measures. It was impossible to burden the people with fresh imposts, and yet the coffers were empty. There was but one remedy which could be applied; that was to reduce the expenses by the suppression of grants; and if this expedient should not suffice, to extend the taxes to a greater number of contributors, that is, to the nobility and clergy. These plans, attempted successively by Turgot and Necker, and resumed by Calonne, appeared to the latter not at all likely to succeed, unless the consent of the privileged classes themselves could be obtained. Calonne, therefore, proposed to collect them together in an assembly, to be called the Assembly of the Notables, in order to lay his plans before them, and to gain their consent either by address or by conviction. The assembly [which met February 22, 1787] was composed of distinguished members of the nobility, clergy, and magistracy, of a great number of masters of requests and some magistrates of the provinces. . . . Very warm discussions ensued." The Notables at length "promised to sanction the plans of Calonne, but on condition that a minister more moral and more deserving of confidence should

be appointed to carry them into execution." Calonne, consequently, was dismissed, and replaced by M. de Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse. "The Notables, bound by the promises which they had made, readily consented to all that they had at first refused: land-tax, stamp-duty, suppression of the gratuitous services of vassals ('*corvées*'), provincial assemblies, were all cheerfully granted. . . . Had M. de Brienne known how to profit by the advantages of his position; had he actively proceeded with the execution of the measures assented to by the Notables; had he submitted them all at once and without delay to the parliament, at the instant when the adhesion of the higher orders seemed to be wrung from them—all would probably have been over; the parliament, pressed on all sides, would have consented to everything. . . . Nothing of the kind, however, was done. By imprudent delays occasion was furnished for relapses; the edicts were submitted only one after another; the parliament had time to discuss, to gain courage, and to recover from the sort of surprise by which the Notables had been taken. It registered, after long discussions, the edict enacting the second abolition of the '*corvées*,' and another permitting the free exportation of corn. Its animosity was particularly directed against the land-tax; but it feared lest by a refusal it should enlighten the public, and show that its opposition was entirely selfish. It hesitated, when it was spared this embarrassment by the simultaneous presentation of the edict on the stamp-duty and the land-tax, and especially by opening the deliberations with the former. The parliament had thus an opportunity of refusing the first without entering into explanations respecting the second; and, in attacking the stamp-duty, which affected the majority of the payers of taxes, it seemed to defend the interest of the public. At a sitting which was attended by the peers, it denounced the abuses, the profligacy, and the prodigality of the court, and demanded statements of expenditure. A councillor, punning upon the '*états*' (statements) exclaimed. . . . —'It is not statements, but States-General that we want.' . . . The utterance of a single word presented an unexpected direction to the public mind: it was repeated by every mouth, and States-General were loudly demanded."—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Revolution* (Am. ed.), v. 1, pp. 17-21. —"There is no doubt that the French administrative body, at the time when Louis XVI. began to reign, was corrupt and self-seeking. In the management of the finances and of the army, illegitimate profits were made. But this was not the worst evil from which the public service was suffering. France was in fact governed by what in modern times is called 'a ring.' The members of such an organization pretend to serve the sovereign, or the public, and in some measure actually do so; but their rewards are determined by intrigue and favor, and are entirely disproportionate to their services. They generally prefer jobbery to direct stealing, and will spend a million of the state's money in a needless undertaking, in order to divert a few thousands into their own pockets. They hold together against all the world, while trying to circumvent each other. Such a ring in old France was the court. By such a ring will every country be governed, where the sovereign who possesses the political power is weak in moral character or careless of

the public interest; whether that sovereign be a monarch, a chamber, or the mass of the people. Louis XVI., king of France and of Navarre, was more dull than stupid, and weaker in will than in intellect. . . . He was . . . thoroughly conscientious, and had a high sense of the responsibility of his great calling. He was not indolent, although heavy, and his courage, which was sorely tested, was never broken. With these virtues he might have made a good king, had he possessed firmness of will enough to support a good minister, or to adhere to a good policy. But such strength had not been given him. Totally incapable of standing by himself, he leant successively, or simultaneously, on his aunt, his wife, his ministers, his courtiers, as ready to change his policy as his adviser. Yet it was part of his weakness to be unwilling to believe himself under the guidance of any particular person; he set a high value on his own authority, and was inordinately jealous of it. No one, therefore, could acquire a permanent influence. Thus a well-meaning man became the worst of sovereigns. . . . Louis XV. had been led by his mistresses; Louis XVI. was turned about by the last person who happened to speak to him. The courtiers, in their turn, were swayed by their feelings, or their interests. They formed parties and combinations, and intrigued for or against each other. They made bargains, they gave and took bribes. In all these intrigues, bribes, and bargains, the court ladies had a great share. They were as corrupt as the men, and as frivolous. It is probable that in no government did women ever exercise so great an influence. The factions into which the court was divided tended to group themselves round certain rich and influential families. Such were the Noailles, an ambitious and powerful house, with which Lafayette was connected by marriage; the Broglies, one of whom had held the thread of the secret diplomacy which Louis XV. had carried on behind the backs of his acknowledged ministers; the Polignacs, new people, creatures of Queen Marie Antoinette; the Rohans, through the influence of whose great name an unworthy member of the family was to rise to high dignity in the church and the state, and then to cast a deep shadow on the darkening popularity of that ill-starred princess. Such families as these formed an upper class among nobles. . . . It is not easy, in looking at the French government in the eighteenth century, to decide where the working administration ended, and where the useless court that answered no real purpose began. . . . There was the department of hunting and that of buildings, a separate one for royal journeys, one for the guard, another for police, yet another for ceremonies. There were five hundred officers 'of the mouth,' table-bearers distinct from chair-bearers. There were tradesmen, from apothecaries and armorers at one end of the list to saddle-makers, tailors and violinists at the other. . . . The military and civil households of the king and of the royal family are said to have consisted of about fifteen thousand souls, and to have cost forty-five million francs per annum. The holders of many of the places served but three months apiece out of every year, so that four officers and four salaries were required, instead of one. With such a system as this we cannot wonder that the men who administered the French government were generally incapable and self-

seeking. Most of them were politicians rather than administrators, and cared more for their places than for their country. Of the few conscientious and patriotic men who obtained power, the greater number lost it very speedily."—E. J. Lowell, *The Eve of the French Revolution*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: F. Rocquain, *The Revolutionary Spirit preceding the Fr. Rev.*, ch. 9-11.—Mme. de Stael, *Considerations on the Principal Events of the Fr. Rev.*, ch. 3-10 (v. 1).—J. Necker, *On the Fr. Rev.*, pt. 1, sect. 1 (v. 1).—Condorcet, *Life of Turgot*, ch. 5-6.—L. Say, *Turgot*, ch. 5-7.—C. D. Yonge, *Life of Marie Antoinette*, ch. 8-21.

A. D. 1778 (February).—Treaty with the United States of America. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1778, and 1778 (FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1780 (July).—Fresh aid to the United States of America. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (July).

A. D. 1782.—Disastrous naval defeat by Rodney.—Unsuccessful siege of Gibraltar. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1780-1782.

A. D. 1782.—The negotiation of Peace between Great Britain and the United States of America.—Dissatisfaction of the French minister. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1782 (SEPTEMBER), and (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1784-1785.—The affair of the Diamond Necklace.—The chief actor in the affair of the diamond necklace, which caused a great scandal and smirched the queen's name, was an adventurer who called herself the Comtesse de La Motte, and claimed descent from Henry II., but who had been half servant, half companion, to a lady of quality, and had picked up a useful acquaintance with the manners and the gossip of court society. "Madame de La Motte's original patroness had a visiting acquaintance with the Cardinal Prince Louis de Rohan, and in her company her protégée learned to know him also. Prince Louis, who had helped to receive Marie Antoinette at Strasburg, had been the French ambassador at Vienna, where he had disgusted and incensed Maria Theresa by his worldliness, profligacy, and arrogance. She had at last procured his withdrawal, and her letters expressing a positive terror lest he should come near Marie Antoinette and acquire an influence over her, were not without their effect. He was not allowed to appear at Court, and for ten long years fretted and fumed under a sense of the royal displeasure. . . . He was now a man hording on fifty, grey-headed, rosy, 'pursy,' with nothing save his blue blood and the great offices which he disgraced to recommend him. Madame de La Motte, hovering about Paris and Versailles, where she had lodgings in La Belle Inage, tried to make her own of backstairs gossip, and picked up a hint or two. Suddenly a great idea struck her, founded on the history of a magnificent necklace dangled before bright eyes, over which many an excitable imagination gloated. The Queen had a court jeweller, Böhmer, who had formerly been jeweller to the King of Saxony at Dresden. . . . For a period of years he had been collecting and assorting the stones which should form an incomparable necklace, in row upon row, pendants and tassels of lustrous diamonds, till the price reached the royal pitch of from eighty to ninety thousand pounds English

money. This costly 'collar,' according to rumour, was . . . meant, in the beginning, for the Comtesse du Barry. In the end, it . . . was offered with confidence to the Queen. . . . She declined to buy—she had enough diamonds. . . . There was nothing for it but that Böhmer should 'hawk' his necklace in every Court of Europe, without success, till the German declared himself ruined, and passionately protested that, if the Queen would not buy the diamonds, there was no resource for him save to throw himself into the Seine. But there was a resource, unhappily for Böhmer, unhappily for all concerned, most so for the poor Queen. Madame de La Motte, in keeping up her acquaintance with Prince Louis de Rohan, began to hint darkly that there might be ways of winning the royal favour. She threw out cunning words about the degree of importance and trust to which she had attained in the highest quarters at Versailles; about the emptiness of the Queen's exchequer, with consequent difficulties in the discharge of her charities; about the secret royal desire for the famous necklace, which the King would not enable Marie Antoinette to obtain. The blinded and besotted Cardinal drank in these insinuations. The black art was called in to deepen his convictions. In an age when many men, especially many churchmen, believed in nothing, in spite of their professions, naturally they were given over to believe a lie. Cagliostro, astrologer and modern magician, was flourishing in Paris, and by circles and signs he promised the priest, De Rohan, progress in the only suit he had at heart. Still the dupe was not so infatuated as to require no proof of the validity of these momentous implications, and proof was not wanting; notes were handed to him, to be afterwards shown to Böhmer, graciously acknowledging his devotion, and authorising him to buy for the Queen the diamond necklace. These notes were apparently written in the Queen's hand (that school-girl's scrawl of which Maria Theresa was wont to complain); but they were signed 'Marie Antoinette de France,' a signature which so great a man as the Cardinal ought to have known was never employed by the Queen, for the very good reason that the termination 'de France' belonged to the children and not to the wife of the sovereign. Even a further assurance that all was right was granted. The Cardinal, trembling in a fever of hope and expectation, was told that a private interview with the Queen would be vouchsafed to him at midnight in the Park of Versailles. At the appointed hour, on the night of the 28th of July, 1784, De Rohan, in a blue greatcoat and slouched hat, was stationed, amidst shrouding, sultry darkness, in the neighbourhood of the palace. Madame de La Motte, in a black domino, hovered near to give the signal of the Queen's approach. The whisper was given, 'In the Hornbeam Arbour,' and the Cardinal hurried to the spot, where he could dimly descry a tall lady in white, with chestnut hair, blue eyes, and a commanding air, if he could really have seen all these well-known attributes. He knelt, but before he could do more than mutter a word of homage and gratitude, the black domino was at his side again with another vehement whisper, 'On vient' (They come). The lady in white dropped a rose, with the significant words, 'Vous savez ce que cela veut dire' (You know what that means), and vanished before the 'Vite,

vite' ('Quick, quick') of the black domino, for the sound of approaching footsteps was supposed to indicate the approach of Madame and the Comtesse d'Artois, and the Cardinal, in his turn, had to flee from detection. What more could be required to convince a man of the good faith of the lady. . . . Bœhmer received a hint that he might sell his necklace, through the Prince Cardinal Louis de Rohan, to one of the great ones of the earth, who was to remain in obscurity. The jeweller drew out his terms—sixteen hundred thousand livres, to be paid in five equal instalments over a year and a-half—to which he and Prince Louis affixed their signatures. This paper Madame de Lamotte carried to Versailles, and brought it back with the words written on the margin, 'Bon Marie Antoinette de France.' In the meantime, Bœhmer, the better to keep the secret, gave out that he had sold the necklace to the Grand Turk for his favourite Sultana. The necklace was, in fact, delivered to Prince Louis and by him entrusted to Madame Lamotte, from whose hands it passed—not into the Queen's. Having been taken to pieces, it was sent in all haste out of the kingdom, while the Cardinal, according to his own account, was still played with. . . . It goes without saying that no payment, except a small offer of interest on the thirty thousand, was forthcoming. The Cardinal and Bœhmer were betrayed into wrath, dismay, and despair. Bœhmer took it upon him to apply, in respectful terms, to her Majesty for payment; and when she said the whole thing was a mistake, the man must be mad, and caused her words to be written to him, he sought an interview with Madame Campan, the first woman of the bedchamber, at her house at Crespy, where he had been dining, and in the gardens there, in the middle of a thunder-shower, astounded her with his version of the story. . . . The Cardinal was taken to the Bastille. More arrests followed, including those of Madame de Lamotte, staying quietly in her house at Bar-sur-Aube, and the girl Gay d'Oliva, an unhappy girl, tall and fair haired, taken from the streets of Paris, and brought to the park of Versailles to personate the Queen. It was said the Queen wept passionately over the scandal—well she might. The court in which the case was tried might prove the forgery, as in fact it did, though not in the way she expected; but every Court in Europe would ring with the story, and she had made deadly enemies, if not of the Church itself, of the great houses of De Rohan, De Soubise, De Guéméné, De Marsan, and their multitude of allies. The procès lasted nine months, and every exertion was made for the deliverance of the princely culprit. . . . The result of the trial was that, though the Queen's signature was declared false, Madame de Lamotte was sentenced to be whipped, branded, and imprisoned for life, her husband was condemned to the galleys, and a man called Villette de Retaux, who was the actual fabricator of the Queen's handwriting, was sentenced to be banished for life. The Cardinal Prince Louis de Rohan was fully acquitted, with permission to publish what defence he chose to write of his conduct. When he left the court, he was escorted by great crowds, hurrahing over his acquittal, because it was supposed to cover the Court with mortification."—Sarah Tytler, *Marie Antoinette*, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *The Diamond Necklace* (*Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, v. 5).—H. Vizetelly, *The Story of the Diamond Necklace*.

A. D. 1787-1789.—Struggle of the Crown with the Parliament of Paris.—The demand for a meeting of the States-General yielded to.—Double representation of the Third Estate conceded.—The make-up of the States-General as elected by the three Estates.—Banished to Troyes (August, 1787), in consequence of its refusal to register two edicts relating to the stamp-duty and the land-tax, the Parliament of Paris "grew weary of exile, and the minister recalled it on condition that the two edicts should be passed. But this was only a suspension of hostilities; the necessities of the crown soon rendered the struggle more obstinate and violent. The minister had to make fresh applications for money; his existence depended on the issue of several successive loans to the amount of 440,000,000. It was necessary to obtain the enrolment of them. Brienne, expecting opposition from the parliament, procured the enrolment of this edict, by a 'bed of justice,' and to conciliate the magistracy and public opinion, the protestants were restored to their rights in the same sitting, and Louis XVI. promised an annual publication of the state of finances, and the convocation of the states-general before the end of five years. But these concessions were no longer sufficient; parliament refused the enrolment, and rose against the ministerial tyranny. Some of its members, among others the duke of Orleans, were banished. Parliament protested by a decree against 'lettres de cachet,' and required the recall of its members. This decree was annulled by the king, and confirmed by parliament. The warfare increased. The magistracy of Paris was supported by all the magistracy of France, and encouraged by public opinion. It proclaimed the rights of the nation, and its own incompetence in matters of taxation; and, become liberal from interest, and rendered generous by oppression, it exclaimed against arbitrary imprisonment, and demanded regularly convoked states-general. After this act of courage, it decreed the irremovability of its members, and the incompetence of any who might usurp their functions. This bold manifesto was followed by the arrest of two members, d'Epréménil and Goislard, by the reform of the body, and the establishment of a plenary court. Brienne understood that the opposition of the parliament was systematic, that it would be renewed on every fresh demand for subsidies, or on the authorization of every loan. Exile was but a momentary remedy, which suspended opposition, without destroying it. He then projected the reduction of this body to judicial functions. . . . All the magistracy of France was exiled on the same day, in order that the new judicial organization might take place. The keeper of the seals deprived the Parliament of Paris of its political attributes, to invest with them a plenary court, ministerially composed, and reduced its judicial competence in favour of bailiwicks, the jurisdiction of which he extended. Public opinion was indignant; the Châtelet protested, the provinces rose, and the plenary court could neither be formed nor act. Disturbances broke out in Dauphiné, Brittany, Provence, Flanders, Languedoc, and Béarn; the ministry, instead of the regular opposition of parliament, had to encounter one much more animated and

factions. The nobility, the third estate, the provincial states, and even the clergy, took part in it. Brienne, pressed for money, had called together an extraordinary assembly of the clergy, who immediately made an address to the king, demanding the abolition of his plenary court, and the recall of the states-general: they alone could thenceforth repair the disordered state of the finances, secure the national debt, and terminate these disputes for power. . . . Obtaining neither taxes nor loans, unable to make use of the plenary court, and not wishing to recall the parliaments, Brienne, as a last resource, promised the convocation of the states-general. By this means he hastened his ruin. . . . He succumbed on the 25th August, 1788. The cause of his fall was a suspension of the payment of the interest on the debt, which was the commencement of bankruptcy. This minister has been the most blamed because he came last. Inheriting the faults, the embarrassments of past times, he had to struggle with the difficulties of his position with inefficient means. He tried intrigue and oppression; he banished, suspended, disorganized parliament; everything was an obstacle to him, nothing aided him. After a long struggle, he sank under lassitude and weakness; I dare not say from incapacity, for had he been far stronger and more skilful, had he been a Richelieu or a Sully, he would still have fallen. It no longer appertained to any one arbitrarily to raise money or to oppress the people. . . . The states-general had become the only means of government, and the last resource of the throne. They had been eagerly demanded by parliament and the peers of the kingdom, on the 13th of July, 1787; by the states of Dauphiné, in the assembly of Vizille; by the clergy in its assembly at Paris. The provincial states had prepared the public mind for them; and the notables were their precursors. The king after having, on the 18th of December, 1787, promised their convocation in five years, on the 8th of August, 1788, fixed the opening for the 1st of May, 1789. Necker was recalled, parliament re-established, the plenary court abolished, the bailiwicks destroyed, and the provinces satisfied; and the new minister prepared everything for the election of deputies and the holding of the states. At this epoch a great change took place in the opposition, which till then had been unanimous. Under Brienne, the ministry had encountered opposition from all the various bodies of the state, because it had sought to oppress them. Under Necker, it met with resistance from the same bodies, which desired power for themselves and oppression for the people. From being despotic, it had become national, and it still had them all equally against it. Parliament had maintained a struggle for authority, and not for the public welfare; and the nobility had united with the third estate, rather against the government than in favour of the people. Each of these bodies had demanded the states-general: the parliament, in the hope of ruling them as it had done in 1614; and the nobility, in the hope of regaining its lost influence. Accordingly, the magistracy proposed as a model for the states-general of 1789, the form of that of 1614, and public opinion abandoned it; the nobility refused its consent to the double representation of the third estate, and a division broke out between these two orders. This double representation was required by the

intellect of the age, the necessity of reform, and by the importance which the third estate had acquired. It had already been admitted into the provincial assemblies. . . . Opinion became daily more decided, and Necker wishing, yet fearing, to satisfy it, and desirous of conciliating all orders, of obtaining general approbation, convoked a second assembly of notables on the 6th of November, 1788, to deliberate on the composition of the states-general, and the election of its members. . . . Necker, having been unable to make the notables adopt the [double] representation of the third estate, caused it to be adopted by the council. The royal declaration of the 27th of November decreed, that the deputies in the states-general should amount to at least a thousand, and that the deputies of the third estate should be equal in number to the deputies of the nobility and clergy together. Necker moreover obtained the admission of the curés into the order of the clergy, and of protestants into that of the third estate. The district assemblies were convoked for the elections; every one exerted himself to secure the nomination of members of his own party, and to draw up manifestoes setting forth his views. Parliament had but little influence in the elections, and the court none at all. The nobility selected a few popular deputies, but for the most part devoted to the interests of their order, and as much opposed to the third estate as to the oligarchy of the great families of the court. The clergy nominated bishops and abbés attached to privilege, and curés favourable to the popular cause, which was their own; lastly, the third estate selected men enlightened, firm and unanimous in their wishes. The deputation of the nobility was comprised of 242 gentlemen, and 28 members of the parliament; that of the clergy, of 48 archbishops or bishops, 35 abbés or deans, and 208 curés; and that of the communes, of two ecclesiastics, 12 noblemen, 18 magistrates of towns, 200 county members, 212 barristers, 16 physicians, and 216 merchants and agriculturists. The opening of the states-general was fixed for the 5th of May, 1789."—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, introd.

ALSO IN: W. Smyth, *Lect's on the Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, lect. 6 (p. 1).—J. Necker, *On the Fr. Rev.*, pt. 1, sect. 1.

A. D. 1789.—The condition of the people on the eve of the great Revolution.—The sources and causes of its destructive fury.—“In 1789 three classes of persons, the Clergy, the Nobles, and the King occupied the most prominent position in the State, with all the advantages which it comports; namely, authority, property, honors, or, at the very least, privileges, immunities, favors, pensions, preferences, and the like. . . . The privileged classes number about 270,000 persons, comprising of the nobility 140,000 and of the clergy 130,000. This makes from 25,000 to 30,000 noble families; 23,000 monks in 2,500 monasteries, and 37,000 nuns in 1,500 convents, and 60,000 curates and vicars in as many churches and chapels. Should the reader desire a more distinct impression of them, he may imagine on each square league of territory, and to each thousand of inhabitants, one noble family in its weathercock mansion, in each village a curate and his church, and, every six or seven leagues, a conventual body of men or of women. . . . A fifth of the soil belongs to the crown and the

communes, a fifth to the third estate, a fifth to the rural population, a fifth to the nobles and a fifth to the clergy. Accordingly, if we deduct the public lands, the privileged classes own one half of the kingdom. This large portion, moreover, is at the same time the richest, for it comprises almost all the large and handsome buildings, the palaces, castles, convents, and cathedrals, and almost all the valuable movable property. . . . Such is the total or partial exemption from taxation. The tax-collectors halt in their presence, because the king well knows that feudal property has the same origin as his own; if royalty is one privilege seigniorial is another; the king himself is simply the most privileged among the privileged. . . . After the assaults of 450 years, taxation, the first of fiscal instrumentalities, the most burdensome of all, leaves feudal property almost intact. . . . The privileged person avoids or repels taxation, not merely because it despoils him, but because it belittles him; it is a mark of plebeian condition, that is to say, of former servitude, and he resists the fisc as much through pride as through interest. . . . La Bruyère wrote, just a century before 1789, 'Certain savage-looking beings, male and female, are seen in the country, black, livid and sunburnt, and belonging to the soil which they dig and grub with invincible stubbornness. They seem capable of articulation, and, when they stand erect they display human lineaments. They are, in fact, men. They retire at night into their dens, where they live on black bread, water and roots. They spare other human beings the trouble of sowing, ploughing and harvesting, and thus should not be in want of the bread they have planted.' They continue in want of it during 25 years after this, and die in herds. I estimate that in 1715 more than one-third of the population, six millions, perish with hunger and of destitution. The picture, accordingly, for the first quarter of the century preceding the Revolution, far from being overdrawn, is the reverse; we shall see that, during more than half a century, up to the death of Louis XV., it is exact; perhaps, instead of weakening any of its points, they should be strengthened. . . . Undoubtedly the government under Louis XVI. is milder; the intendants are more humane, the administration is less rigid, the 'taille' becomes less unequal, and the 'corvée' is less onerous through its transformation, in short, misery has diminished, and yet this is greater than human nature can bear. Examine administrative correspondence for the last thirty years preceding the Revolution. Countless statements reveal excessive suffering, even when not terminating in fury. Life to a man of the lower class, to an artisan, or workman, subsisting on the labor of his own hands, is evidently precarious; he obtains simply enough to keep him from starvation and he does not always get that. Here, in four districts, 'the inhabitants live only on buckwheat,' and for five years, the apple crop having failed, they drink only water. There, in a country of vineyards, 'the vine-dressers each year are reduced, for the most part, to begging their bread during the dull season.' . . . In a remote canton the peasants cut the grain still green and dry it in the oven, because they are too hungry to wait. . . . Between 1750 and 1760, the idlers who eat suppers begin to regard with compassion and alarm the laborers who go without dinners. Why are the latter so impoverished, and by what chance, on a soil as rich as that of

France, do those lack bread who grow the grain? In the first place, many farms remain uncultivated, and, what is worse, many are deserted. According to the best observers 'one-quarter of the soil is absolutely lying waste. . . . Hundreds and hundreds of arpents of heath and moor form extensive deserts.' . . . This is not sterility but decadence. The régime invented by Louis XIV. has produced its effect; the soil for a century past is reverting back to a wild state. . . . In the second place, cultivation, when it does take place, is carried on according to mediæval modes. Arthur Young, in 1789, considers that French agriculture has not progressed beyond that of the 10th century. Except in Flanders and on the plains of Alsace, the fields lie fallow one year out of three and oftentimes one year out of two. The implements are poor; there are no ploughs made of iron; in many places the plough of Virgil's time is still in use. . . . Arthur Young shows that in France those who lived on field labor, and they constituted the great majority, are 76 per cent. less comfortable than the same laborers in England, while they are 76 per cent. less well fed and well clothed, besides being worse treated in sickness and in health. The result is that, in seven-eighths of the kingdom, there are no farmers but simply métayers. ['The poor people,' says Arthur Young, 'who cultivate the soil here are métayers, that is, men who hire the land without ability to stock it; the proprietor is forced to provide cattle and seed, and he and his tenants divide the product.'] . . . Misery begets bitterness in a man; but ownership coupled with misery renders him still more bitter"; and, strange as it appears, the acquisition of land by the French peasants, in small holdings, went on steadily during the 18th century, despite the want and suffering which were so universal. "The fact is almost incredible, but it is nevertheless true. We can only explain it by the character of the French peasant, by his sobriety, his tenacity, his rigor with himself, his dissimulation, his hereditary passion for property and especially for that of the soil. He had lived on privations and economized sou after sou. . . . Towards 1760, one-quarter of the soil is said to have already passed into the hands of agriculturists. . . . The small cultivator, however, in becoming a possessor of the soil assumed its charges. Simply as day-laborer, and with his arms alone, he was only partially affected by the taxes; 'where there is nothing the king loses his dues.' But now, vainly is he poor and declaring himself still poorer; the fisc has a hold on him and on every portion of his new possessions. . . . In 1715, the 'taille' [see TAILLE AND GABELLE] and the poll-tax, which he alone pays, or nearly alone, amounts to 66,000,000 livres, the amount is 93,000,000 in 1759 and 110,000,000 in 1789. . . . 'I am miserable because too much is taken from me. Too much is taken from me because not enough is taken from the privileged. Not only do the privileged force me to pay in their place, but, again, they previously deduct from my earnings their ecclesiastical and feudal dues. When, out of my income of 100 francs, I have parted with 53 francs, and more, to the collector, I am obliged again to give 14 francs to the seignior, also more than 14 for tithes, and, out of the remaining 18 or 19 francs, I have additionally to satisfy the excise-men. I alone, a poor man, pay two governments, one, the old government [the seigniorial govern-

ment of the feudal regime], local and now absent, useless, inconvenient and humiliating, and active only through annoyances, exemptions and taxes; and the other [the royal government], recent, centralized, everywhere present, which, taking upon itself all functions, has vast needs and makes my meagre shoulders support its enormous weight.' These, in precise terms, are the vague ideas beginning to ferment in the popular brain and encountered on every page of the records of the States-General. . . . The privileged wrought their own destruction. . . . At their head, the king, creating France by devoting himself to her as if his own property, ended by sacrificing her as if his own property; the public purse is his private purse, while passions, vanities, personal weaknesses, luxurious habits, family solicitudes, the intrigues of a mistress and the caprices of a wife, govern a state of 26,000,000 men with an arbitrariness, a heedlessness, a prodigality, an unskilfulness, an absence of consistency, that would scarcely be overlooked in the management of a private domain. The king and the privileged excel in one direction, in good-breeding, in good taste, in fashion, in the talent for self-display and in entertaining, in the gift of graceful conversation, in finesse and in gayety, in the art of converting life into a brilliant and ingenious festivity. . . . Through the habit, perfection and sway of polished intercourse they stamped on the French intellect a classic form, which, combined with recent scientific acquisitions, produced the philosophy of the 18th century, the ill-repute of tradition, the ambition of recasting all human institutions according to the sole dictates of reason, the appliance of mathematical methods to politics and morals, the catechism of the rights of man, and other dogmas of anarchical and despotic character in the 'Contrat Social.'—Once this chimera is born they welcome it as a drawing-room fancy; they use the little monster as a plaything, as yet innocent and decked with ribbons like a pastoral lambkin; they never dream of it becoming a raging, formidable brute; they nourish it, and caress it, and then, opening their doors, they let it descend into the streets.—Here, amongst a middle class which the government has rendered ill-disposed by compromising its fortunes, which the privileged have offended by restricting its ambition, which is wounded by inequality through injured self-esteem, the revolutionary theory gains rapid accessions, a sudden asperity, and, in a few years, it finds itself undisputed master of public opinion.—At this moment, and at its summons, another colossal monster rises up, a monster with millions of heads, a blind, startled animal, an entire people pressed down, exasperated and suddenly loosed against the government whose exactions have despoiled it, against the privileged whose rights have reduced it to starvation."—H. A. Taine, *The Ancient Régime*, bk. 1, ch. 1, 2, and bk. 5, ch. 1, 2, 5.—"When the facts of history are fully and impartially set forth, the wonder is rather that sane men put up with the chaotic imbecility, the hideous injustices, the shameless scandals, of the 'Ancien Régime,' in the earlier half of the century, many years before the political 'Philosophes' wrote a line,—why the Revolution did not break out in 1754 or 1757, as it was on the brink of doing, instead of being delayed, by the patient endurance of the people, for another generation. It can hardly be doubted that the

Revolution of '89 owed many of its worst features to the violence of a populace degraded to the level of the beasts by the effect of the institutions under which they herded together and starved; and that the work of reconstruction which it attempted was to carry into practice the speculations of Mably and of Rousseau. But, just as little, does it seem open to question that, neither the writhings of the dregs of the populace in their misery, nor the speculative demonstrations of the Philosophers, would have come to much, except for the revolutionary movement which had been going on ever since the beginning of the century. The deeper source of this lay in the just and profound griefs of at least 95 per cent. of the population, comprising all its most valuable elements, from the agricultural peasants to the merchants and the men of letters and science, against the system by which they were crushed, or annoyed, whichever way they turned. But the surface current was impelled by the official defenders of the 'Ancien Régime' themselves. It was the Court, the Church, the Parliaments, and, above all, the Jesuits, acting in the interests of the despotism of the Papacy, who, in the first half of the 18th century, effectually undermined all respect for authority [see PORT ROYAL AND THE Jansenists: A. D. 1702-1715; and JESUITS: A. D. 1761-1767], whether civil or religious, and justified the worst that was or could be said by the 'Philosophes' later on."—Prof. T. H. Huxley, *Introd. to F. Rocquain's "The Revolutionary Spirit preceding the French Rev."*—"I took part in the opening of the States-General, and, in spite of the pomp with which the royal power was still surrounded, I there saw the passing away of the old régime. The régime which preceded '89, should, it seems to me, be considered from a two-fold aspect: the one, the general condition of the country, and the other, the relations existing between the government and the country. With regard to the former, I firmly believe that, from the earliest days of the monarchy, France had at no period been happier than she was then. She had not felt the effects of any great misfortune since the crash which followed Law's system. The long lasting ministry of Cardinal de Fleury, doubtless inglorious, but wise and circumspect, had made good the losses and lightened the burdens imposed at the end of the reign of Louis XV. If, since that time, several wars undertaken with little skill, and waged with still less, had compromised the honor of her arms and the reputation of her government; if they had even thrown her finances into a somewhat alarming state of disorder, it is but fair to say that the confusion resulting therefrom had merely affected the fortune of a few creditors, and had not tapped the sources of public prosperity; on the contrary, what is styled the public administration had made constant progress. If, on the one hand, the state had not been able to boast of any great ministers, on the other, the provinces could show many highly enlightened and clever intendants. Roads had been opened connecting numerous points, and had been greatly improved in all directions. It should not be forgotten that these benefits are principally due to the reign of Louis XV. Their most important result had been a progressive improvement in the condition of agriculture. The reign of Louis XVI. had continued favoring this wise policy, which had not been interrupted

by the maritime war undertaken on behalf of American independence. Many cotton-mills had sprung up, while considerable progress had been made in the manufacture of printed cotton fabrics, and of steel, and in the preparing of skins. . . . I saw the splendors of the Empire. Since the Restoration I see daily new fortunes spring up and consolidate themselves; still nothing so far has, in my eyes, equalled the splendor of Paris during the years which elapsed between 1783 and 1789. . . . Far be it from me to shut my eyes to the reality of the public prosperity which we are now [1822] enjoying. . . . But, nevertheless, when I question my reason and my conscience as to the possible future of the France of 1789, if the Revolution had not burst, if the ten years of destruction to which it gave birth had not weighed heavily upon that beautiful country, . . . I am convinced that France, at the time I am writing, would be richer and stronger than she is to-day."—Chancellor Pasquier, *Memoirs*, pp. 44–47.—"The history of the revolution can no more be understood without understanding the part played in it by Paris, than one can conceive of the tragedy of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out; and to understand the part played by Paris in the revolution is equally impossible. . . . Let us commence at the bottom with the nobodies. . . . Since the days of Henry III. (1574–89) the forcing of all industrial pursuits into the strait-jacket of guildships had been carried to the extreme of utter absurdity. Here, too, the chronic financial distress had been the principal cause. At first the handicrafts, which everybody had been at liberty to practice, were withdrawn from free competition and sold as a privilege, and then, when nothing was left to be sold, the old guilds were split up into a number of guildlets, merely to have again something to put on the counter. And it was not only left pretty much to the masters whom they would admit to the freedom of the guild, but besides the charges for it were so high that it was often absolutely out of the reach even of the most skillful journeyman. Even a blood-aristocracy was not lacking. In a number of guilds only the sons of masters and the second husbands of masters' widows could become masters. Thus an immense proletariat was gradually formed, which to a great extent was a proletariat only because the law irresistibly forced it into this position. And the city proletariat proper received constant and ever-increasing additions from the country. There such distress prevailed, that the paupers flocked in crowds to the cities. . . . In 1791, long before the inauguration of the Reign of Terror, there were in a population of 650,000, 118,000 paupers (indigents). Under the 'ancien régime' the immigrant proletariat from the country was by the law barred out from all ways of earning a livelihood except as common day-laborers, and the wages of these were in 1788, on an average, 26 cents for men and 15 for women, while the price of bread was higher than in our times. What a gigantic heap of ferment!"—H. von Holst, *The French Revolution*, lect. 2.—"In the spring of 1789 who could have foreseen the bloody catastrophe? Everything was tinged with hopefulness; the world was dreaming of the Golden Age. . . . Despite the previous disorders, and seeds of discord contained in certain cahiers, the prevailing sentiment was confidence. . . .

The people everywhere hailed with enthusiasm the new era which was dawning. With a firm king, with a statesman who knew what he wished, and was determined to accomplish it, this confidence would have been an incomparable force. With a feeble prince like Louis XVI., with an irresolute minister like Necker, it was an appalling danger. The public, inflamed by the anarchy that had preceded the convocation of the States, disposed, through its inexperience, to accept all Utopias, and impelled by its peculiar character to desire their immediate realization, naturally grew more exacting in proportion as they were promised more, and more impatient and irritable as their hopes became livelier and appeared better founded. In the midst of this general satisfaction there was but one dark spot,—the queen. The cheers which greeted the king were silent before his wife. Calumny had done its work; and all the nobles from the provinces, the country curates, the citizens of the small towns, came from the confines of France imbued with the most contemptible prejudices against this unfortunate princess. Pamphlets, poured out against her by malicious enemies; vague and mysterious rumours, circulated everywhere, repeated in whispers, without giving any clew to their source,—the more dangerous because indefinite, and the more readily believed because infamous and absurd,—had so often reiterated that the queen was author of all the evil, that the world had come to regard her as the cause of the deficit, and the only serious obstacle to certain efficacious reforms. 'The queen pillages on all sides, she even sends money, it is said, to her brother, the emperor,' wrote a priest of Maine, in his parochial register, in 1781; and he attributed the motive of the reunion of the Notables to these supposed depredations. This was eight years before the crisis came, and such stories grew and spread."—M. de la Rocheterie, *Life of Marie Antoinette*, v. 2, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: A. de Tocqueville, *On the State of Society in France before the Rev.*—A. Young, *Travels in France, 1787–89*.—R. H. Dabney, *Causes of the French Rev.*—E. J. Lowell, *The Eve of the French Rev.*

A. D. 1789 (May).—Meeting of the States-General.—Conflict between the three Estates.—The question of three Houses or one.—"The opening of the States-general was fixed for the 5th of May, 1789, and Versailles was chosen as the place of their meetings. On the 4th, half Paris poured into that town to see the court and the deputies marching in procession to the solemn religious ceremony, which was to inaugurate the important epoch. . . . On the following day, the States-general, to the number of 1,200 persons, assembled in the spacious and richly decorated 'salle des menus plaisirs.' The King appeared surrounded by his family, with all the magnificence of the ancient court, and was greeted by the enthusiastic applause of the deputies and spectators." The king made a speech, followed by Barentin, the keeper of the great seal, and by Necker. The latter "could not prevail upon himself to avow to the Assembly the real state of affairs. He announced an annual deficit of 56,000,000 francs, and thereby confused the mind of the public, which since the meeting of the Notables, had always been discussing a deficit of from 120,000,000 to 140,000,000. He was quite right in assuming that those 56,000,000

might be covered by economy in the expenditure; but it was both irritating and untrue, when he, on this ground, denied the necessity of summoning the States-general, and called their convocation a free act of royal favour. . . . The balance of income and expenditure might, indeed, easily be restored in the future, but the deficit of former years had been heedlessly allowed to accumulate, and by no one more than by Necker himself. A floating debt of 550,000,000 had to be faced—in other words, therefore, more than a whole year's income had been expended in advance. . . . The real deficit of the year, therefore, at the lowest calculation, amounted to more than 200,000,000, or nearly half the annual income. . . . These facts, then, were concealed, and thus the ministry was necessarily placed in a false position towards the States-general; the continuance of the former abuses was perpetuated, or a violent catastrophe made inevitable. . . . For the moment the matter was not discussed. Everything yielded to the importance of the constitutional question—whether the three orders should deliberate in common or apart—whether there should be one single representative body, or independent corporations. This point was mooted at once in its full extent on the question, whether the validity of the elections should be scrutinised by each order separately, or by the whole Assembly. We need not here enter into the question of right; but of this there can be no doubt, that the government, which virtually created the States-general afresh [since there had been no national meeting of the Estates since the States-general of 1614—see above: A. D. 1610-1619], had the formal right to convocate them either in one way or the other, as it thought fit. . . . They [the government] infinitely lowered their own influence and dignity by leaving a most important constitutional question to the decision and the wrangling of the three orders; and they frustrated their own practical objects, by not decidedly declaring for the union of the orders in one assembly. Every important measure of reform, which had in view the improvement of the material and financial condition of the country, would have been mutilated by the clergy and rejected by the nobles. This was sufficiently proved by the 'cahiers' of the electors [written instructions given by the electors to the deputies]. The States themselves had to undertake what the government had neglected. That which the government might have freely and legally commanded, now led to violent revolution. But there was no choice left; the commons would not tolerate the continuance of the privileged orders; and the state could not tolerate them if it did not wish to perish. The commons, who on this point were unanimous, considered the system of a single Assembly as a matter of course. They took care not to constitute themselves as 'tiers état,' but remained passive, and declared that they would wait until the Assembly should be constituted as a whole. Thus slowly and cautiously did they enter on their career. . . . Indisputably the most important and influential among them was Count Mirabeau, the representative of the town of Aix in Provence, a violent opponent of feudalism, and a restless participator in all the recent popular commotions. He would have been better able than any man to stimulate the Assembly to vigorous action; but even he hesitated, and kept

back his associates from taking any violent steps, because he feared that the inconsistency and inexperience of the majority would bring ruin on the state. . . . It was only very gradually that the 'tiers état' began to negotiate with the other orders. The nobles shewed themselves haughty, dogmatical, and aggressive; and the clergy cautious, unctuous, and tenacious. They tried the efficacy of general conferences; but as no progress was found to have been made after three weeks, they gave up their consultations on the 25th of May. The impatience of the public, and the necessities of the treasury, continually increased; the government, therefore, once more intervened, and Necker was called upon to propose a compromise," which was coldly rejected by the nobles, who "declared that they had long ago finished their scrutiny, and constituted themselves as a separate order. They thus spared the commons the dreaded honour of being the first to break with the crown. The conferences were again closed on the 9th of June. The leaders of the commons now saw that they must either succumb to the nobility, or force the other orders to submission."—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, bk. 1, ch. 2 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: W. Smyth, *Lect's on the Hist. of the French Rev.*, lect. 8 (v. 1).—Prince de Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, pt. 1 (v. 1).

A. D. 1789 (June).—The Third Estate seizes the reins, proclaims itself the National Assembly, and assumes sovereign powers.—The passionate excitement of Paris.—Dismissal of Necker.—Rising of the mob.—"At last . . . on the proposal of Sieyès [the Abbé, deputy for Paris] and amid a storm of frantic excitement, the Third Estate alone voted themselves 'the National Assembly,' invited the other two orders to join them, and pushing their pretensions to sovereignty to the highest point, declared that the existing taxes, not having been consented to by the nation, were all illegal. The National Assembly, however, allowed them to be levied till its separation, after which they were to cease if not formally regranted. This great revolution was effected on June 17, and it at once placed the Third Order in a totally new relation both to the other orders and to the Crown. There were speedy signs of yielding among some members of the privileged orders, and a fierce wave of excitement supported the change. Malouet strongly urged that the proper course was to dissolve the Assembly and to appeal to the constituencies, but Necker declined, and a feeble and ineffectual effort of the King to accomplish a reunion, and at the same time to overawe the Third Order, precipitated the Revolution. The King announced his intention of holding a royal session on June 22, and he summoned the three orders to meet him. It was his design to direct them to unite in order to deliberate in common on matters of common interest, and to regain the royal initiative by laying down the lines of a new constitution. . . . On Saturday, the 20th, however, the course of events was interrupted by the famous scene in the tennis court. Troops had lately been pouring to an alarming extent into Paris, and exciting much suspicion in the popular party, and the Government very injudiciously selected for the royal session on the following Monday the hall in which the Third Order assembled. The hall was being prepared for the occasion, and therefore no meeting could be held.

The members, ignorant of the fact, went to their chamber and were repelled by soldiers. Furious at the insult, they adjourned to the neighbouring tennis court [Jeu-de-Paume]. A suspicion that the King meant to dissolve them was abroad, and they resolved to resist such an attempt. With lifted hands and in a transport of genuine, if somewhat theatrical enthusiasm, they swore that they would never separate 'till the constitution of the kingdom and the regeneration of public order were established on a solid basis.' . . . One single member, Martin d'Auche, refused his assent. The Third Estate had thus virtually assumed the sole legislative authority in France, and like the Long Parliament in England had denied the King's power to dissolve them. . . . Owing to the dissension that had arisen, the royal session was postponed till the 23rd, but on the preceding day the National Assembly met in a church, and its session was a very important one, for on this occasion a great body of the clergy formally joined it. One hundred and forty-eight members of the clergy, of whom 134 were curés, had now given their adhesion. Two of the nobles, separating from their colleagues, took the same course. Next day the royal session was held. The project adopted in the council differed so much from that of Necker that this minister refused to give it the sanction of his presence. Instead of commanding the three orders to deliberate together in the common interest, it was determined in the revised project that the King should merely invite them to do so. . . . It was . . . determined to withdraw altogether from the common deliberation 'the form of the constitution to be given to the coming States-General,' and to recognise fully the essential distinction of the three orders as political bodies, though they might, with the approval of the Sovereign, deliberate in common. Necker had proposed . . . that the King should decisively, and of his own authority, abolish all privileges of taxation, but in the amended article the King only undertook to give his sanction to this measure on condition of the two orders renouncing their privileges. On the other hand, the King announced to the Assembly a long series of articles of reform which would have made France a thoroughly constitutional country, and have swept away nearly all the great abuses in its government. . . . He annulled the proceedings of June 17, by which the Third Estate alone declared itself the Legislature of France. He reminded the Assembly that none of its proceedings could acquire the force of law without his assent, and he asserted his sole right as French Sovereign to the command of the army and police. He concluded by directing the three orders to withdraw and to meet next day to consider his proposals. The King, with the nobles and the majority of the clergy, at once withdrew, but the Third Order defiantly remained. It was evident that the attempt to conciliate, and the attempt to assert the royal authority, had both failed. The Assembly proclaimed itself inviolable. It confirmed the decrees which the King had annulled. Sieyès declared, in words which excited a transport of enthusiasm, that what the Assembly was yesterday it still was to-day; and two days later, the triumph of the Assembly became still more evident by the adhesion of 47 of the nobility. After this defection the King saw the hopelessness of resistance, and on the 27th

he ordered the remainder of the nobles to take the same course. . . . In the mean time the real rulers of the country were coming rapidly to the surface. . . . Groups of local agitators and of the scum of the Paris mob began to overawe the representatives of the nation, and to direct the course of its policy. Troops were poured into Paris, but their presence was an excitement without being a protection, for day after day it became more evident that their discipline was gone, and that they shared the sympathies and the passions of the mob. . . . At the same time famine grew daily more intense, and the mobs more passionate and more formidable. The dismissal of Necker on the evening of July 11 was the spark which produced the conflagration that had long been preparing. Next day Paris flew to arms. The troops with few exceptions abandoned the King."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of England in the 18th Century*, ch. 20 (v. 5).

Also in: E. Dumont, *Recollections of Mirabeau*, ch. 4-5.

A. D. 1789 (July).—The mob in arms.—Anarchy in Paris.—The taking of the Bastille.—"On the 12th of July, near noon, on the news of the dismissal of Necker, a cry of rage arises in the Palais-Royal; Camille Desmoulins, mounted on a table, announces that the Court meditates 'a St. Bartholomew of patriots.' The crowd embrace him, adopt the green cockade which he has proposed, and oblige the dancing-saloons and theatres to close in sign of mourning: they hurry off to the residence of Curtius [a plaster-cast master], and take the busts of the Duke of Orleans and of Necker and carry them about in triumph. Meanwhile, the dragoons of the Prince de Lambesc, drawn up on the Place Louis-Quinze, find a barricade of chairs at the entrance of the Tuilleries, and are greeted with a shower of stones and bottles. Elsewhere, on the Boulevard, before the Hôtel Montmorency, some of the French Guards, escaped from their barracks, fired on a loyal detachment of the 'Royal Allemand.' The tocsin is sounding on all sides, the shops where arms are sold are pillaged, and the Hôtel-de-Ville is invaded; 15 or 16 well-disposed electors, who meet there, order the districts to be assembled and armed.—The new sovereign, the people in arms and in the street, has declared himself. The dregs of society at once come to the surface. During the night between the 12th and 13th of July, 'all the barriers, from the Faubourg Saint-Antoine to the Faubourg Saint-Honoré, besides those of the Faubourgs Saint-Marcel and Saint-Jacques, are forced and set on fire.' There is no longer an 'octroi'; the city is without a revenue just at the moment when it is obliged to make the heaviest expenditures. . . . 'During this fearful night, the bourgeoisie kept themselves shut up, each trembling at home for himself and those belonging to him.' On the following day, the 13th, the capital appears to be given up to bandits and the lowest of the low. . . . During these two days and nights, says Bailly, 'Paris ran the risk of being pillaged, and was only saved from the marauders by the national guard.' . . . Fortunately the militia organized itself, and the principal inhabitants and gentlemen enrol themselves; 48,000 men are formed into battalions and companies; the bourgeoisie buy guns of the vagabonds for three livres apiece, and sabres or pistols for twelve sous. At last, some of the offenders are hung on

the spot, and others disarmed, and the insurrection again becomes political. But, whatever its object, it remains always wild, because it is in the hands of the populace. . . . There is no leader, no management. The electors who have converted themselves into the representatives of Paris seem to command the crowd, but it is the crowd which commands them. One of them, Legrand, to save the Hôtel-de-Ville, has no other resource but to send for six barrels of gun-powder, and to declare to the assailants that he is about to blow everything into the air. The commandant whom they themselves have chosen, M. de Salles, has twenty bayonets at his breast during a quarter of an hour, and, more than once, the whole committee is near being massacred. Let the reader imagine, on the premises where the discussions are going on, and petitions are being made, 'a concourse of 1,500 men pressed by 100,000 others who are forcing an entrance,' the wainscoting cracking, the benches upset one over another . . . a tumult such as to bring to mind 'the day of judgment,' the death-shrieks, songs, yells, and 'people beside themselves, for the most part not knowing where they are nor what they want.' Each district is also a petty centre, while the Palais-Royal is the main centre. . . . One wave gathers here and another there, their strategy consists in pushing and in being pushed. Yet, their entrance is effected only because they are let in. If they get into the Invalides it is owing to the connivance of the soldiers. — At the Bastille, firearms are discharged from ten in the morning to five in the evening against walls 40 feet high and 30 feet thick, and it is by chance that one of their shots reaches an 'invalid' on the towers. They are treated the same as children whom one wishes to hurt as little as possible. The governor, on the first summons to surrender, orders the cannon to be withdrawn from the embrasures; he makes the garrison swear not to fire if it is not attacked; he invites the first of the deputations to lunch; he allows the messenger dispatched from the Hôtel-de-Ville to inspect the fortress; he receives several discharges without returning them, and lets the first bridge be carried without firing a shot. When, at length, he does fire, it is at the last extremity, to defend the second bridge, and after having notified the assailants that he is going to do so. . . . The people, in turn, are infatuated with the novel sensations of attack and resistance, with the smell of gunpowder, with the excitement of the contest; all they can think of doing is to rush against the mass of stone, their expedients being on a level with their tactics. A brewer fancies that he can set fire to this block of masonry by pumping over it spikenard and poppy-seed oil mixed with phosphorus. A young carpenter, who has some archæological notions, proposes to construct a catapult. Some of them think that they have seized the governor's daughter, and want to burn her in order to make the father surrender. Others set fire to a projecting mass of buildings filled with straw, and thus close up the passage. 'The Bastille was not taken by main force,' says the brave Elie, one of the combatants; 'it was surrendered before even it was attacked,' by capitulation, on the promise that no harm should be done to anybody. The garrison, being perfectly secure, had no longer the heart to fire on human beings while themselves risking nothing, and, on the other

hand, they were unnerved by the sight of the immense crowd. Eight or nine hundred men only were concerned in the attack, most of them workmen or shopkeepers belonging to the faubourg, tailors, wheelwrights, mercers, and wine-dealers, mixed with the French Guards. The Place de la Bastille, however, and all the streets in the vicinity, were crowded with the curious who came to witness the sight; 'among them,' says a witness, 'were a number of fashionable women of very good appearance, who had left their carriages at some distance.' To the 120 men of the garrison, looking down from their parapets, it seemed as though all Paris had come out against them. It is they, also, who lower the drawbridge and introduce the enemy: everybody has lost his head, the besieged as well as the besiegers, the latter more completely because they are intoxicated with the sense of victory. Scarcely have they entered when they begin the work of destruction, and the latest arrivals shoot at random those that come earlier; 'each one fires without heeding where or on whom his shot tells.' Sudden omnipotence and the liberty to kill are a wine too strong for human nature. . . . Elle, who is the first to enter the fortress, Cholat, Hulien, the brave fellows who are in advance, the French Guards who are cognizant of the laws of war, try to keep their word of honour; but the crowd pressing on behind them know not whom to strike, and they strike at random. They spare the Swiss soldiers who have fired on them, and who, in their blue smocks, seem to them to be prisoners; on the other hand, by way of compensation, they fall furiously on the 'invalides' who opened the gates to them; the man who prevented the governor from blowing up the fortress has his wrist severed by the blow of a sabre, is twice pierced with a sword and is hung, and the hand which had saved one of the districts of Paris is promenaded through the streets in triumph. The officers are dragged along and five of them are killed, with three soldiers, on the spot, or on the way." M. de Launay, the governor, after receiving many wounds, while being dragged to the Hôtel-de-Ville, was finally killed by bayonet thrusts, and his head, cut from his body, was placarded and borne through the streets upon a pitchfork.—H. A. Taine, *The French Revolution*, bk. 1, ch. 2 (v. 1).—"I was present at the taking of the Bastille. What has been styled the fight was not serious, for there was absolutely no resistance shown. Within the hold's walls were neither provisions nor ammunition. It was not even necessary to invest it. The regiment of gardes françaises which had led the attack, presented itself under the walls on the rue Saint Antoine side, opposite the main entrance, which was barred by a drawbridge. There was a discharge of a few musket shots, to which no reply was made, and then four or five discharges from the cannon. It has been claimed that the latter broke the chains of the drawbridge. I did not notice this, and yet I was standing close to the point of attack. What I did see plainly was the action of the soldiers, invalides, or others, grouped on the platform of the high tower, holding their muskets stock in the air, and expressing by all means employed under similar circumstances their desire of surrendering. The result of this so-called victory, which brought down so many favors on the heads of the so-called victors, is well-known. The truth is, that this great fight

did not for a moment frighten the numerous spectators who had flocked to witness its result. Among them were many women of fashion, who, in order to be closer to the scene, had left their carriages some distance away."—Chancellor Pasquier, *Memoirs*, pp. 55–56.

ALSO IN: D. Bingham, *The Bastille*, v. 2, ch. 9–12.—R. A. Davenport, *Hist. of the Bastille*, ch. 12.—J. Claretie, *Camille Desmoulins and his Wife*, ch. 1, sect. 4.

A. D. 1789 (July).—Practical surrender of authority by the king.—Organization of the National Guard with Lafayette in command.—Disorder and riot in the provinces.—Hunger in the capital.—The murder of Foulon and Berthier.—“The next morning the taking of the Bastille bore its intended fruit. Marshal de Broglie, who had found, instead of a loyal army, only disaffected regiments which had joined or were preparing to join the mob, sent in his resignation. . . . The king, deserted by his army, his authority now quite gone, had no means of restoring order except through the Assembly. He begged that body to undertake the work, promising to recall the dismissed ministers. . . . The power of the king had now passed from him to the National Assembly. But that numerous body of men, absorbed in interminable discussions on abstract ideas, was totally incapable of applying its power to the government of the country. The electors at the Hotel de Ville, on the 15th of July, resolved that there must be a mayor to direct the affairs of Paris, and a National Guard to preserve order. Dangers threatened from every quarter. When the question arose as to who should fill these offices, Moreau de Saint Méry, the president of the electors, pointed to the bust of Lafayette, which had been sent as a gift to the city of Paris by the State of Virginia, in 1784. The gesture was immediately understood, and Lafayette was chosen by acclamation. Not less unanimous was the choice of Bailly for mayor. Lafayette was now taken from the Assembly to assume the more active employment of commanding the National Guard. While the Assembly pursued the destruction of the old order and the erection of a new, Lafayette, at the age of 32, became the chief depository of executive power. . . . Throughout France, the deepest interest was exhibited in passing events. . . . The victory of the Assembly over the king and aristocracy led the people of the provinces to believe that their cause was already won. A general demoralization ensued.” After the taking of the Bastille, “the example of rebellion thus set was speedily followed. Rioting and lawlessness soon prevailed everywhere, increased and embittered by the scarcity of food. In the towns, bread riots became continual, and the custom-houses, the means of collecting the exorbitant taxes, were destroyed. In the rural districts, châteaux were to be seen burning on all sides. The towers in which were preserved the titles and documents which gave to the nobleman his oppressive rights were carried by storm and their contents scattered. Law and authority were fast becoming synonymous with tyranny; the word ‘liberty,’ now in every mouth, had no other signification than license. Into Paris slunk hordes of gaunt foot-pads from all over France, attracted by the prospect of disorder and pillage. . . . From such circumstances naturally arose the National Guard.” The king had been asked,

on the 13th, by a deputation from the Assembly, “to confide the care of the city to a militia,” and had declined. The military organization of citizens was then undertaken by the electors at the Hotel de Ville, without his consent, and its commander designated without his appointment. “The king was obliged to confirm this choice, and he was thus deprived even of the merit of naming the chief officer of the guard whose existence had been forced upon him.” On the 17th the king was persuaded to visit the city, for the effect which his personal presence would have, it was thought, upon the anxious and excited public mind. Lafayette had worked with energy to prepare his National Guard for the difficult duty of preserving order and protecting the royal visitor on the occasion. “So intense was the excitement and the insurrectionary spirit of the time, so uncertain were the boundaries between rascality and revolutionary zeal, that it was difficult to establish the fact that the new guard was created to preserve order and not to fight the king and pillage the aristocracy. The great armed mob, now in process of organization, had to be treated with great tact, lest it should refuse to submit to authority in any shape.” But short as the time was, Lafayette succeeded in giving to the powerless monarch a safe and orderly reception. “The king made his will and took the sacraments before leaving Versailles, for . . . doubts were entertained that he would live to return.” He was met at the gates of Paris by the new mayor, Bailly, and escorted through a double line of National Guards to the Hotel de Ville. There he was obliged to fix on his hat the national cockade, just brought into use, and to confirm the appointments of Lafayette and Bailly. “Louis XVI. then returned to Versailles, on the whole pleased, as the day had been less unpleasant than had been expected. But the compulsory acceptance of the cockade and the nominations meant nothing less than the extinction of his authority. . . . Lafayette recruited his army from the bourgeois class, for the good reason that, in the fever then raging for uncontrolled freedom, that class was the only one from which the proper material could be taken. The importance of order was impressed on the bourgeois by the fact that they had shops and houses which they did not wish to see pillaged. . . . The necessity for strict police measures was soon to be terribly illustrated. For a week past a large crowd composed of starving workmen, country beggars, and army deserters, had thronged the streets, angrily demanding food. The city was extremely short of provisions, and it was impossible to satisfy the demands made upon it. . . . On July 22, an old man named Foulon, a member of the late ministry, who had long been the object of public dislike, and was now detested because it was rumored that he said that ‘the people might eat grass,’ was arrested in the country, and brought to the Hotel de Ville, followed by a mob who demanded his immediate judgment.” Lafayette exerted vainly his whole influence and his whole authority to protect the wretched old man until he could be lodged in prison. The mob tore its victim from his very hands and destroyed him on the spot. The next day, Foulon’s son-in-law, Berthier, the Intendant of Paris, was arrested in the country, and the tragedy was re-enacted. “Shocked by these murders and disgusted by his own inability

to prevent them, Lafayette sent his resignation to the electors, and for some time persisted in his refusal to resume his office. But no other man could be found in Paris equally fitted for the place; so that on the personal solicitation of the electors and a deputation from the 60 districts of the city, he again took command."—B. Tuckerman, *Life of General Lafayette*, v. 1, ch. 9-10.

ALSO IN: J. Michelet, *Historical View of the French Rev.*, bk. 2, ch. 1-2.

A. D. 1789 (July—August).—Cause and character of the "Emigration."—"Everything, or nearly everything, was done by the party opposed to the Revolution in the excitement of the moment; nothing was the result of reasoning. Who, for instance, reasoned out the emigration? It has oftentimes been asked how so extraordinary a resolution came to be taken; how it had entered the minds of men gifted with a certain amount of sense that there was any advantage to be derived from abandoning all the posts where they could still exercise power; of giving over to the enemy the regiments they commanded, the localities over which they had control; of delivering up completely to the teachings of the opposite party the peasantry, over whom, in a goodly number of provinces, a valuable influence might be exerted, and among whom they still had many friends; and all this, to return for the purpose of conquering, at the sword's point, positions, a number of which at least could be held without a fight. No doubt it has been offered as an objection, that the peasantry set fire to châteaux, that soldiers mutinied against their officers. This was not the case at the time of what has been called the first emigration, and, at any rate, such doings were not general; but does danger constitute sufficient cause for abandoning an important post? . . . What is the answer to all this? Merely what follows. The voluntary going into exile of nearly the whole nobility of France, of many magistrates who were never to unsheath a sword, and lastly, of a large number of women and children, — this resolve, without a precedent in history, was not conceived and determined upon as a State measure; chance brought it about. A few, in the first instance, followed the princes who had been obliged, on the 14th of July, to seek safety out of France, and others followed them. At first, it was merely in the nature of a pleasant excursion. Outside of France, they might freely enjoy saying and believing anything and everything. . . . The wealthiest were the first to incur the expense of this trip, and a few brilliant and amiable women of the Court circle did their share to render most attractive the sojourn in a number of foreign towns close to the frontier. Gradually the number of these small gatherings increased, and it was then that the idea arose of deriving advantage from them. It occurred to the minds of a few men in the entourage of the Comte d'Artois, and whose moving spirit was M. de Calonne, that it would be an easy matter for them to create a kingdom for their sovereign outside of France, and that if they could not in this fashion succeed in giving him provinces to reign over, he would at least reign over subjects, and that this would serve to give him a standing in the eyes of foreign powers, and determine them to espouse his cause. . . . Thus in '89, '90, and '91, there were a few who were compelled to fly from actual danger; a small number were led

away by a genuine feeling of enthusiasm; many felt themselves bound to leave, owing to a point of honor which they obeyed without reasoning it out; the mass thought it was the fashion, and that it looked well; all, or almost all, were carried away by expectations encouraged by the wildest of letters, and by the plotting of a few ambitious folk, who were under the impression that they were building up their fortunes."—Chancellor Pasquier, *Memoirs*, pp. 64-66.

A. D. 1789 (August).—The Night of Sacrifices.—The sweeping out of Feudalism.—"What was the Assembly doing at this period, when Paris was waiting in expectation, and the capture of the Bastille was being imitated all over France; when châteaux were burning, and nobles flying into exile; when there was positive civil war in many a district, and anarchy in every province? Why, the Assembly was discussing whether or not the new constitution of France should be prefaced by a Declaration of the Rights of Man. In the discussion of this extremely important question were wasted the precious days which followed July 17. . . .

The complacency of these theorists was rudely shaken on August 4, when Salomon read to the Assembly the report of the Comité des Recherches, or Committee of Researches, on the state of France. A terrible report it was. Châteaux burning here and there; millers hung; tax-gatherers drowned; the warehouses and depôts of the gabelle burnt; everywhere rioting, and nowhere peace. . . . Among those who listened to the clear and forcible report of Salomon were certain of the young liberal noblesse who had just been dining with the Duc de la Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, a wise and enlightened nobleman. At their head was the Vicomte de Noailles, a young man of thirty-three, who had distinguished himself at the head of his regiment under his cousin, Lafayette, in America. . . . The Vicomte de Noailles was the first to rush to the tribune. 'What is the cause of the evil which is agitating the provinces?' he cried; and then he showed that it arose from the uncertainty under which the people dwelt, as to whether or not the old feudal bonds under which they had so long lived and laboured were to be perpetuated or abolished, and concluded an impassioned speech by proposing to abolish them at once. One after another the young liberal noblemen, and then certain deputies of the tiers état, followed him with fresh sacrifices. First the old feudal rights were abolished; then the rights of the dove-cote and the game laws; then the old copyhold services; then the tithes paid to the Church, in spite of a protest from Siéyès; then the rights of certain cities over their immediate suburbs and rural districts were sacrificed; and the contention during that feverish night was rather to remember something or other to sacrifice than to suggest the expediency of maintaining anything which was established. In its generosity the Assembly even gave away what did not belong to it. The old dues paid to the pope were abolished, and it was even declared that the territory of Avignon, which had belonged to the pope since the Middle Ages, should be united to France if it liked; and the sitting closed with a unanimous decree that a statue should be erected to Louis XVI., 'the restorer of French liberty.' Well might Mirabeau define the night of August 4 as a mere 'orgie.' . . . Noble indeed

were the intentions of the deputies. . . . Yet the results of this night of sacrifices were bad rather than good. As Mirabeau pointed out, the people of France were told that all the feudal rights, dues, and tithes had been abolished that evening, but they were not told at the same time that there must be taxes and other burdens to take their place. It was of no use to issue a provisional order that all rights, dues, and taxes remained in force for the present, because the poor peasant would refuse to pay what was illegal, and would not understand the political necessity of supporting the revenue. . . . This ill-considered mass of resolutions was what was thrown in the face of France in a state of anarchy to restore it to a state of order."—H. M. Stephens, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, v. 1, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev.* (Am. ed.), v. 1, pp. 81–84.

A. D. 1789 (August—October).—Constitution-making and the Rights of Man.—The first emigration of nobles.—Famine in Paris.—Rumors of an intended flight of the King.—"One may look upon the peculiarity of the Assembly as being a singular faith in the power of ideas. That was its greatness. It firmly believed that truth shaped into laws would be invincible. Two months—such was the calculation—would suffice to construct the constitution. That constitution by its omnipotent virtue would convince all men and bend them to its authority, and the revolution would be completed. Such was the faith of the National Assembly. The attitude of the people was so menacing that many of the courtiers fled. Thus commenced the first emigration. . . . As if the minds of men were not sufficiently agitated, there now were heard cries of a great conspiracy of the aristocrats. The papers announced that a plot had been discovered which was to have delivered Brest to the English. Brest, the naval arsenal, wherein France for whole centuries had expended her millions and her labours: this given up to England! England would once more overrun France! . . . It was amidst these cries of alarm—with on one hand the emigration of the nobility, on the other the hunger of a maddened people; with here an irresolute aristocracy, startled at the audacity of the 'canaille,' and there a resolute Assembly, prepared, at the hazard of their lives, to work out the liberty of France; amidst reports of famine, of insurrections, and wild disorders of all sorts, that we find the National Assembly debating upon the rights of man, discussing every article with metaphysical quibbling and wearisome fluency, and, having finally settled each article, making their famous Declaration. This Declaration, which was solemnly adopted by the Assembly, on the 18th of August, was the product of a whole century of philosophical speculation, fixed and reduced to formulas, and bearing unmistakable traces of Rousseau. It declared the original equality of mankind, and that the ends of social union are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression. It declared that sovereignty resides in the nation, from whence all power emanates; that freedom consists in doing everything which does not injure another; that law is the expression of the general will; that public burdens should be borne by all the members of the state in proportion to their fortunes; that the elective franchise should be extended to all; that the exercise of natural rights has no other

limit than their interference with the rights of others; that no man should be persecuted for his religious opinions, provided he conform to the laws and do not disturb the religion of the state; that all men have the right of quitting the state in which they were born, and of choosing another country, by renouncing their rights of citizenship; that the liberty of the press is the foremost support of public liberty, and the law should maintain it, at the same time punishing those who abuse it by distributing seditious discourses, or calumnies against individuals." Having adopted its Declaration of the rights of man, the Assembly proceeded to the drawing up of a constitution which should embody the principles of the Declaration, and soon found itself in passionate debate upon the relations to be established between the national legislature and the king. Should the king retain a veto upon legislation? Should he have any voice in the making of laws? "The lovers of England and the English constitution all voted in favour of the veto. Even Mirabeau was for it." Robespierre, just coming into notice, bore a prominent part in the opposition. "The majority of the Assembly shared Robespierre's views; and the King's counselors were at length forced to propose a compromise in the shape of a suspensive veto; namely, that the King should not have the absolute right of preventing any law, but only the right of suspending it for two, four, or six years. . . . It was carried by a large majority." Meantime, in Paris, "vast and incalculable was the misery: crowds of peruke-makers, tailors, and shoemakers, were wont to assemble at the Louvre and in the Champs Elysées, demanding things impossible to be granted; demanding that the old regulations should be maintained, and that new ones should be made; demanding that the rate of daily wages should be fixed; demanding . . . that all the Savoyards in the country should be sent away, and only Frenchmen employed. The bakers' shops were besieged, as early as five o'clock in the morning, by hungry crowds who had to stand 'en queue'; happy when they had money to purchase miserable bread, even in this uncomfortable manner. . . . Paris was living at the mercy of chance: its subsistence dependent on some arrival or other: dependent on a convoy from Beaune, or a boat from Corbeil. The city, at immense sacrifices, was obliged to lower the price of bread: the consequence was that the population for more than ten leagues round came to procure provisions at Paris. The uncertainty of the morrow augmented the difficulties. Everybody stored up, and concealed provisions. The administration sent in every direction, and bought up flour, by fair means, or by foul. It often happened that at midnight there was but half the flour necessary for the morning market. Provisioning Paris was a kind of war. The National Guard was sent to protect each arrival; or to secure certain purchases by force of arms. Speculators were afraid; farmers would not thrash any longer; neither would the miller grind. 'I used to see,' says Bailly, 'good tradesmen, mercers and goldsmiths, praying to be admitted among the beggars employed at Montmartre, in digging the ground.' Then came fearful whispers of the King's intention to fly to Metz. What will become of us if the King should fly? He must not fly; we will have him here; here amongst us in Paris! This produced the famous insurrection

of women . . . on the 5th October."—G. H. Lewes, *Life of Robespierre*, ch. 9.—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, bk. 1, ch. 3-4 (v. 1).

A. D. 1789 (October).—The Insurrection of Women.—Their march to Versailles.—“A thought, or dim raw-material of a thought, was fermenting all night [October 4-5], universally in the female head, and might explode. In squalid garret, on Monday morning Maternity awakes, to hear children weeping for bread. Maternity must forth to the streets, to the herb-markets and Bakers'-queues; meets there with hunger-stricken Maternity, sympathetic, exasperative. O we unhappy women! But, instead of Bakers'-queues, why not to Aristocrats' palaces, the root of the matter? Allons! Let us assemble. To the Hôtel-de-Ville; to Versailles; to the Lanterne! In one of the Guard houses of the Quartier Saint-Eustache, ‘a young woman’ seizes a drum,—for how shall National Guards give fire on women, on a young woman? The young woman seizes the drum; sets forth, beating it, ‘uttering cries relative to the dearth of grains.’ Descend, O mothers; descend, ye Judiths, to food and revenge!—All women gather and go; crowds storm all stairs, force out all women: the female Insurrectionary Force, according to Camille, resembles the English Naval one; there is a universal ‘Press of women.’ Robust Dames of the Halle, slim Mantua-makers, assiduous, risen with the dawn; ancient Virginity tripping to matins; the Housemaid, with early broom; all must go. Rouse ye, O women; the laggard men will not act; they say, we ourselves may act! And so, like snowbreak from the mountains, for every staircase is a melted brook, it storms; tumultuous, wild-shrilling, towards the Hôtel-de-Ville. Tumultuous; with or without drum-music: for the Faubourg Saint-Antoine also has tucked-up its gown; and with besom-staves, fire-irons, and even rusty pistols (void of ammunition), is flowing on. Sound of it flies, with a velocity of sound, to the utmost Barriers. By seven o’clock, on this raw October morning, fifth of the month, the Townhall will see wonders. . . . Grand it was, says Camille, to see so many Judiths, from eight to ten thousand of them in all, rushing out to search into the root of the matter! Not unfrightful it must have been; ludicro-terrible, and most unmanageable. At such hour the overwatched Three Hundred are not yet stirring: none but some Clerks, a company of National Guards; and M. de Gouvion, the Major-general. Gouvion has fought in America for the cause of civil Liberty; a man of no inconsiderable heart, but deficient in head. He is, for the moment, in his back apartment; assuaging Usher Maillard, the Bastille-sergeant, who has come, as too many do, with ‘representations.’ The assuagement is still incomplete when our Judiths arrive. The National Guards form on the outer stairs, with levelled bayonets; the ten thousand Judiths press up, resistless; with obtestations, with outspread hands,—merely to speak to the Mayor. The rear forces them; nay from male hands in the rear, stones already fly: the National Guard must do one of two things; sweep the Place de Grève with cannon, or else open to right and left. They open: the living deluge rushes in. Through all rooms and cabinets, upwards to the topmost belfry: ravenous; seeking arms, seeking Mayors, seeking justice;—while, again, the better-dressed speak kindly to

the Clerks; point out the misery of these poor women; also their ailments, some even of an interesting sort. Poor M. de Gouvion is shiftless in this extremity;—a man shiftless, perturbed: who will one day commit suicide. How happy for him that Usher Maillard the shifty was there, at the moment, though making representations! Fly back, thou shifty Maillard: seek the Bastille Company; and O return fast with it; above all, with thy own shifty head! For, behold, the Judiths can find no Mayor or Municipal; scarcely, in the topmost belfry, can they find poor Abbé Lefèvre the Powder-distributor. Him, for want of a better, they suspend there: in the pale morning light; over the top of all Paris, which swims in one’s failing eyes:—a horrible end? Nay the rope broke, as French ropes often did; or else an Amazon cut it. Abbé Lefèvre falls, some twenty feet, rattling among the leads; and lives long years after, though always with ‘a tremblement in the limbs.’ And now doors fly under hatchets; the Judiths have broken the Armory; have seized guns and cannons, three money-bags, paper-heaps; torches flare: in few minutes, our brave Hôtel-de-Ville, which dates from the Fourth Henry, will, with all that it holds, be in flames! In flames, truly,—were it not that Usher Maillard, swift of foot, shifty of head, has returned! Maillard, of his own motion,—for Gouvion or the rest would not even sanction him,—snatches a drum: descends the Porch-stairs, ran-tan, beating sharp, with loud rolls, his Rogues'-march: To Versailles! Allons; à Versailles! As men beat on kettle or warming-pan, when angry she-bees, or say, flying desperate wasps, are to be hived; and the desperate insects hear it, and cluster round it,—simply as round a guidance, where there was none: so now these Menads round shifty Maillard, Riding-Usher of the Châtelet. The axe pauses uplifted; Abbé Lefèvre is left half-hanged: from the belfry downwards all vomits itself. What rub-a-dub is that? Stanislas Maillard, Bastille hero, will lead us to Versailles? Joy to thee, Maillard; blessed art thou above Riding-Ushers! Away, then, away! The seized cannon are yoked with seized cart-horses: brown-locked Demoiselle Théroigne, with pike and helmet, sits there as gunneress. . . . Maillard (for his drum still rolls) is, by heaven-rending acclamation, admitted General. Maillard hastens the languid march. . . . And now Maillard has his Menads in the Champs Elysées (Fields Tartarean rather); and the Hôtel-de-Ville has suffered comparatively nothing. . . . Great Maillard! A small nucleus of Order is round his drum; but his outskirts fluctuate like the mad Ocean: for Rascality male and female is flowing in on him, from the four winds: guidance there is none but in his single head and two drum-sticks. . . . On the Elysian Fields there is pause and fluctuation; but, for Maillard, no return. He persuades his Menads, clamorous for arms and the Arsenal, that no arms are in the Arsenal; that an unarmed attitude, and petition to a National Assembly, will be the best: he hastily nominates or sanctions generaleesses, captains of tens and fifties;—and so, in loosest-flowing order, to the rhythm of some ‘eight drums’ (having laid aside his own), with the Bastille Volunteers bringing up his rear, once more takes the road. Chaillot, which will promptly yield baked loaves, is not plundered; nor are the Sèvres Potteries broken. . . . The press of women

still continues, for it is the cause of all Eve's Daughters, mothers that are, or that ought to be. No carriage-lady, were it with never such hysterics, but must dismount, in the mud roads, in her silk shoes, and walk. In this manner, amid wild October weather, they, a wild unwinged stork-flight, through the astonished country wend their way."—T. Carlyle, *The French Revolution*, v. 1, bk. 7, ch. 4-5.

A. D. 1789 (October).—The mob of men at Versailles, with Lafayette and the National Guard.—The king and royal family brought to Paris.—Before the memorable 5th day of October closed, the movement of the women upon Versailles was followed by an outpouring, in the same direction, of the masculine mob of Paris, headed by the National Guard. "The commander, Lafayette, opposed their departure a long time, but in vain; neither his efforts nor his popularity could overcome the obstinacy of the people. For seven hours he harangued and retained them. At length, impatient at this delay, rejecting his advice, they prepared to set forward without him; when, feeling that it was now his duty to conduct as it had previously been to restrain them, he obtained his authorisation from the corporation, and gave the word for departure about seven in the evening." Meantime the army of the amazons had arrived at Versailles, and excited the terrors of the court. "The troops of Versailles flew to arms and surrounded the château, but the intentions of the women were not hostile. Maillard, their leader, had recommended them to appear as suppliants, and in that attitude they presented their complaints successively to the assembly and to the king. Accordingly, the first hours of this turbulent evening were sufficiently calm. Yet it was impossible but that causes of hostility should arise between an excited mob and the household troops, the objects of so much irritation. The latter were stationed in the court of the château opposite the national guard and the Flanders regiment. The space between was filled by women and volunteers of the Bastille. In the midst of the confusion, necessarily arising from such a juxtaposition, a scuffle arose; this was the signal for disorder and conflict. An officer of the guards struck a Parisian soldier with his sabre, and was in turn shot in the arm. The national guards sided against the household troops; the conflict became warm, and would have been sanguinary, but for the darkness, the bad weather, and the orders given to the household troops, first to cease firing and then to retire. . . . During this tumult, the court was in consternation; the flight of the king was suggested, and carriages prepared; a piquet of the national guard saw them at the gate of the orangery, and having made them go back, closed the gate: moreover, the king, either ignorant of the designs of the court, or conceiving them impracticable, refused to escape. Fears were mingled with his pacific intentions, when he hesitated to repel the aggression or to take flight. Conquered, he apprehended the fate of Charles I. of England; absent, he feared that the duke of Orleans would obtain the lieutenantancy of the kingdom. But, in the meantime, the rain, fatigue, and the inaction of the household troops, lessened the fury of the multitude, and Lafayette arrived at the head of the Parisian army. His presence restored security to the court, and the replies of the king to the deputation from Paris satisfied

the multitude and the army. In a short time, Lafayette's activity, the good sense and discipline of the Parisian guard, restored order everywhere. Tranquillity returned. The crowd of women and volunteers, overcome by fatigue, gradually dispersed, and some of the national guard were entrusted with the defence of the château, while others were lodged with their companions in arms at Versailles. The royal family, re-assured after the anxiety and fear of this painful night, retired to rest about two o'clock in the morning. Towards five, Lafayette, having visited the outposts which had been confided to his care, and finding the watch well kept, the town calm, and the crowds dispersed or sleeping, also took a few moments repose. About six, however, some men of the lower class, more enthusiastic than the rest, and awake sooner than they, prowled round the château. Finding a gate open, they informed their companions, and entered. Unfortunately, the interior posts had been entrusted to the household guards, and refused to the Parisian army. This fatal refusal caused all the misfortunes of the night. The interior guard had not even been increased; the gates scarcely visited, and the watch kept as negligently as on ordinary occasions. These men, excited by all the passions that had brought them to Versailles, perceiving one of the household troops at a window, began to insult him. He fired, and wounded one of them. They then rushed on the household troops, who defended the château breast to breast, and sacrificed themselves heroically. One of them had time to warn the queen, whom the assailants particularly threatened; and, half dressed, she ran for refuge to the king. The tumult and danger were extreme in the château. Lafayette, apprised of the invasion of the royal residence, mounted his horse, and rode hastily to the scene of danger. On the square he met some of the household troops surrounded by an infuriated mob, who were on the point of killing them. He threw himself among them, called some French guards who were near, and, having rescued the household troops and dispersed their assailants, he hurried to the château. He found it already secured by the grenadiers of the French guard, who, at the first noise of the tumult, had hastened and protected the household troops from the fury of the Parisians. But the scene was not over; the crowd assembled again in the marble court under the king's balcony, loudly called for him, and he appeared. They required his departure for Paris; he promised to repair thither with his family, and this promise was received with general applause. The queen was resolved to accompany him; but the prejudice against her was so strong that the journey was not without danger; it was necessary to reconcile her with the multitude. Lafayette proposed to her to accompany him to the balcony; after some hesitation, she consented. They appeared on it together, and to communicate by a sign with the tumultuous crowd, to conquer its animosity, and awaken its enthusiasm, Lafayette respectfully kissed the queen's hand; the crowd responded with acclamations. It now remained to make peace between them and the household troops. Lafayette advanced with one of these, placed his own tricoloured cockade on his hat, and embraced him before the people, who shouted 'Vivent les gardes-du-corps!' Thus terminated this scene; the royal family set out for Paris, escorted by the

army and its guards mixed with it."—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, ch. 2.

Also in: B. Tuckerman, *Life of Lafayette*, v. 1, ch. 11.

A. D. 1789-1791.—The new constitution.—Appropriation and sale of Church property.—Issue of Assignats.—Abolition of titles of honor.—Civil constitution of the clergy.—The Feast of the Federation.—The Émigrés on the border and their conduct.—"The king was henceforth at the mercy of the mob. Deprived of his guards, and at a distance from his army, he was in the centre of the revolution; and surrounded by an excited and hungry populace. He was followed to Paris by the Assembly; and, for the present, was protected from further outrages by Lafayette and the national guards. Mirabeau, who was now in secret communication with the court, warned the king of his danger, in the midst of the revolutionary capital. 'The mob of Paris,' he said, 'will scourge the corpses of the king and queen.' He saw no hope of safety for them, or for the State, but in their withdrawal from this pressing danger, to Fontainebleau or Rouen, and in a strong government, supported by the Assembly, pursuing liberal measures, and quelling anarchy. His counsels were frustrated by events; and the revolution had advanced too far to be controlled by this secret and suspected adviser of the king. Meanwhile, the Assembly was busy with further schemes of revolution and desperate finance. France was divided into departments: the property of the Church was appropriated to meet the urgent necessities of the State: the disastrous assignats were issued: the subjection of the clergy to the civil power was decreed: the Parliaments were superseded, and the judicature of the country was reconstituted, upon a popular basis: titles of honour, orders of knighthood, armorial bearings—even liveries—were abolished: the army was reorganised, and the privileges of birth were made to yield to service and seniority. All Frenchmen were henceforth equal, as 'citoyens': and their new privileges were wildly celebrated by the planting of trees of liberty. The monarchy was still recognised, but it stood alone, in the midst of revolution."—Sir T. E. May, *Democracy in Europe*, ch. 13 (v. 2).—"The monarchy was continued and liberally endowed; but it was shorn of most of its ancient prerogatives, and reduced to a very feeble Executive; and while it obtained a perilous veto on the resolutions and acts of the Legislature, it was separated from that power, and placed in opposition to it, by the exclusion of the Ministers of the Crown from seats and votes in the National Assembly. The Legislature was composed of a Legislative Assembly, formed of a single Chamber alone, in theory supreme, and almost absolute; but, as we have seen, it was liable to come in conflict with the Crown, and it had less authority than might be supposed, for it was elected by a vote not truly popular, and subordinate powers were allowed to possess a very large part of the rights of Sovereignty which it ought to have divided with the King. This last portion of the scheme was very striking, and was the one, too, that most caused alarm among distant political observers. Too great centralization having been one of the chief complaints against the ancient Monarchy, this evil was met with a radical reform. . . . The towns received

extraordinary powers; their municipalities had complete control over the National Guards to be elected in them, and possessed many other functions of Government; and Paris, by these means, became almost a separate Commonwealth, independent of the State, and directing a vast military force. The same system was applied to the country; every Department was formed into petty divisions, each with its National Guards, and a considerable share of what is usually the power of the government. . . . Burke's saying was strictly correct, 'that France was split into thousands of Republics, with Paris predominating and queen of all.' With respect to other institutions of the State, the appointment of nearly all civil functionaries, judicial and otherwise, was taken from the Crown, and abandoned to a like popular election; and the same principle was also applied to the great and venerable institution of the Church, already deprived of its vast estates, though the election of bishops and priests by their flocks interfered directly with Roman Catholic discipline, and probably, too, with religious dogma. . . . Notwithstanding the opposition of Necker, who, though hardly a statesman, understood finance, it was resolved to sell the lands of the Church to procure funds for the necessities of the State; and the deficit, which was increasing rapidly, was met by an inconvertible currency of paper, secured on the lands to be sold. This expedient . . . was carried out with injudicious recklessness. The Assignats, as the new notes were called, seemed a mine of inexhaustible wealth, and they were issued in quantities which, from the first moment, disturbed the relations of life and commerce, though they created a show of brisk trade for a time. In matters of taxation the Assembly, too, exceeded the bounds of reason and justice; exemptions previously enjoyed by the rich were now indirectly extended to the poor; wealthy owners of land were too heavily burdened, while the populace of the towns went scot free. . . . Very large sums, also, belonging to the State, were advanced to the Commune of Paris, now rising into formidable power. . . . The funds so obtained were lavishly squandered in giving relief to the poor of the capital in the most improvident ways—in buying bread dear and reselling it cheap, and in finding fanciful employment for artisans out of work. The result, of course, was to attract to Paris many thousands of the lowest class of rabble, and to add them to the scum of the city. . . . On the first anniversary [July 14, 1790] of the fall of the Bastille, and before the Constitution had been finished . . . a great national holiday [called the Feast of the Federation] was kept; and, amidst multitudes of applauding spectators, deputations from every Department in France, headed by the authorities of the thronging capital, defiled in procession to the broad space known as the Field of Mars, along the banks of the Seine. An immense amphitheatre had been constructed [converting the plain into a valley, by the labor of many thousands, in a single week], and decorated with extraordinary pomp; and here, in the presence of a splendid Court, of the National Assembly, and of the municipalities of the realm, and in the sight of a great assemblage surging to and fro with throbbing excitement, the King took an oath that he would faithfully respect the order of things that was being established, while incense

streamed from high-raised altars, and the ranks of 70,000 National Guards burst into loud cheers and triumphant music; and even the Queen, sharing in the passion of the hour, and radiant with beauty, lifted up in her arms the young child who was to be the future chief of a disenthralled and regenerate people. . . . The following week was gay with those brilliant displays which Paris knows how to arrange so well. . . . The work, however, of the National Assembly developed some of its effects ere long. . . . The emigration of the Nobles, which had become very general from the 5th and 6th of October, went on in daily augmenting numbers; and, in a short time, the frontiers were edged with bands of exiles breathing vengeance and hatred." To all the many destructive and revolutionary influences at work was now added "the pitiful conduct of those best known by the still dishonorable name of 'Émigrés.' In a few months the great majority of the aristocracy of France had fled the kingdom, abandoned the throne around which they had stood, breathing maledictions against a contemptuous Nation, as arrogant as ever in the impotence of want, and thinking only of a counter-revolution that would cover the natal soil with blood. . . . Their utter want of patriotism and of sound feeling made thousands believe that the state of society which had bred such creatures ought to be swept away." —W. O'C. Morris, *The French Rev. and First Empire*, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: H. Von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, bk. 1, ch. 5, and bk. 2, ch. 3-5.—M'me de Staël, *Considerations on the Fr. Rev.*, pt. 2, ch. 12-19 (v. 1).—E. Burke, *Reflections on the Rev. in France*.—A. F. Bertrand de Moleville, *Annals of the Fr. Rev.*, pt. 1, ch. 22-25 (v. 2-3).—Duchess de Tourzell, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 3-11.—W. H. Jarvis, *The Gallican Church and the Rev.*, ch. 1-4.

A. D. 1789-1794.—Myths of the Revolution.—"The rapid growth and the considerable number of these myths are one of the most curious features of the Revolution, while their persistent vitality is a standing warning for historical students. I claim to show that Cazotte's vision was invented by Laharpe, that Sombreuil's daughter did not purchase his liberty by quaffing blood, that the locksmith Gamain was not poisoned, that Labussière did not save hundreds of prisoners by destroying the documents incriminating them, that the Girondins had no last supper, that some famous ejaculations have been fabricated or distorted, that no attempt was made to save the last batch of victims, that the boys Barra and Viala were not heroes, that no leather was made of human skins, that no Englishmen plied the September assassins with drink, that the 'Vengeur' crew did not perish rather than surrender, that the ice-bound Dutch fleet was not captured, that Robespierre's wound was not the work of Merda, but was self-inflicted, and that Thomas Paine had no miraculous escape."—J. G. Alger, *Glimpses of the French Rev.*

A. D. 1790.—The Rise of the Clubs.—Jacobins, Cordeliers, Feuillants, Club Monarchique, and Club of '89.—"Every party sought to gain the people; it was courted as sovereign. After attempting to influence it by religion, another means was employed, that of the clubs. At that period, clubs were private assemblies, in which the measures of government, the business of the state, and the decrees of the assembly, were dis-

cussed; their deliberations had no authority, but they exercised a certain influence. The first club owed its origin to the Breton deputies, who already met together at Versailles to consider the course of proceeding they should take. When the national representatives were transferred from Versailles to Paris, the Breton deputies and those of the assembly who were of their views held their sittings in the old convent of the Jacobins, which subsequently gave its name to their meetings. It did not at first cease to be a preparatory assembly, but as all things increase in time, the Jacobin Club did not confine itself to influencing the assembly; it sought also to influence the municipality and the people, and received as associates members of the municipality and common citizens. Its organization became more regular, its action more powerful; its sittings were regularly reported in the papers; it created branch clubs in the provinces, and raised by the side of legal power another power which first counselled and then conducted it. The Jacobin Club, as it lost its primitive character and became a popular assembly, had been forsaken by part of its founders. The latter established another society on the plan of the old one, under the name of the Club of '89. Siéyès, Chapelier, Lafayette, La Rochefoucauld, directed it, as Lameth and Barnave directed that of the Jacobins. Mirabeau belonged to both, and by both was equally courted. These clubs, of which the one prevailed in the assembly, and the other amongst the people, were attached to the new order of things, though in different degrees. The aristocracy sought to attack the revolution with its own arms; it opened royalist clubs to oppose the popular clubs. That first established, under the name of the Club des Impartiaux, could not last because it addressed itself to no class opinion. Reappearing under the name of the Club Monarchique, it included among its members all those whose views it represented. It sought to render itself popular with the lower classes, and distributed bread; but, far from accepting its overtures, the people considered such establishments as a counter-revolutionary movement. It disturbed their sittings, and obliged them several times to change their place of meeting. At length, the municipal authority found itself obliged, in January, 1791, to close this club, which had been the cause of several riots."—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, ch. 3.—"At the end of 1790 the number of Jacobin Clubs was 200, many of which—like the one in Marseilles—contained more than a thousand members. Their organization extended through the whole kingdom, and every impulse given at the centre in Paris was felt at the extremities. . . . It was far indeed from embracing the majority of adult Frenchmen, but even at that time it had undoubtedly become—by means of its strict unity—the greatest power in the kingdom."—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, bk. 1, ch. 5 (v. 1).—"This Jacobin Club soon divided itself into three other clubs: first, that party which looked upon the Jacobins as lukewarm patriots left it, and constituted themselves into the Club of the Cordeliers, where Danton's voice of thunder made the halls ring; and Camille Desmoulins' light, glancing wit played with momentous subjects. The other party, which looked upon the Jacobins as too fierce, constituted itself into the 'Club of 1789: friends of the monarchic constitution;' and after-

wards named Feuillant's Club, because it met in the Feuillant Convent. Lafayette was their chief; supported by the 'respectable' patriots. These clubs generated many others, and the provinces imitated them."—G. H. Lewes, *Life of Robespierre*, ch. 10.—"The Cordeliers were a Parisian club; the Jacobins an immense association extending throughout France. But Paris would stir and rise at the fury of the Cordeliers; and Paris being once in motion, the political revolutionists were absolutely obliged to follow. Individuality was very powerful among the Cordeliers. Their journalists, Marat, Desmoulins, Fréron, Robert, Hébert and Fabre d'Églantine, wrote each for himself. Danton, the omnipotent orator, would never write; but, by way of compensation, Marat and Desmoulins, who stammered or lisped, used principally to write, and seldom spoke. . . . The Cordeliers formed a sort of tribe, all living in the neighbourhood of the club."—J. Michelet, *Hist. View of the Fr. Rev.*, bk. 4, ch. 7 and 5.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *The Fr. Rev.*, v. 2, bk. 1, ch. 5.—H. A. Taine, *The Fr. Rev.*, bk. 4 (v. 2).

A. D. 1790-1791.—Revolution at Avignon.—Reunion of the old Papal province with France decreed.—"The old residence of the Popes [Avignon] remained until the year 1789 under the papal government, which, from its distance, exercised its authority with great mildness, and left the towns and villages of the country in the enjoyment of a great degree of independence. The general condition of the population was, however, much the same as in the neighbouring districts of France—agitation in the towns and misery in the country. It is not surprising, therefore, that the commotion of August 4th should extend itself among the subjects of the Holy see. Here, too, castles were burned, black mail levied on the monasteries, tithes and feudal rights abolished. The city of Avignon soon became the centre of a political agitation, whose first object was to throw off the papal yoke, and then to unite the country with France. . . . In June, 1790, the people of Avignon tore down the papal arms, and the Town Council sent a message to Paris that Avignon wished to be united to France." Some French regiments were sent to the city to maintain order; but "the greater part of them deserted, and marched out with the Democrats of the town to take and sack the little town of Cavaillon, which remained faithful to the Pope. From this time forward civil war raged without intermission. . . . The Constituent Assembly, on the 14th of September, 1791, decreed the reunion of the country with France. Before the new government could assert its authority, fresh and more dreadful atrocities had taken place," ending with the fiendish massacre of 110 prisoners, held by a band of ruffians who had taken possession of the papal castle.—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, bk. 3, ch. 2 (v. 1).

A. D. 1790-1791.—The oath of the clergy.—First movements toward the European coalition against French democracy.—Death of Mirabeau.—The King's flight and arrest at Varennes.—Rise of a Republican Party.—"By a decree of November 27th, 1790, the Assembly required the clergy to take an oath of fidelity to the nation, the law and the king, and to maintain the constitution. This oath they were to take within a week, on pain of deprivation. The

King, before assenting to this measure, wished to procure the consent of the Pope, but was persuaded not to wait for it, and gave his sanction, December 3rd. . . . Of 300 prelates and priests, who had seats in the Assembly, those who sat on the right unanimously refused to take the oath, while those who sat on the left anticipated the day appointed for that purpose. Out of 138 archbishops and bishops, only four consented to swear, Talleyrand, Loménie de Brienne (now Archbishop of Sens), the Bishop of Orléans, and the Bishop of Viviers. The oath was also refused by the great majority of the curés and vicars, amounting, it is said, to 50,000. Hence arose the distinction of 'prêtres sermentés' and 'insermentés,' or sworn and non-juring priests. The brief of Pius VI., forbidding the oath, was burnt at the Palais Royal, as well as a mannikin representing the Pope himself in his pontificals. Many of the deprived ecclesiastics refused to vacate their functions, declared their successors intruders and the sacraments they administered null, and excommunicated all who recognised and obeyed them. Louis XVI., whose religious feelings were very strong, was perhaps more hurt by these attacks upon the Church than even by those directed against his own prerogative. The death of Mirabeau, April 2nd 1791, was a great loss to the King, though it may well be doubted whether his exertions could have saved the monarchy. He fell a victim to his profligate habits, assisted probably by the violent exertions he had recently made in the Assembly. . . . He was honoured with a sumptuous funeral at the public expense, to which, says a contemporary historian, nothing but grief was wanting. In fact, to most of the members of the Assembly, eclipsed by his splendid talents and overawed by his reckless audacity, his death was a relief. . . . After Mirabeau's death, Duport, Barnave, and Lameth reigned supreme in the Assembly, and Robespierre became more prominent. The King had now begun to fix his hopes on foreign intervention. The injuries inflicted by the decrees of the Assembly on August 4th 1789, on several princes of the Empire, through their possessions in Alsace, Franche Comté, and Lorraine, might afford a pretext for a rupture between the German Confederation and France. . . . The German prelates, injured by the Civil Constitution of the clergy, were among the first to complain. By this act the Elector of Mentz was deprived of his metropolitan rights over the bishoprics of Strasburg and Spire; the Elector of Trèves of those over Metz, Toul, Verdun, Nancy and St. Diez. The Bishops of Strasburg and Bâle lost their diocesan rights in Alsace. Some of these princes and nobles had called upon the Emperor and the German body in January 1790, for protection against the arbitrary acts of the National Assembly. This appeal had been favourably entertained, both by the Emperor Joseph II. and by the King of Prussia; and though the Assembly offered suitable indemnities, they were haughtily refused. . . . The Spanish and Italian Bourbons were naturally inclined to support their relative, Louis XVI. . . . The King of Sardinia, connected by intermarriages with the French Bourbons, had also family interests to maintain. Catherine II. of Russia had witnessed, with humiliation and alarm, the fruits of the philosophy which she had patronised, and was opposed to the new order of things in France. . . . All the

materials existed for an extensive coalition against French democracy. In this posture of affairs the Count d'Artois, accompanied by Calonne, who served him as a sort of minister, and by the Count de Durfort, who had been despatched from the French Court, had a conference with the Emperor, now Leopold II., at Mantua, in May 1791, in which it was agreed that, towards the following July, Austria should march 35,000 men towards the frontiers of Flanders; the German Circles 15,000 towards Alsace; the Swiss 15,000 towards the Lyonnais; the King of Sardinia 15,000 towards Dauphiné; while Spain was to hold 20,000 in readiness in Catalonia. This agreement, for there was not, as some writers have supposed, any formal treaty, was drawn up by Calonne, and amended with the Emperor's own hand. But the large force to be thus assembled was intended only as a threatening demonstration, and hostilities were not to be actually commenced without the sanction of a congress. . . . The King's situation had now become intolerably irksome. He was, to all intents and purposes, a prisoner at Paris. A trip, which he wished to make to St. Cloud during the Easter of 1791, was denounced at the Jacobin Club as a pretext for flight; and when he attempted to leave the Tuileries, April 18th, the tocsin was rung, his carriage was surrounded by the mob, and he was compelled to return to the palace. . . . A few days after . . . the leaders of the Revolution, who appear to have suspected his negotiations abroad, exacted that he should address a circular to his ambassadors at foreign courts, in which he entirely approved the Revolution, assumed the title of 'Restorer of French liberty,' and utterly repudiated the notion that he was not free and master of his actions." But the King immediately nullified the circular by despatching secret agents with letters "in which he notified that any sanction he might give to the decrees of the Assembly was to be reputed null; that his pretended approval of the constitution was to be interpreted in an opposite sense, and that the more strongly he should seem to adhere to it, the more he should desire to be liberated from the captivity in which he was held. Louis soon after resolved on his unfortunate flight to the army of the Marquis de Bouillé at Montmédy. . . . Having, after some hair-breadth escapes, succeeded in quitting Paris in a travelling berlin, June 20th, they [the King, Queen, and family] reached St. Menesbould in safety. But here the King was recognised by Drouet, the son of the postmaster, who, mounting his horse, pursued the royal fugitives to Varennes, raised an alarm, and caused them to be captured when they already thought themselves out of danger. In consequence of their being rather later than was expected, the military preparations that had been made for their protection entirely failed. The news of the King's flight filled Paris with consternation. The Assembly assumed all the executive power of the Government, and when the news of the King's arrest arrived, they despatched Barnave, Latour, Maubourg and Pétion to conduct him and his family back to Paris. . . . Notices had been posted up in Paris, that those who applauded the King should be horsewhipped, and that those who insulted him should be hanged; hence he was received on entering the capital with a dead silence. The streets, however, were traversed without accident to the Tuileries, but as the

royal party were alighting, a rush was made upon them by some ruffians, and they were with difficulty saved from injury. The King's brother, the Count of Provence, who had fled at the same time by a different route, escaped safely to Brussels. This time the King's intention to fly could not be denied; he had, indeed, himself proclaimed it, by sending to the Assembly a manifest, in which he explained his reasons for it, declared that he did not intend to quit the kingdom, expressed his desire to restore liberty and establish a constitution, but annulled all that he had done during the last two years. . . . The King, after his return, was provisionally suspended from his functions by a decree of the Assembly, June 25th. Guards were placed over him and the Queen; the gardens of the Tuileries assumed the appearance of a camp; sentinels were stationed on the roof of the Palace, and even in the Queen's bedchamber. . . . From the period of the King's flight to Varennes must be dated the first decided appearance of a republican party in France. During his absence the Assembly had been virtually sovereign, and hence men took occasion to say, 'You see the public peace has been maintained, affairs have gone on in the usual way in the King's absence.' The chief advocates of a republic were Brissot, Condorcet, and the recently-established club of the Cordeliers. . . . The arch-democrat, Thomas Payne, who was now at Paris, also endeavoured to excite the populace against the King. The Jacobin Club had not yet gone this length; they were for bringing Louis XVI. to trial and deposing him, but for maintaining the monarchy."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 2-3 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: J. Michelet, *Hist. View of the French Rev.*, bk. 4, ch. 8-14.—M^{me} Campan, *Memoirs of Marie Antoinette*, v. 2, ch. 5-7.—Marquis de Bouillé, *Memoirs*, ch. 8-11.—Duchess de Tourzel, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 12.—A. B. Cochran, *Francis I., and other Historical Studies*, v. 2 (*The Flight of Varennes*).

A. D. 1791 (July—September).—Attitude of Foreign Powers.—Coolness of Austria towards the Émigrés.—The Declaration of Pillnitz.—Completion of the Constitution.—Restoration of the King.—Tumult in the Champs de Mars.—Dissolution of the Constituent National Assembly.—"On the 27th of July, Prince Reuss presented a memorial [from the Court of Austria] to the Court of Berlin, in which the Emperor explained at length his views of a European Concert. It was drawn up, throughout, in Leopold's usual cautious and circumspect manner. . . . In case an armed intervention should appear necessary—they would take into consideration the future constitution of France; but in doing so they were to renounce, in honour of the great cause in which they were engaged, all views of selfish aggrandizement. We see what a small part the desire for war played in the drawing up of this far-seeing plan. The document repeatedly urged that no step ought to be taken without the concurrence of all the Powers, and especially of England; and as England's decided aversion to every kind of interference was well known, this stipulation alone was sufficient to stamp upon the whole scheme, the character of a harmless demonstration." At the same time Catharine II. of Russia, released from war with the Turks, and bent upon the destruction of Poland, desired "to implicate the

Emperor as inextricably as possible in the French quarrel, in order to deprive Poland of its most powerful protector; she therefore entered with the greatest zeal into the negotiations for the support of Louis XVI. Her old opponent, the brilliant King Gustavus of Sweden, declared his readiness—on receipt of a large subsidy from Russia—to conduct a Swedish army by sea to the coast of Flanders, and thence, under the guidance of Bouillé, against Paris. . . . But, of course, every word he uttered was only an additional warning to Leopold to keep the peace. . . . Under these circumstances he [the Emperor] was most disagreeably surprised on the 20th of August, a few days before his departure for Pillnitz, by the sudden and entirely unannounced and unexpected arrival in Vienna of the Count d'Artois. It was not possible to refuse to see him, but Leopold made no secret to him of the real position of affairs. . . . He asked permission to accompany the Emperor to Pillnitz, which the latter, with cool politeness, said that he had no scruple in granting, but that even there no change of policy would take place. . . . Filled with such sentiments, the Emperor Leopold set out for the conference with his new ally; and the King of Prussia came to meet him with entirely accordant views. . . . The representations of d'Artois, therefore, made just as little impression at Pillnitz, as they had done, a week before, at Vienna. . . . On the 27th, d'Artois received the joint answer of the two Sovereigns, the tone and purport of which clearly testified to the sentiments of its authors. . . . The Emperor and King gave their sanction to the peaceable residence of individual Emigrés in their States, but declared that no armed preparations would be allowed before the conclusion of an agreement between the European Powers. To this rejection the two Monarchs added a proposal of their own—contained in a joint declaration—in which they spoke of the restoration of order and monarchy in France as a question of the greatest importance to the whole of Europe. They signified their intention of inviting the coöperation of all the European Powers. . . . But as it was well ascertained that England would take no part, the expressions they chose were really equivalent to a declaration of non-intervention, and were evidently made use of by Leopold solely to intimidate the Parisian democrats. . . . Thus ended the conference of Pillnitz, after the two Monarchs had agreed to protect the constitution of the Empire, to encourage the Elector of Saxony to accept the crown of Poland, and to afford each other friendly aid in every quarter. The statement, therefore, which has been a thousand times repeated, that the first coalition for an attack on the French Revolution was formed on this occasion, has been shown to be utterly without foundation. As soon as the faintest gleam of a reconciliation between Louis and the National Assembly appeared, the cause of the Emigrés was abandoned by the German Courts.”—H. Von Sybel, *History of the French Revolution*, bk. 2, ch. 6 (v. 1).—At Paris, meantime, “the commissioners charged to make their report on the affair of Varennes presented it on the 16th of July. In the journey, they said, there was nothing culpable; and even if there were, the King was inviolable. Dethronement could not result from it, since the King had not staid away long enough, and had not resisted the summons of the legislative body.

Robespierre, Buzot, and Pétion repeated all the well known arguments against the inviolability. Duport, Barnave, and Salles answered them, and it was at length resolved that the King could not be brought to trial on account of his flight. . . . No sooner was this resolution passed than Robespierre rose, and protested strongly against it, in the name of humanity. On the evening preceding this decision, a great tumult had taken place at the Jacobins. A petition to the Assembly was there drawn up, praying it to declare that the King was deposed as a perfidious traitor to his oaths, and that it would seek to supply his place by all the constitutional means. It was resolved that this petition should be carried on the following day to the Champ de Mars, where every one might sign it on the altar of the country. Next day, it was accordingly carried to the place agreed upon, and the crowd of the seditious was reinforced by that of the curious, who wished to be spectators of the event. At this moment the decree was passed, so that it was now too late to petition. Lafayette arrived, broke down the barricades already erected, was threatened and even fired at, but . . . at length prevailed on the populace to retire. . . . But the tumult was soon renewed. Two invalids, who happened to be, nobody knows for what purpose, under the altar of the country, were murdered, and then the uproar became unbounded. The Assembly sent for the municipality, and charged it to preserve public order. Bailly repaired to the Champ de Mars, ordered the red flag to be unfurled, and, by virtue of martial law, summoned the seditious to retire. . . . Lafayette at first ordered a few shots to be fired in the air: the crowd quitted the altar of the country, but soon rallied. Thus driven to extremity, he gave the word, ‘Fire!’ The first discharge killed some of the rioters. Their number has been exaggerated. Some have reduced it to 30, others have raised it to 400, and others to several thousand. The last statement was believed at the moment, and the consternation became general. . . . Lafayette and Bailly were vehemently reproached for the proceedings in the Champ de Mars; but both of them, considering it their duty to observe the law, and to risk popularity and life in its execution, felt neither regret nor fear for what they had done. The factions were overawed by the energy which they displayed. . . . About this time the Assembly came to a determination which has since been censured, but the result of which did not prove so mischievous as it has been supposed. It decreed that none of its members should be re-elected. Robespierre was the proposer of this resolution, and it was attributed to the envy which he felt against his colleagues, among whom he had not shone. . . . The new Assembly was thus deprived of men whose enthusiasm was somewhat abated, and whose legislative science was matured by an experience of three years. . . . The constitution was . . . completed with some haste, and submitted to the King for his acceptance. From that moment his freedom was restored to him; or, if that expression be objected to, the strict watch kept over the palace ceased. . . . After a certain number of days he declared that he accepted the constitution. . . . He repaired to the Assembly, where he was received as in the most brilliant times. Lafayette, who never forgot to repair the inevitable evils of

political troubles, proposed a general amnesty for all acts connected with the Revolution, which was proclaimed amidst shouts of joy, and the prisons were instantly thrown open. At length, on the 30th of September [1791], Thouret, the last president, declared that the Constituent Assembly had terminated its sittings."—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev. (Am. ed.)*, v. 1, pp. 186–193.

Also in: M^{me} de Stael, *Considerations on the French Rev.*, pt. 2, ch. 22–23, and pt. 3, ch. 1–2.—H. C. Lockwood, *Constitutional Hist. of France*, ch. 1., and app. 1.

A. D. 1791 (August).—Insurrection of slaves in San Domingo. See HAYTI: A. D. 1632–1803.

A. D. 1791 (September).—Removal of all disabilities from the Jews. See JEWS: A. D. 1791.

A. D. 1791 (October).—The meeting of the Legislative Assembly.—Its party divisions.—The Girondists and their leaders.—The Mountain.—“The most glorious destiny was predicted for the Constitution, yet it did not live a twelve month; the Assembly that was to apply it was but a transition between the Constitutional Monarchy and the Republic. It was because the Revolution partook much more of a social than of a political overthrow. The Constitution had done all it could for the political part, but the social fabric remained to be reformed; the ancient privileged classes had been scotched, but not killed. . . . The new Legislative Assembly [which met October 1, its members having been elected before the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly] was composed of 745 deputies, mostly chosen from the middle classes and devoted to the Revolution; those of the Right and Extreme Right going by the name of Feuillants, those of the Left and Extreme Left by the name of Jacobins. The Right was composed of Constitutionals, who counted on the support of the National Guard and departmental authorities. Their ideas of the Revolution were embodied in the Constitution. . . . They kept up some relations with the Court by means of Barnave and the Lameths, but their pillar outside the Assembly, their trusty counsellor, seems to have been Lafayette. . . . The Left was composed of men resolved at all risks to further the Revolution, even at the expense of the Constitution. They intended to go as far as a Republic, only they lacked common unity of views, and did not form a compact body. . . . They reckoned among their numbers Vergniaud, Guadet, and Gensonné, deputies of the Gironde [the Bordeaux region, on the Garonne], powerful and vehement orators, and from whom their party afterwards took the name of ‘Girondins’; also Brissot [de Warville] (born 1754), a talented journalist, who had drawn up the petition for the King’s deposition; and Condorcet (born 1743), an ultra-liberal, but a brilliant philosopher. Their leader outside the Assembly was Pétion (born 1753), a cold, calculating, and dissembling Republican, enjoying great popularity with the masses. The Extreme Left, occupying in small numbers the raised seats in the Assembly, from which circumstance they afterwards took the name of ‘the Mountain,’ were auxiliaries of the ‘Girondins’ in their attempts to further a Revolution which should be entirely in the interest of the people. Their inspirers outside the Assembly were Robespierre (born 1759), who controlled the club of the Jacobins by

his dogmatic rigorism and fame for integrity; and Danton (born 1759), surnamed the Mirabeau of the ‘Breechless’ (Sansculottes), a bold and daring spirit, who swayed the new club of the Cordeliers. The Centre was composed of nonentities, their moderation was inspired by fear, hence they nearly always voted with the Left.”—H. Van Laun, *The French Revolutionary Epoch*, bk. 1, ch. 2, sect. 3 (v. 1).—“The department of the Gironde had given birth to a new political party in the twelve citizens who formed its deputies. . . . The names (obscure and unknown up to this period), of Ducos, Guadet, Lafond-Ladebat, Grangeneuve, Gensonné, Vergniaud, were about to rise into notice and renown with the storms and disasters of their country; they were the men who were destined to give that impulse to the Revolution that had hitherto remained in doubt and indecision, before which it still trembled with apprehension, and which was to precipitate it into a republic. Why was this impulse fated to have birth in the department of the Gironde and not in Paris? Nought but conjectures can be offered on this subject. . . . Bordeaux was a commercial city, and commerce, which requires liberty through interest, at last desires it through a love of freedom. Bordeaux was the great commercial link between America and France, and their constant intercourse with America had communicated to the Gironde their love for free institutions. Moreover Bordeaux . . . was the birthplace of Montaigne and Montesquieu, those two great republicans of the French school.”—A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Girondists*, bk. 4, sect. 1 (v. 1).—“In the new National Assembly there was only one powerful and active party—that of the Gironde. . . . When we use the term ‘parties’ in reference to this Assembly, nothing more is meant by it than small groups of from 12 to 20 persons, who bore the sway in the rostra and in the Committees, and who alternately carried with them the aimless crowd of Deputies. It is true, indeed, that at the commencement of their session, 130 Deputies entered their names among the Jacobins, and about 200 among the Feuillants, but this had no lasting influence on the divisions, and the majority wavered under the influence of temporary motives. The party which was regarded as the ‘Right’ had no opportunity for action, but saw themselves, from the very first, obliged to assume an attitude of defence. . . . Outside the Chamber the beau ideal of this party,—General Lafayette,—declared himself in favour of an American Senate, but without any of the energy of real conviction. As he had defended the Monarchy solely from a sense of duty, while all the feelings of his heart were inclined towards a Republic, so now, though he acknowledged the necessity of an upper Chamber, the existing Constitution appeared to him to possess a more ideal beauty. He never attained, on this point, either to clear ideas or decided actions; and it was at this period that he resigned his command of the National guard in Paris, and retired for a while to his estate in Auvergne. . . . The Girondist Deputies . . . were distinguished among the new members of the Assembly by personal dignity, regular education, and natural ability; and were, moreover, as ardent in their radicalism as any Parisian demagogue. They consequently soon became the darlings of all those zealous patriots for whom the Cordeliers were too dirty

and the Feuillants too luke warm. External advantages are not without their weight, even in the most terrible political crises, and the Girondists owe to the magic of their eloquence, and especially to that of Vergniaud, an enduring fame, which neither their principles nor their deeds would have earned for them. . . . The representatives of Bordeaux had never occupied a leading position in the Girondist party, to which they had given its name. The real leadership of the Gironde fell singularly enough into the hands of an obscure writer, a political lady, and a priest who carried on his operations behind the scenes. It was their hands that overthrew the throne of the Capets, and spread revolution over Europe. . . . The writer in this trio was Brissot, who on the 16th of July had wished to proclaim the Republic, and who now represented the capital in the National Assembly, as a constitutional member. . . . While Brissot shaped the foreign policy of the Girondist party, its home affairs were directed by Marie Jeanne Roland, wife of the quondam Inspector of Factories at Lyons, with whom she had come the year before to Paris, and immediately thrown herself into the whirlpool of political life. As early as the year 1789, she had written to a friend, that the National Assembly must demand two illustrious heads, or all would be lost. . . . She was . . . 36 years old, not beautiful, but interesting, enthusiastic and indefatigable; with noble aims, but incapable of discerning the narrow line which separates right from wrong. . . . When warned by a friend of the unruly nature of the Parisian mob, she replied, that bloodhounds were after all indispensable for starting the game. . . . A less conspicuous, but not less important, part in this association, was played by the Abbé Sieyès. He did what neither Brissot nor Mad. Roland could have done by furnishing his party with a comprehensive and prospective plan of operations. . . . Their only clearly defined objects were to possess themselves of the reins of government, to carry on the Revolution, and to destroy the Monarchy by every weapon within their reach."—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, bk. 3, ch. 1 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: H. A. Taine, *The French Rev.*, bk. 4 (v. 2).—See, also, below.

A. D. 1791-1792.—Growth and spread of anarchy and civil war.—Activity of the Emigrés and the ejected priests.—Decrees against them vetoed by the King.—The Girondists in control of the government.—War with the German powers forced on by them.—"It was an ominous proof of the little confidence felt by serious men in the permanence of the new Constitution, that the funds fell when the King signed it. All the chief municipal posts in Paris were passing into the hands of Republicans, and when Bailly, in November, ceased to be Mayor of Paris, he was succeeded in that great office by Pétion, a vehement and intolerant Jacobin. Lafayette had resigned the command of the National Guard, which was then divided under six commanders, and it could no longer be counted on to support the cause of order. Over a great part of France there was a total insecurity of life and property, such as had perhaps never before existed in a civilised country, except in times of foreign invasion or successful rebellion. Almost all the towns in the south—Marseilles, Toulon, Nîmes, Arles, Avignon, Montpellier, Carpentras, Aix, Montauban—were centres of

Republicanism, brigandage, or anarchy. The massacres of Jourdain at Avignon, in October, are conspicuous even among the horrors of the Revolution. Caen in the following month was convulsed by a savage and bloody civil war. The civil constitution of the clergy having been condemned by the Pope, produced an open schism, and crowds of ejected priests were exciting the religious fanaticism of the peasantry. In some districts in the south, the war between Catholic and Protestant was raging as fiercely as in the 17th century, while in Brittany, and especially in La Vendée, there were all the signs of a great popular insurrection against the new Government. Society seemed almost in dissolution, and there was scarcely a department in which law was observed and property secure. The price of corn, at the same time, was rising fast under the influence of a bad harvest in the south, aggravated by the want of specie, the depreciation of paper money, and the enormously increased difficulties of transport. The peasantry were combining to refuse the paper money. It was falling rapidly in value. . . . In the mean time the stream of emigrants continued unabated, and it included the great body of the officers of the army who had been driven from the regiments by their own soldiers. . . . At Brussels, Worms, and Coblenz, emigrants were forming armed organisations."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th century*, ch. 21 (v. 5).—"The revolution was threatened by two dangerous enemies, the emigrants, who were urging on a foreign invasion, and the non-juring bishops and priests who were doing all in their power to excite domestic rebellion. The latter were really the more dangerous. . . . The Girondists clamoured for repressive measures. On the 30th of October it was decreed that the count of Provence, unless he returned within two months, should forfeit all rights to the regency. On the 9th of November an edict threatened the emigrants with confiscation and death unless they returned to their allegiance before the end of the year. On the 29th of November came the attack upon the non-jurors. They were called upon to take the oath within eight days, when lists were to be drawn up of those who refused; these were then to forfeit their pensions, and if any disturbance took place in their district they were to be removed from it, or if their complicity were proved they were to be imprisoned for two years. The king accepted the decree against his brother, but he opposed his veto to the other two. The Girondists and Jacobins eagerly seized the opportunity for a new attack upon the monarchy. . . . Throughout the winter attention was devoted almost exclusively to foreign affairs. It has been seen that the emperor was really eager for peace, and that as long as he remained in that mood there was little risk of any other prince taking the initiative. At the same time it must be acknowledged that Leopold's tone towards the French government was often too haughty and menacing to be conciliatory, and also that the open preparations of the emigrants in neighbouring states constituted an insult if not a danger to France. The Girondists, the most susceptible of men, only expressed the national sentiment in dwelling upon this with bitterness, and in calling for vengeance. At the same time they had conceived the definite idea that their own supremacy could best be obtained and secured by force-

ing on a foreign war. This was expressly avowed by Brissot, who took the lead of the party in this matter. Robespierre, on the other hand, partly through temperament and partly through jealousy of his brilliant rivals, was inclined to the maintenance of peace. But on this point the Feuillants were agreed with the Gironde, and so a vast majority was formed to force the unwilling king and ministers into war. The first great step was taken when Duportail, who had charge of military affairs, was replaced by Narbonne, a Feuillant. Louis XVI. was compelled to issue a note (14 December, 1791) to the emperor and to the archbishop of Trier to the effect that if the military force of the emigrants were not disbanded by the 15th of January hostilities would be commenced against the elector. The latter at once ordered the cessation of the military preparations, but the emigrants not only refused to obey but actually insulted the French envoy. Leopold expressed his desire for peace, but at the same time declared that any attack on the electorate of Trier would be regarded as an act of hostility to the empire. These answers were unsatisfactory, and Narbonne collected three armies on the frontiers, under the command of Rochambeau, Lafayette, and Luckner, and amounting together to about 150,000 men. On the 25th of January an explicit declaration was demanded from the emperor, with a threat that war would be declared unless a satisfactory answer was received by the 4th of March. Leopold II. saw all his hopes of maintaining peace in western Europe gradually disappearing, and was compelled to bestir himself. . . . On the 7th of February he finally concluded a treaty with the king of Prussia. . . . On the 1st of March, while still hoping to avoid a quarrel, Leopold II. died of a sudden illness, and with him perished the last possibility of peace. His son and successor, Francis II., who was now 24, had neither his father's ability nor his experience, and he was naturally more easily swayed by the anti-revolutionary spirit. . . . The Girondists combined all their efforts for an attack upon the minister of foreign affairs, Delessart, whom they accused of truckling to the enemies of the nation. Delessart was committed to prison, and his colleagues at once resigned. The Gironde now came into office. The ministry of home affairs was given to Roland; of war to Servan; of finance to Clavière. Dumouriez obtained the foreign department, Duranthon that of justice, and Lacoste the marine. Its enemies called it 'the ministry of the sansculottes.' . . . On the 20th of April [1792] Louis XVI. appeared in the assembly and read with trembling voice a declaration of war against the king of Hungary and Bohemia."—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, ch. 22, sect. 20-21.—The sincere desire of the Emperor Leopold II. to avoid war with France, and the restraining influence over the King of Prussia which he exercised up to the time when Catherine II. of Russia overcame it by the Polish temptation, are set forth by H. von Sybel in passages quoted elsewhere. See GERMANY: A. D. 1791-1792.

ALSO IN: A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Girondists*, bk. 6-14 (v. 1).—A. F. Bertrand de Moleville, *Annals of the French Rev.*, pt. 2, ch. 1-14 (v. 5-6).—F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the Eighteenth Century*, 5th period, 2d div., ch. 1 (v. 6).

A. D. 1792 (April).—Fête to the Soldiers of Chateaufvieux. See LIBERTY CAP.

A. D. 1792 (April—July).—Opening of the war with Austria and Prussia.—French reverses.—"Hostilities followed close upon the declaration of war. At this time the forces destined to come into collision were posted as follows: Austria had 40,000 men in Belgium, and 25,000 on the Rhine. These numbers might easily have been increased to 80,000, but the Emperor of Austria did no more than collect 7,000 or 8,000 around Brisgau, and some 20,000 more around Rastadt. The Prussians, now bound into a close alliance with Austria, had still a great distance to traverse from their base to the theatre of war, and could not hope to undertake active operations for a long time to come. France, on the other hand, had already three strong armies in the field. The Army of the North, under General Rochambeau, nearly 50,000 strong, held the frontier from Philippeville to Dunkirk; General Lafayette commanded a second army of about the same strength in observation from Philippeville to the Lauter; and a third army of 40,000 men, under Marshal Luckner, watched the course of the Rhine from Lauterbourg to the confines of Switzerland. The French forces were strong, however, on paper only. The French army had been mined, as it seemed, by the Revolution, and had fallen almost to pieces. The wholesale emigration of the aristocrats had robbed it of its commissioned officers, the old experienced leaders whom the men were accustomed to follow and obey. Again, the passion for political discussion, and the new notions of universal equality had fostered a dangerous spirit of license in the ranks. . . . While the regular regiments of the old establishment were thus demoralised, the new levies were still but imperfectly organised, and the whole army was unfit to take the field. It was badly equipped, without transport, and without those useful administrative services which are indispensable for mobility and efficiency. Moreover, the prestige of the French arms was at its lowest ebb. A long and enervating peace had followed since the last great war, in which the French armies had endured only failure and ignominious defeat. It is not strange, then, that the foes whom France had so confidently challenged, counted upon an easy triumph over the revolutionary troops. The earliest operations fully confirmed these anticipations. . . . France after the declaration of war had at once assumed the initiative, and proceeded to invade Belgium. Here the Duke Albert of Saxe-Teschen, who commanded the Imperialist forces, held his forces concentrated in three principal corps: one covered the line from the sea to Tournay; the second was at Leuze; the third and weakest at Mons. The total of these troops rose to barely 40,000, and Mons, the most important point in the general line of defence, was the least strongly held. An able strategist gathering together 30,000 men from each of the French armies of the Centre and North, would have struck at Mons with all his strength, cut Duke Albert's communications with the Rhine, turned his inner flank, and rolled him up into the sea. But no great genius as yet directed the military energies of France. . . . By Dumouriez's advice, the French armies were ordered to advance against the Austrians by several lines. Four columns of invasion were to enter Belgium; one was to follow the sea coast, the second to march on Tournay, the third to move from Valenciennes on Mons, and the fourth,

under Lafayette, on Givet or Namur. Each, according to the success it might achieve, was to reinforce the next nearest to it, and all, finally, were to converge on Brussels. At the very outset, however, the French encountered the most ludicrous reverses. Their columns fled in disorder directly they came within sight of the enemy. Lafayette alone continued his march boldly towards Namur; but he was soon compelled to retire by the news of the hasty flight of the columns north of him. The French troops had proved as worthless as their leaders were incapable; whole brigades turned tail, crying that they were betrayed, casting away their weapons as they ran, and displaying the most abject cowardice and terror. Not strangely, after this pitiful exhibition, the Austrians—all Europe, indeed—held the military power of France in the utmost contempt. . . . But now the national danger stirred France to its inmost depths. French spirit was thoroughly roused. The country rose as one man, determined to offer a steadfast, stubborn front to its foes. Stout-hearted leaders, full of boundless energy and enthusiasm, summoned all the resources of the nation to stem and roll back the tide of invasion. Immediate steps were taken to put the defeated and disgraced armies of the frontier upon a new footing. Lafayette replaced Rochambeau, with charge from Longwy to the sea, his main body about Sedan; Luckner took the line from the Moselle to the Swiss mountains, with head-quarters at Metz. A third general, destined to come speedily to the front, also joined the army as Lafayette's lieutenant. This was Dumouriez, who, wearied and baffled by Parisian politics, sought the freedom of the field."—A. Griffiths, *French Revolutionary Generals*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1792 (June—August).—The King's dismissal of Girondist ministers.—Mob demonstration of June 20.—Lafayette in Paris.—His failure.—The Country declared to be in Danger.—Gathering of volunteers in Paris.—Brunswick's manifesto.—Mob attack on the Tuileries, August 10.—Massacre of the Swiss.—"Servan, the minister of war, proposed the formation of an armed camp for the protection of Paris. Much opposition was, however, raised to the project, and the Assembly decreed (June 6) that 20,000 volunteers, recruited in the departments, should meet at Paris to take part in the celebration of a federal festival on July 14, the third anniversary of the fall of the Bastille. The real object of those who supported the decree was to have a force at Paris with which to maintain mastery over the city should the Allies penetrate into the interior. Louis left the decree unsanctioned, as he had the one directed against nonjurors. The agitators of the sections sought to get up an armed demonstration against this exercise of the King's constitutional prerogative. Though armed demonstrations were illegal, the municipality offered but a perfunctory and half-hearted resistance. . . . Louis, irritated at the pressure put on him by Roland, Clavière, and Servan, to sanction the two decrees, dismissed the three ministers from office (June 13). Dumouriez, who had quarreled with his colleagues, supported the King in taking this step, but in face of the hostility of the Assembly himself resigned office (June 15). Three days later a letter from Lafayette was read in the Assembly. The general denounced the Jacobins as the authors of all dis-

orders, called on the Assembly to maintain the prerogatives of the crown, and intimated that his army would not submit to see the constitution violated (June 18). Possibly the dismissal of the ministers and the writing of this letter were measures concerted between the King and Lafayette. In any case the King's motive was to excite division between the constitutionalists and the Girondists, so as to weaken the national defence. The dismissal of the ministers was, however, regarded by the Girondists as a proof of the truth of their worst suspicions, and no measures were taken to prevent an execution of the project of making an armed, and therefore illegal, demonstration against the royal policy. On June 20, thousands of persons, carrying pikes or whatever weapon came to hand, and accompanied by several battalions of the national guard, marched from St. Antoine to the hall of the Assembly. A deputation read an address demanding the recall of the ministers. Afterwards the whole of the procession, men, women and children, dancing, singing, and carrying emblems, defiled through the chamber. Instigated by their leaders they broke into the Tuileries. The King, who took his stand on a window seat, was mobbed for four hours. To please his unwelcome visitors, he put on his head a red cap, such as was now commonly worn at the Jacobins as an emblem of liberty, in imitation of that which was once worn by the emancipated Roman slave. He declared his intention to observe the constitution, but neither insult nor menace could prevail on him to promise his sanction to the two decrees. The Queen, separated from the King, sat behind a table on which she placed the Dauphin, exposed to the gaze and taunts of the crowds which slowly traversed the palace apartments. At last, but not before night, the mob left the Tuileries without doing further harm, and order was again restored. This insurrection and the slackness, if not connivance, of the municipal authorities, excited a widespread feeling of indignation amongst constitutionalists. Lafayette came to Paris, and at the bar of the Assembly demanded in person what he had before demanded by letter (June 28). With him, as with other former members of the constituent Assembly, it was a point of honour to shield the persons of the King and Queen from harm. Various projects for their removal from Paris were formed, but policy and sentiment alike forbade Marie Antoinette to take advantage of them. . . . The one gleam of light on the horizon of this unhappy Queen was the advance of the Allies. 'Better die,' she one day bitterly exclaimed, 'than be saved by Lafayette and the constitutionalists.' There was, no doubt, a possibility of the Allies reaching Paris that summer, but this enormously increased the danger of the internal situation. . . . To rouse the nation to a sense of peril the Assembly [July 11] caused public proclamation to be made in every municipality that the country was in danger. The appeal was responded to with enthusiasm, and within six weeks more than 60,000 volunteers enlisted. The Duke of Brunswick, the commander-in-chief of the allied forces, published a manifesto, drawn up by the emigrants. If the authors of this astounding proclamation had deliberately intended to serve the purpose of those Frenchmen who were bent on kindling zeal for the war, they could not have done anything more likely to serve their purpose. The powers required the country to submit

unconditionally to Louis's mercy. All who offered resistance were to be treated as rebels to their King, and Paris was to suffer military execution if any harm befell the royal family. . . . Meanwhile, a second insurrection, which had for its object the King's deposition, was in preparation. The Assembly, after declaring the country in danger, had authorised the sections of Paris, as well as the administrative authorities throughout France, to meet at any moment. The sections had, in consequence, been able to render themselves entirely independent of the municipality. In each of the sectional or primary assemblies from 700 to 3,000 active citizens had the right to vote, but few cared to attend, and thus it constantly happened that a small active minority spoke and acted in the name of an apathetic constitutional majority. Thousands of volunteers passed through Paris on their way to the frontier, some of whom were purposely retained to take part in the insurrection. The municipality of Marseilles, at the request of Barbaroux, a young friend of the Rolands, sent up a band of 500 men, who first sung in Paris the verses celebrated as the 'Marseillaise' [see MARSEILLAISE]. The danger was the greater since every section had its own cannon and a special body of cannoners, who nearly to a man were on the side of the revolutionists. The terrified and oscillating Assembly made no attempt to suppress agitation, but acquitted (August 8) Lafayette, by 406 against 280 votes, of a charge of treason made against him by the left, on the ground that he had sought to intimidate the Legislature. This vote was regarded as tantamount to a refusal to pass sentence of deposition on Louis. On the following night the insurrection began. Its centre was in the Faubourg of St. Antoine, and it was organised by but a small number of men. Mandat, the commander-in-chief of the national guard, was an energetic constitutionalist, who had taken well-concerted measures for the defence of the Tuileries. But the unscrupulousness of the conspirators was more than a match for his zeal. Soon after midnight commissioners from 28 sections met together at the Hotel de Ville, and forced the Council-General of the Municipality to summon Mandat before it, and to send out orders to the officers of the guard in contradiction to those previously given. Mandat, unaware of what was passing, obeyed the summons, and on his arrival was arrested and murdered. After this the commissioners dispersed the lawful council and usurped its place. At the Tuileries were about 950 Swiss and more than 4,000 national guards. Early in the morning the first bands of insurgents appeared. On the fidelity of the national guards it was impossible to rely; and the royal family, attended by a small escort, left the palace, and sought refuge with the Assembly [which held its sessions in the old Riding-School of the Tuileries, not far from the palace, at one side of the gardens]. Before their departure orders had been given to the Swiss to repel force by force, and soon the sound of firing spread alarm through Paris. The King sent the Swiss instructions to retire, which they punctually obeyed. One column, passing through the Tuileries gardens, was shot down almost to a man. The rest reached the Assembly in safety, but several were afterwards massacred on their way to prison. For 24 hours the most frightful anarchy prevailed. Numerous murders were committed

in the streets. The assailants, some hundreds of whom had perished, sacked the palace, and killed all the men whom they found there."—B. M. Gardiner, *The French Revolution*, ch. 5.—"Terror and fury ruled the hour. The Swiss, pressed on from without, paralysed from within, have ceased to shoot; but not to be shot. What shall they do? Desperate is the moment. Shelter or instant death: yet How, Where? One party flies out by the Rue de l'Échelle; is destroyed utterly, 'en entier.' A second, by the other side, throws itself into the Garden; 'hurrying across a keen fusillade'; rushes suppliant into the National Assembly; finds pity and refuge in the back benches there. The third, and largest, darts out in column, 300 strong, towards the Champs Elysées: 'Ah, could we but reach Courbevoie, where other Swiss are!' Wo! see, in such fusillade the column 'soon breaks itself by diversity of opinion,' into distracted segments, this way and that;—to escape in holes, to die fighting from street to street. The firing and murdering will not cease; not yet for long. The red Porters of Hotels are shot at, be they 'Suisse' by nature, or Suisse only in name. The very Firemen, who pump and labour on that smoking Carrousel [which the mob had fired], are shot at; why should the Carrousel not burn? Some Swiss take refuge in private houses; find that mercy too does still dwell in the heart of man. The brave Marseillaise are merciful, late so wrath; and labour to save. . . . But the most are butchered, and even mangled. Fifty (some say Fourscore) were marched as prisoners, by National Guards, to the Hôtel-de-Ville: the ferocious people bursts through on them, in the Place-de-Grève; massacres them to the last man. 'O People, envy of the universe!' People, in mad Gaelic effervescence! Surely few things in the history of carnage are painfule. What ineffaceable red streak, flickering so sad in the memory, is that, of this poor column of red Swiss, 'breaking itself in the confusion of opinions'; dispersing, into blackness and death! Honour to you, brave men; honourable pity, through long times! Not martyrs were ye; and yet almost more. He was no King of yours, this Louis; and he forsook you like a King of shreds and patches; ye were but sold to him for some poor sixpence a-day; yet would ye work for your wages, keep your plighted word. The work now was to die; and ye did it. Honour to you, O Kinsmen; and may the old Deutsch 'Biederkeit' and 'Tapferkeit,' and Valour which is Worth and Truth, be they Swiss, be they Saxon, fail in no age!"—T. Carlyle, *The French Rev.*, v. 2, bk. 6, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev.* (Am. ed.), v. 1, pp. 266-330.—Madame Campan, *Memoirs of Marie Antoinette*, v. 2, ch. 9-10.—J. Claretie, *Camille Desmoulins and his Wife*, ch. 3, sect. 4-5.—A. F. Bertrand de Moleville, *Annals of the French Rev.*, pt. 2, ch. 18-28 (v. 6-7).—Duchess de Tourzel, *Memoirs*, v. 2, ch. 8-10.—Count M. Dumas, *Memoirs*, ch. 4 (v. 1).

A. D. 1792 (August).—Power seized by the insurrectionary Commune of Paris.—De-thronement and imprisonment of the King.—Conflict between the Girondins of the Assembly and the Jacobins of the Commune.—Alarm at the advance of the Prussians.—The searching of the city for suspects.—Arrest of 3,000.—"While the Swiss were being murdered, the Legislative Assembly were informed that a depu-

tation wished to enter. At the head of this deputation appeared Huguenin, who announced that a new municipality for Paris had been formed, and that the old one had resigned. This was, indeed, the fact. On the departure of Santerre the commissioners of the sections had given orders to the legitimate council-general of the municipality to resign, and the council-general, startled by the events which were passing, consented. The commissioners then called themselves the new municipality, and proceeded, as municipal officers, to send a deputation to the Assembly. The deputation almost ordered that the Assembly should immediately declare the king's dethronement, and, in the presence of the unfortunate monarch himself, Vergniaud mounted the tribune, and proposed, on behalf of the Committee of Twenty-one, that the French people should be invited to elect a National Convention to draw up a new Constitution, and that the chief of the executive power, as he called the king, should be provisionally suspended from his functions until the new Convention had pronounced what measures should be adopted to establish a new government and the reign of liberty and equality. The motion was carried, and was countersigned by one of the king's ministers, De Joly; and thus the old monarchy of the Bourbons in France came to an end. But the Assembly had not yet completed its work. The ministry was dismissed, as not having the confidence of the people, and the Minister of War, d'Abancourt, was ordered to be tried by the court at Orleans for treason, in having brought the Swiss Guards to Paris. The Assembly then prepared to elect new ministers. Roland, Clavière, and Servan were recalled by acclamation to their former posts. . . . Danton was elected Minister of Justice by 222 votes against 60; Gaspard Monge, the great mathematician, was elected Minister of Marine, on the nomination of Condorcet; and Lebrun-Tondu, a friend of Brissot and Dumouriez, and a former abbé, to the department of Foreign Affairs. At the bidding of the self-elected municipality of Paris the king had been suspended, and a new ministry inaugurated, and this new municipality, which, it must be remembered, only represented 28 sections of Paris, next proceeded to send its decrees all over France. It was joined on this very day by some of the extreme men who hoped through its means to force a republic on France—notably by Camille Desmoulins and Dubois-Dubais; and on the 11th it was still further reinforced by the presence of Robespierre, Billaud-Varenne, and Marat. The Legislative Assembly had become a mere instrument in the hands of the Committee of Twenty-one [a committee specially charged with watchfulness over the safety of the public, and which foreshadowed the later famous Committee of Public Safety]. The majority of the deputies either left Paris, or, if they belonged to the right, hid themselves, while those of the left had to obey every order of their leaders, and left the transaction of temporary business to the Committee of Twenty-one. This committee practically ruled France for forty days, until the meeting of the Convention; the Assembly always accepted its propositions and sent the deputies it nominated on important missions; its only rival was the insurrectionary commune, and the internecine warfare between the Jacobins and the Girondins was foreshadowed in the struggle between

this Commune and the Committee of Twenty-one. For, while the extreme Jacobins filled the new Commune of Paris, the Committee of Twenty-one consisted of Girondins and Feuillants, Brissot was its president, Vergniaud its reporter, and Gensonné, Condorcet, Lasource, Guadet, Lacépède, Lacuée, Pastoret, Muraire, Delmas, and Guyton-Morveau were amongst its members. On the evening of August 10 the Assembly decreed that the difference between active and passive citizens should be abolished, and that every Frenchman of the age of 25 should have a vote for the Convention. . . . The last sight the king might have seen on the night of August 10 was his palace of the Tuileries in flames, where, for mischief, fire had been set to the stables. It spread from building to building, and the Assembly only took steps to check it when it threatened to spread to the houses of the Rue Saint Honoré. . . . On the day after this terrible night the king was informed that rooms had been found for him in the Convent of the Feuillants; and to four monastic cells, which had not been inhabited since the dissolution of the monastery two years before, the royal family was led, and round them was placed a strong guard. Yet they were no more prisoners in the Convent of the Feuillants than they had been in the splendid palace of the Tuileries. . . . The king's nominal authority was annihilated; but though the course of events left him a prisoner, it cannot be said that his influence was diminished, for he had none left to diminish. It was to the Girondins, rather than to the king, that the results of August 10 brought unpleasant surprises. . . . The real power had gone to the Commune of Paris, and this was very clearly perceived by Robespierre and by Marat. . . . Though Marat was received with the loudest cheers by the insurrectionary commune, Robespierre was the man who really became its leader. He had long expected the shock which had just taken place, and had prepared himself for the crisis. The first requisition was, of course, for a Convention. This had been granted on the very first day. The second demand of the Commune was the safe custody of the king, so that he should not be able to escape to the army. This was conceded by the Assembly on August 12, when they ordered that the king and royal family should be taken to the old tower of the Temple, and there strictly guarded under the superintendence of the insurrectionary commune. Lafayette's sudden flight greatly strengthened the position of the Commune of Paris. . . . Relieved from the fear of Lafayette's turning against them, both the Girondins in the Legislative Assembly and the Jacobins in the insurrectionary commune turned to the pursuit of their own special plans, and naturally soon came into violent collision. . . . The Girondins were, above all things, men of ideas; the Jacobins, above all things, practical men; and of the issue of a struggle between them there could be little doubt, though, at this period the Girondins had the advantage of the best position. On August 15 the final blow was struck at the unfortunate Feuillants, or Constitutionalists. The last ministers of the king, as well Duport du Tertre, Bertrand de Moleville, and Duportail, were all ordered to be arrested, with Barnave and Charles de Lameth. The Assembly followed up this action by establishing the special tribunal of August 17, which

held its first sitting on the same evening at the Hotel de Ville. Robespierre was elected president, and refused the office. . . . The new tribunal was too slow to satisfy the leaders of the Commune of Paris, for its first prisoner, Laporte, the old intendant of the civil list, was not judged until August 21, and then acquitted. This news made the Commune lose all patience, and they determined to urge the Assembly to more energetic measures. Under the pressure of the Commune the Assembly took vigorous measures indeed. All the leaders of the émigrés were sequestered; all ecclesiastics who would not take the oath were to be transported to French Guiana, and it was decreed that the National Guard should enlist every man, whether an active or a passive citizen. Much of this vigour on the part of the Assembly was due, not only to the pressure of the Commune, but to the rapid advance of the Prussians. . . . The Assembly . . . decreed that an army of 30,000 men should be raised in Paris, and that every man who had a musket issued to him should be punished with death if he did not march at once. . . . On August 28, on the motion of Danton, now Minister of Justice, a general search for arms and suspects was ordered. The gates of the city were closed on August 30; every street was ordered to be illuminated; bodies of national guards entered each house and searched it from top to bottom. Barely 1,000 muskets were seized, but more than 3,000 prisoners were taken and shut up, not only in the prisons, but in all the largest convents of Paris, which were turned into houses of detention. Who should be arrested as a suspect depended entirely on the municipal officer who happened to examine the house, and these men acted under the orders of a special committee established by the Commune, at the head of which sat Marat. . . . The residents in Paris at the time of the Revolution seem to have been more struck by this house-to-house visitation than by many other events which were far more horrible."—H. M. Stephens, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, v. 2, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: Grace D. Elliot, *Journal of My Life during the French Rev.*, ch. 4.—Gouverneur Morris, *Life and Corr.*, ed. by Sparks, v. 2, pp. 203-217.—G. Long, *France and its Revolutions*, ch. 29.

A. D. 1792 (August).—Lafayette's unsuccessful resistance to the Jacobins.—His withdrawal from France.—"The news of the 10th of August was carried to Lafayette by one of his own officers who happened to be in Paris on business. He learned that the throne was overturned and the Assembly in subjection, but he could not believe that the cause of the constitutional monarchy was abandoned without a struggle. He announced to the army the events that had taken place, and conjured the men to remain true to the king and constitution. The commissioners despatched by the Commune of Paris to announce to the different armies the change of government and to exact oaths of fidelity to it soon arrived at Sedan within Lafayette's command. The general had them brought before the municipality of Sedan and interrogated regarding their mission. Convinced, from their own account, that they were the agents of a faction which had unlawfully seized upon power, he ordered their arrest and had them imprisoned. Lafayette's moral influence in the army and the

country was still so great that the Jacobins knew that they must either destroy him or win him over to their side. The latter course was preferred. . . . The imprisoned commissioners, therefore, requested a private conference with Lafayette, and offered him, on the part of their superiors in Paris, whatever executive power he desired in the new government. It is needless to say that Lafayette, whose sole aim was to establish liberty in his country, refused to entertain the idea of associating himself with the despotism of the mob. He caused his own soldiers to renew their oath of fidelity to the king, and communicated with Luckner on the situation. . . . Meanwhile, emissaries from the Commune were sent to Sedan to influence the soldiers by bribes and threats to renounce their loyalty to their commander. All the other armies and provinces to which commissioners had been sent had received them and taken the new oaths. Lafayette found himself alone in his resistance. His attitude acquired, every day, more the appearance of rebellion against authorities recognized by the rest of France. New commissioners arrived, bringing with them his dismissal from command. The army was wavering between attachment to their general and obedience to government. On the 19th of August, the Jacobins, seeing that they could not win him over, caused the Assembly to declare him a traitor. Lafayette had now to take an immediate resolution. France had declared for the Paris Commune. The constitutional monarchy was irretrievably destroyed. For the general to dispute with his appointed successor the command of the army was to provoke further disorders in a cause that had ceased to be that of the nation and become only his own. Three possible courses remained open to him,—to accept the Jacobin overtures and become a part of their bloody despotism; to continue his resistance and give his head to the guillotine; to leave the country. He resolved to seek an asylum in a neutral territory with the hope, as he himself somewhat naively expressed it, 'some day to be again of service to liberty and to France.' Lafayette made every preparation for the safety of his troops, placing them under the orders of Luckner until the arrival of Dumouriez, the new general in command. He publicly acknowledged responsibility for the arrest of the commissioners and the defiance of Sedan to the Commune, in order that the municipal officers who had supported him might escape punishment. He included in his party his staff-officers, whose association with him would have subjected them to the fury of the Commune, and some others who had also been declared traitors on account of obedience to his orders. He then made his way to Bouillon, on the extreme frontier. There, dismissing the escort, and sending back final orders for the security of the army, he rode with his companions into a foreign land."—B. Tuckerman, *Life of Lafayette*, v. 2, ch. 3.

A. D. 1792 (August—September).—The September Massacres in the Paris prisons.—The house-to-house search for suspects was carried on during the night of August 29 and the following day. "The next morning, at daybreak, the Mairie, the sections, the ancient prisons of Paris, and the convents that had been converted into prisons, were crowded with prisoners. They were summarily interrogated, and half of them, the victims of error or precipitation, were set at

liberty, or claimed by their sections. The remainder were distributed in the prisons of the Abbaye Saint Germain, the Conciergerie, the Châtelet, La Force, the Luxembourg, and the ancient monasteries of the Bernardins, Saint Firmin, and the Carmes; Bicêtre and the Salpêtrière also opened their gates to receive fresh inmates. The three days that followed this night were employed by the commissaries in making a selection of the prisoners. Already their death was projected. . . . 'We must purge the prisons, and leave no traitors behind us when we hasten to the frontiers.' Such was the cry put into the mouth of the people by Marat and Danton. Such was the attitude of Danton on the brink of these crimes. As for the part of Robespierre, it was the same as in all these crises — on the debate concerning war, on the 20th of June, and on the 10th of August. He did not act, he blamed; but he left the event to itself, and when once accomplished he accepted it as a progressive step of the Revolution. . . . On Sunday, the 2d of September, at three o'clock in the afternoon, the signal for the massacre was given by one of those accidents that seem so perfectly the effect of chance. Five coaches, each containing six priests, started from the Hôtel-de-Ville to the prison of the Abbaye . . . escorted by weak detachments of Avignonnais and Marseillais, armed with pikes and sabers. . . . Groups of men, women and children insulted them as they passed, and their escort joined in the invective threats and outrages of the populace. . . . The émeute, increasing in number at every step across the Rue Dauphine, was met by another mob, that blocked up the Carrefour Bussy, where municipal officers received enrolments in the open air. The carriages stopped; and a man, forcing his way through the escort, sprung on the step of the first carriage, plunged his saber twice into the body of one of the priests, and displayed it reeking with blood: the people uttered a cry of horror. 'This frightens you, cowards!' said the assassin, with a smile of disdain; 'You must accustom yourselves to look on death.' With these [words] he again plunged his saber into the carriage and continued to strike. . . . The coaches slowly moved on, and the assassin, passing from one to the other, and clinging with one hand to the door, stabbed at random at all he could reach; while the assassins of Avignon, who formed part of their escort, plunged their bayonets into the interior; and the pikes, pointed against the windows, prevented any of the priests from leaping into the street. The long line of carriages moving slowly on, and leaving a bloody trace behind them, the despairing cries and gestures of the priests, the ferocious shouts of their butchers, the yells of applause of the populace, announced from a distance their arrival to the prisoners of the Abbaye. The cortège stopped at the door of the prison, and the soldiers of the escort dragged out by the feet eight dead bodies. The priests who had escaped, or who were only wounded, precipitated themselves into the prison; four of them were seized and massacred on the threshold. . . . The prisoners . . . cooped up in the Abbaye heard this prelude to murder at their gates. . . . The internal wickets were closed on them, and they received orders to return to their chambers, as if to answer the muster-roll. A fearful spectacle was visible in the outer court: the last wicket

opening into it had been transformed into a tribunal; and around a large table — covered with papers, writing materials, the registers of the prisons, glasses, bottles, pistols, sabers, and pipes — were seated twelve judges, whose gloomy features and athletic proportions stamped them men of toil, debauch or blood. Their attire was that of the laboring classes. . . . Two or three of them attracted attention by the whiteness of their hands and the elegance of their shape; and that betrayed the presence of men of intellect, purposely mingled with these men of action to guide them. A man in a gray coat, a saber at his side, pen in his hand, and whose inflexible features seemed as though they were petrified, was seated at the center of the table, and presided over the tribunal. This was the Huissier Maillard, the idol of the mobs of the Faubourg Saint Marceau . . . an actor in the days of October, the 20th of June, and the 10th of August. . . . He had just returned from the Carmes, where he had organized the massacre. It was not chance that had brought him to the Abbaye at the precise moment of the arrival of the prisoners, and with the prison registers in his hand. He had received, the previous evening, the secret orders of Marat, through the members of the Comité de Surveillance. Danton had sent for the registers to the prison, and gone through them; and Maillard was shown those he was to acquit and condemn. If the prisoner was acquitted, Maillard said, 'Let this gentleman be set at liberty'; if condemned, a voice said, 'A la Force.' At these words the outer door opened, and the prisoner fell dead as he crossed the threshold. The massacre commenced with the Swiss, of whom there were 150 at the Abbaye, officers and soldiers. . . . They fell, one after another, like sheep in a slaughter-house. The tumbrils were not sufficient to carry away the corpses, and they were piled up on each side of the court to make room for the rest to die: their commander, Major Reding, was the last to fall. . . . After the Swiss, the king's guards, imprisoned in the Abbaye, were judged en masse. . . . Their massacre lasted a long time, for the people, excited by what they had drank — brandy mingled with gun-powder — and intoxicated by the sight of blood, prolonged their tortures. . . . The whole night was scarcely enough to slay and strip them."—A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Girondists*, bk. 25 (v. 2).—"To moral intoxication is added physical intoxication, wine in profusion, bumpers at every pause, revelry over corpses. . . . They dance . . . and sing the 'carmagnole'; they arouse the people of the quarter 'to amuse them,' and that they may have their share of 'the fine fête.' Benches are arranged for 'gentlemen' and others for 'ladies': the latter, with greater curiosity, are additionally anxious to contemplate at their ease 'the aristocrats' already slain; consequently, lights are required, and one is placed on the breast of each corpse. Meanwhile, slaughter continues, and is carried to perfection. A butcher at the Abbaye complains that 'the aristocrats die too quick, and that those only who strike first have the pleasure of it': henceforth they are to be struck with the backs of the swords only, and made to run between two rows of their butchers, like soldiers formerly running a gauntlet. . . . All the unfettered instincts that live in the lowest depths of the heart start from the human abyss at once, not alone the

heinous instincts with their fangs, but likewise the foulest with their slaver, while both packs fall furiously on women whose noble or infamous repute brings them before the world; on Madame de Lamballe, the Queen's friend; on Madame Desrues, widow of the famous prisoner; on the flower-girl of the Palais-Royal, who, two years before, had mutilated her lover, a French guardsman, in a fit of jealousy. Ferocity here is associated with lubricity to add profanation to torture, while life is attacked through attacks on modesty. In Madame de Lamballe, killed too quickly, the libidinous butchers could only outrage a corpse, but for the widow, and especially the flower-girl, they imagine the same as a Nero the fire-circle of the Iroquois. . . . At La Force, Madame de Lamballe is cut to pieces. I cannot transcribe what Charlot, the hair-dresser, did with her head. I merely state that another wretch, in the Rue Saint-Antoine, bore off her heart and 'ate it.' They kill and they drink, and drink and kill again. . . . As the prisons are to be cleaned out, it is as well to clean them all out, and do it at once. After the Swiss, priests, the aristocrats, and the 'white-skin gentlemen,' there remain convicts and those confined through the ordinary channels of justice, robbers, assassins, and those sentenced to the galleys in the Conciergerie, in the Châtelet, and in the Tour St. Bernard, with branded women, vagabonds, old beggars and boys confined in Bicêtre and the Salpêtrière. They are good for nothing, cost something to feed, and, probably, cherish evil designs. . . . This time, as the job is more foul, the broom is wielded by fouler hands. . . . At the Salpêtrière, 'all the bullies of Paris, former spies, . . . libertines, the rascals of France and all Europe, prepare beforehand for the operation,' and rape alternates with massacre. . . . At Bicêtre, however, it is crude butchery, the carnivorous instinct alone satisfying itself. Among other prisoners are 43 youths of the lowest class, from 17 to 19 years of age, placed there for correction by their parents, or by those to whom they are bound. . . . These the band falls on, beating them to death with clubs. . . . There are six days and five nights of uninterrupted butchery, 171 murders at the Abbaye, 169 at La Force, 223 at the Châtelet, 328 at the Conciergerie, 73 at the Tour-Saint-Bernard, 120 at the Carmelites, 79 at Saint-Firmin, 170 at Bicêtre, 35 at the Salpêtrière; among the dead, 250 priests, 3 bishops or archbishops, general officers, magistrates, one former minister, one royal princess, belonging to the best names in France, and, on the other side, one negro, several low class women, young scape-graces, convicts, and poor old men. . . . Fournier, Lazowski, and Bécarré, the chiefs of robbers and assassins, return from Orleans with 1,500 cut-throats. On the way they kill M. de Brissac, M. de Lessart, and 42 others accused of 'lèse-nation,' whom they arrested from their judges' hands, and then, by way of surplus, 'following the example of Paris,' 21 prisoners taken from the Versailles prisons. At Paris the Minister of Justice thanks them, the Commune congratulates them, and the sections feast them and embrace them. . . . All the journals approve, palliate, or keep silent; nobody dares offer resistance. Property as well as lives belong to whoever wants to take them. . . . Like a man struck on the head with a mallet, Paris, felled to the ground, lets things go; the

authors of the massacre have fully attained their ends. The faction has fast hold of power, and will maintain its hold. Neither in the Legislative Assembly nor in the Convention will the aims of the Girondists be successful against its tenacious usurpation. . . . The Jacobins, through sudden terror, have maintained their illegal authority; through a prolongation of terror they are going to establish their legal authority. A forced suffrage is going to put them in office at the Hotel-de-Ville, in the tribunals, in the National Guard, in the sections, and in the various administrations."—H. A. Taine, *The French Rev.*, bk. 4, ch. 9 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev.* (Am. ed.), v. 1, pp. 350–368.—Sergeant Marceau, *Reminiscences of a Regicide*, ch. 9.—A. Dobson, *The Princess de Lamballe* ("Four Frenchwomen," ch. 3).—*The Reign of Terror: A collection of Authentic Narratives*, v. 2.—J. B. Cléry, *Journal of Occurrences at the Temple*.—*Despatches of Earl Gower*, pp. 225–229.

A. D. 1792 (September–November).—Meeting of the National Convention.—Abolition of royalty.—Proclamation of the Republic.—Adoption of the Era of the Republic.—Establishment of absolute equality.—The losing struggle of the Girondists with the Jacobins of the Mountain.—"It was in the midst of these horrors [of the September massacres] that the Legislative Assembly approached its termination. . . . The National Convention began [September 22] under darker auspices. . . . The great and inert mass of the people were disposed, as in all commotions, to range themselves on the victorious side. The sections of Paris, under the influence of Robespierre and Marat, returned the most revolutionary deputies; those of most other towns followed their example. The Jacobins, with their affiliated clubs, on this occasion exercised an overwhelming influence over all France. . . . At Paris, where the elections took place on the 2d September, amidst all the excitement and horrors of the massacres in the prisons, the violent leaders of the municipality, who had organized the revolt of August 10th, exercised an irresistible sway over the citizens. Robespierre and Danton were the first named, amidst unanimous shouts of applause; after them Camille Desmoulins, Tallien, Osselin, Freron, Anacharsis Clootz, Fabre d'Eglantine, David, the celebrated painter, Collet d'Herbois, Billaud Varennes, Legendre, Panis, Sergeant, almost all implicated in the massacres in the prisons, were also chosen. To these was added the Duke of Orleans, who had abdicated his titles, and was called Philippe Égalité. . . . The most conservative part of the new Assembly were the Girondists who had overturned the throne. From the first opening of the Convention, the Girondists occupied the right, and the Jacobins the seats on the summit of the left; whence their designation of 'The Mountain' was derived. The former had the majority of votes, the greater part of the departments having returned men of comparatively moderate principles. But the latter possessed a great advantage, in having on their side all the members of the city of Paris, who ruled the mob, . . . and in being supported by the municipality, which had already grown into a ruling power in the state, and had become the great centre of the democratic party. A neutral body, composed of those

members whose principles were not yet declared, was called the Plain, or, Marais; it ranged itself with the Girondists, until terror compelled its members to coalesce with the victorious side. . . . The two rival parties mutually indulged in recriminations, in order to influence the public mind. The Jacobins incessantly reproached the Girondists with desiring to dissolve the Republic; to establish three-and-twenty separate democratic states, held together, like the American provinces, by a mere federal union. . . . Nothing more was requisite to render them in the highest degree unpopular in Paris, the very existence of which depended on its remaining, through all the phases of government, the seat of the ruling power. The Girondists retorted upon their adversaries charges better founded, but not so likely to inflame the populace. They reproached them with endeavouring to establish in the municipality of Paris a power superior to the legislature of all France, with overawing the deliberations of the Convention by menacing petitions, or the open display of brute force; and secretly preparing for their favourite leaders, Danton, Robespierre, and Marat, a triumvirate of power, which would speedily extinguish all the freedom which had been acquired. The first part of the accusation was well-founded even then; of the last, time soon afforded an ample confirmation. The Convention met at first in one of the halls of the Tuileries, but immediately adjourned to the Salle du Ménagement, where its subsequent sittings were held. Its first step was, on the motion of the Abbé Gregoire, and amidst unanimous transports, to declare Royalty abolished in France, and to proclaim a republic; and by another decree it was ordered, that the old calendar taken from the year of Christ's birth should be abandoned, and that all public acts should be dated from the first year of the French republic. This era began on the 22d September 1792. [See, also, below: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER).] . . . A still more democratic constitution than that framed by the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies was at the same time established. All the requisites for election to any office whatever were, on the motion of the Duke of Orleans, abolished. It was no longer necessary to select judges from legal men, nor magistrates from the class of proprietors. All persons, in whatever rank, were declared eligible to every situation; and the right of voting in the primary assemblies was conferred on every man above the age of 21 years. Absolute equality, in its literal sense, was universally established. Universal suffrage was the basis on which government rested." The leaders of the Girondists soon opened attacks upon Robespierre and Marat, accusing the former of aspiring to a dictatorship, and also holding him responsible, with Marat and Danton, for the September massacres; but Louvet and others who made the attack were feebly supported by their party. Louvet "repeatedly appealed to Pétion, Vergniaud, and the other leaders, to support his statements; but they had not the firmness boldly to state the truth. Had they testified a fourth part of what they knew, the accusation must have been instantly voted, and the tyrant crushed at once. As it was, Robespierre, fearful of its effects, demanded eight days to prepare for his defence. In the interval, the whole machinery of terror was put in force. The Jacobins thundered out accusations against the

intrepid accuser, and all the leaders of the Mountain were indefatigable in their efforts to strike fear into their opponents. . . . By degrees the impression cooled, fear resumed its sway, and the accused mounted the tribune at the end of the week with the air of a victor. . . . It was now evident that the Girondists were no match for their terrible adversaries. The men of action on their side, Louvet, Barbaroux, and Lanjuinais, in vain strove to rouse them to the necessity of vigorous measures in contending with such enemies. Their constant reply was, that they would not be the first to commence the shedding of blood. Their whole vigour manifested itself in declamation, their whole wisdom in abstract discussion. They had now become humane in intention, and moderate in counsel, though they were far from having been so in the earlier stages of the Revolution. . . . They were too honourable to believe in the wickedness of their opponents, too scrupulous to adopt the measures requisite to disarm, too destitute of moral courage to be able to crush them. . . . The Jacobins . . . while they were daily strengthening and increasing the armed force of the sections at the command of the municipality, . . . strenuously resisted the slightest approach towards the establishment of any guard or civic force for the defence of the Convention. . . . Aware of their weakness from this cause, the Girondists brought forward a proposal for an armed guard for the Convention. The populace was immediately put in motion," and the overawed Convention abandoned the measure. "In the midst of these vehement passions, laws still more stringent and sanguinary were passed against the priests and emigrants. . . . First, it was decreed that every Frenchman taken with arms in his hands against France should be punished with death; and soon after, that 'the French emigrants are forever banished from the territory of France, and those who return shall be punished with death.' A third decree directed that all their property, movable and immovable, should be confiscated to the service of the state. These decrees were rigidly executed: and though almost unnoticed amidst the bloody deeds which at the same period stained the Revolution, ultimately produced the most lasting and irremediable effects. At length the prostration of the Assembly before the armed sections of Paris had become so excessive, that Buzot and Barbaroux, the most intrepid of the Girondists, brought forward two measures which, if they could have been carried, would have emancipated the legislature from this odious thralldom. Buzot proposed to establish a guard, specially for the protection of the Convention, drawn from young men chosen from the different departments. Barbaroux at the same time brought forward four decrees. . . . By the first, the capital was to cease to be the seat of the legislature, when it lost its claim to their presence by failing to protect them from insult. By the second, the troops of the Fédérés and the national cavalry were to be charged, along with the armed sections, with the protection of the legislature. By the third, the Convention was to constitute itself into a court of justice, for the trial of all conspirators against its authority. By the fourth, the Convention suspended the municipality of Paris. . . . The Jacobins skilfully availed themselves of these impotent manifestations of distrust, to give additional currency to the report

that the Girondists intended to transport the seat of government to the southern provinces. This rumour rapidly gained ground with the populace, and augmented their dislike at the ministry. . . . All these preliminary struggles were essays of strength by the two parties, prior to the grand question which was now destined to attract the eyes of Europe and the world. This was the trial of Louis XVI."—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, ch. 8 (v. 3).

ALSO IN: G. H. Lewes, *Life of Robespierre*, ch. 16.—A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Girondists*, bk. 29–31.—C. D. Yonge, *Hist. of France under the Bourbons*, ch. 43 (v. 4).—J. Moore, *Journal in France*, 1792, v. 2.

A. D. 1792 (September—December).—The war on the northern frontier.—Battle of Valmy.—Retreat of the invading army.—Custine in Germany and Dumouriez in the Netherlands.—Annexation of Savoy and Nice.—The Decree of December 15.—Proclamation of a republican crusade.—“The defence of France rested on General Dumouriez. . . . Happily for France the slow advance of the Prussian general permitted Dumouriez to occupy the difficult country of the Argennes, where, while waiting for his reinforcements, he was able for some time to hold the invaders in check. At length Brunswick made his way past the defile which Dumouriez had chosen for his first line of defence; but it was only to find the French posted in such strength on his flank that any further advance would imperil his own army. If the advance was to be continued, Dumouriez must be dislodged. Accordingly, on the 20th of September, Brunswick, facing half-round from his line of march, directed his artillery against the hills of Valmy, where Kellermann and the French left were encamped. The cannonade continued for some hours, but it was followed by no general attack. Already, before a blow had been struck, the German forces were wasting away with disease. . . . The King of Prussia began to listen to the proposals of peace which were sent to him by Dumouriez. A week spent in negotiations served only to strengthen the French and to aggravate the scarcity and sickness within the German camp. Dissensions broke out between the Prussian and Austrian commanders; a retreat was ordered; and, to the astonishment of Europe, the veteran forces of Brunswick fell back before the mutinous soldiery and unknown generals of the Revolution. . . . In the meantime the Legislative Assembly had decreed its own dissolution . . . and had ordered the election of representatives to frame a constitution for France. . . . The Girondins, who had been the party of extremes in the Legislative Assembly, were the party of moderation and order in the Convention. . . . Monarchy was abolished, and France declared a Republic (Sept. 21). Office continued in the hands of the Gironde; but the vehement, uncompromising spirit of their rivals, the so-called party of the Mountain, quickly made itself felt in all the relations of France to foreign powers. The intention of conquest might still be as sincerely disavowed as it had been five months before; but were the converts to liberty to be denied the right of uniting themselves to the French people by their own free will? . . . The scruples which had lately condemned all annexation of territory vanished in that orgy of patriotism which followed the expulsion of the in-

vader and the discovery that the Revolution was already a power in other lands than France. . . . Along the entire frontier, from Dunkirk to the Maritime Alps, France nowhere touched a strong, united, and independent people; and along this entire frontier, except in the country opposite Alsace, the armed proselytism of the French Revolution proved a greater force than the influences on which the existing order of things depended. In the Low Countries, in the Principalities of the Rhine, in Switzerland, in Savoy, in Piedmont itself, the doctrines of the Revolution were welcomed by a more or less numerous class, and the armies of France appeared for a moment as the missionaries of liberty and right rather than as an invading enemy. No sooner had Brunswick been brought to a stand by Dumouriez at Valmy than a French division under Custine crossed the Alsatian frontier and advanced upon Spire, where Brunswick had left large stores of war. The garrison was defeated in an encounter outside the town; Spire and Worms surrendered to Custine. In the neighbouring fortress of Mainz, the key to western Germany, Custine's advance was watched with anxious satisfaction by a republican party among the inhabitants, from whom the French general learnt that he had only to appear before the city to become its master. . . . At the news of the capture of Spire, the Archbishop retired into the interior of Germany, leaving the administration to a board of ecclesiastics and officials, who published a manifesto calling upon their ‘beloved brethren’ the citizens to defend themselves to the last extremity, and then followed their master's example. A council of war declared the city to be untenable; and, before Custine had brought up a single siege-gun, the garrison capitulated, and the French were welcomed into Mainz by the partisans of the Republic (Oct. 20). . . . Although the mass of the inhabitants held aloof, a Republic was finally proclaimed, and incorporated with the Republic of France. The success of Custine's raid into Germany did not divert the Convention from the design of attacking Austria in the Netherlands, which Dumouriez had from the first pressed upon the Government. It was not three years since the Netherlands had been in full revolt against the Emperor Joseph. . . . Thus the ground was everywhere prepared for a French occupation. Dumouriez crossed the frontier. The border fortresses no longer existed: and after a single battle won by the French at Jemappes on the 6th November, the Austrians, finding the population universally hostile, abandoned the Netherlands without a struggle. The victory of Jemappes, the first pitched battle won by the Republic, excited an outburst of revolutionary fervour in the Convention which deeply affected the relations of France to Great Britain, hitherto a neutral spectator of the war. A decree was passed for the publication of a manifesto in all languages, declaring that the French nation offered its alliance to all peoples who wished to recover their freedom, and charging the generals of the Republic to give their protection to all persons who had suffered or might suffer in the cause of liberty. (Nov. 19.) A week later Savoy and Nice were annexed to France, the population of Savoy having almost unanimously declared in favour of France on the outbreak of war between France and Sardinia. On the 15th December the Convention proclaimed

that a system of social and political revolution was henceforth to accompany every movement of its armies on foreign soil. 'In every country that shall be occupied by the armies of the French Republic'—such was the substance of the Decree of December 15th—'the generals shall announce the abolition of all existing authorities; of nobility, of serfage, of every feudal right and every monopoly; they shall proclaim the sovereignty of the people. . . . The French nation will treat as enemies any people which, refusing liberty and equality, desires to preserve its prince and privileged castes, or to make any accommodation with them.' This singular announcement of a new crusade caused the Government of Great Britain to arm.—C. A. Fyfe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 1, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the 18th Century*, v. 6, div. 2, ch. 2, sect. 1.—E. Baines, *Hist. of the Wars of the French Rev.*, bk. 1, ch. 3–5 (v. 1).

A.D. 1792 (November–December).—Charges against the King.—Jacobin clamor for his condemnation.—The contest in Convention.—'There were, without a doubt, in this conjuncture, a great number of Mountaineers who, on this occasion, acted with the greatest sincerity, and only as republicans, in whose eyes Louis XVI. appeared guilty with respect to the revolution; and a dethroned king was dangerous to a young democracy. But this party would have been more clement, had it not had to ruin the Gironde at the same time with Louis XVI. . . . Party motives and popular animosities combined against this unfortunate prince. Those who, two months before, would have repelled the idea of exposing him to any other punishment than that of dethronement, were stupefied; so quickly does man lose in moments of crisis the right to defend his opinions! . . . After the 10th of August, there were found in the offices of the civil list documents which proved the secret correspondence of Louis XVI. with the discontented princes, with the emigration, and with Europe. In a report, drawn up at the command of the legislative assembly, he was accused of intending to betray the state and overthrow the revolution. He was accused of having written, on the 16th April, 1791, to the bishop of Clermont, that if he regained his power he would restore the former government, and the clergy to the state in which they previously were; of having afterwards proposed war, merely to hasten the approach of his deliverers; . . . of having been on terms with his brothers, whom his public measures had discountenanced; and, lastly, of having constantly opposed the revolution. Fresh documents were soon brought forward in support of this accusation. In the Tuileries, behind a panel in the wainscot, there was a hole wrought in the wall, and closed by an iron door. This secret closet was pointed out by the minister, Roland, and there were discovered proofs of all the conspiracies and intrigues of the court against the revolution; projects with the popular leaders to strengthen the constitutional power of the king, to restore the ancient régime and the aristocrats; the manœuvres of Talon, the arrangements with Mirabeau, the propositions accepted by Bouillé, under the constituent assembly, and some new plots under the legislative assembly. This discovery increased the exasperation against Louis XVI. Mirabeau's bust was broken by the Jaco-

bins, and the convention covered the one which stood in the hall where it held its sittings. For some time there had been a question in the assembly as to the trial of this prince, who, having been dethroned, could no longer be proceeded against. There was no tribunal empowered to pronounce his sentence, no punishment which could be inflicted on him: accordingly, they plunged into false interpretations of the inviolability granted to Louis XVI., in order to condemn him legally. . . . The committee of legislation, commissioned to draw up a report on the question as to whether Louis XVI. could be tried, and whether he could be tried by the convention, decided in the affirmative. . . . The discussion commenced on the 13th of November, six days after the report of the committee. . . . This violent party [the Mountain], who wished to substitute a coup d'état for a sentence, to follow no law, no form, but to strike Louis XVI. like a conquered prisoner, by making hostilities even survive victory, had but a very feeble majority in the convention; but without, it was strongly supported by the Jacobins and the commune. Notwithstanding the terror which it already inspired, its murderous suggestions were repelled by the convention; and the partisans of inviolability, in their turn, courageously asserted reasons of public interest at the same time as rules of justice and humanity. They maintained that the same men could not be judges and legislators, the jury and the accusers. . . . In a political view, they showed the consequences of the king's condemnation, as it would affect the anarchical party of the kingdom, rendering it still more insolent; and with regard to Europe, whose still neutral powers it would induce to join the coalition against the republic. But Robespierre, who during this long debate displayed a daring and perseverance that presaged his power, appeared at the tribune to support Saint Just, to reproach the convention with involving in doubt what the insurrection had decided, and with restoring, by sympathy and the publicity of a defence, the fallen royalist party. 'The assembly,' said Robespierre, 'has involuntarily been led far away from the real question. Here we have nothing to do with trial: Louis is not an accused man; you are not judges, you are, and can only be statesmen. You have no sentence to pronounce for or against a man, but you are called on to adopt a measure of public safety; to perform an act of national precaution. A dethroned king is only fit for two purposes, to disturb the tranquillity of the state, and shake its freedom, or to strengthen one or the other of them. Louis was king; the republic is founded; the famous question you are discussing is decided in these few words. Louis cannot be tried; he is already tried, he is condemned, or the republic is not absolved.' He required that the convention should declare Louis XVI. a traitor towards the French, criminal towards humanity, and sentence him at once to death, by virtue of the insurrection. The Mountaineers, by these extreme propositions, by the popularity they attained without, rendered condemnation in a measure inevitable. By gaining an extraordinary advance on the other parties, it obliged them to follow it, though at a distance. The majority of the convention, composed in a large part of Girondists, who dared not pronounce Louis XVI. inviolable, and of the Plain, decided, on Pétion's proposition, against the opinion of

the fanatical Mountaineers and against that of the partisans of inviolability, that Louis XVI. should be tried by the convention. Robert Lindet then made, in the name of the commission of the twenty-one, his report respecting Louis XVI. The arraignment, setting forth the offences imputed to him, was drawn up, and the convention summoned the prisoner to its bar."—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: G. H. Lewes, *Life of Robespierre*, ch. 17.—A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Girondists*, bk. 32-33 (v. 2).—A. de Beauchesne, *Louis XVII.: His Life, his Suffering, his Death*, bk. 9.

A. D. 1792-1793 (December—January).—The King's Trial and death sentence.—"On December 11, the ill-fated monarch, taken from his prison to his former palace, appeared at the bar of his republican judges, was received in silence and with covered heads, and answered interrogatories addressed to him as 'Louis Capet,' though with an air of deference. His passive constancy touched many hearts. . . . On the 26th the advocates of the King made an eloquent defence for their discredited client, and Louis added, in a few simple words, that the 'blood of the 10th of August should not be laid to his charge.' The debates in the Assembly now began, and it soon became evident that the Jacobin faction were making the question the means to further their objects, and to hold up their opponents to popular hatred. They clamored for immediate vengeance on the tyrant, declared that the Republic could not be safe until the Court was smitten on its head, and a great example had been given to Europe, and denounced as reactionary and as concealed royalists all who resisted the demands of patriotism. These ferocious invectives were aided by the expedients so often employed with success, and the capital and its mobs were arrayed to intimidate any deputies who hesitated in the 'cause of the Nation.' The Moderates, on the other hand, were divided in mind; a majority, perhaps, condemning the King, but also wishing to spare his life: and the Gironde leaders, halting between their convictions, their feelings, their desires, and their fears, shrank from a courageous and resolute course. The result was such as usually follows when energy and will encounter indecision. On January 14 [the 15th, according to Thiers and others], 1793, the Convention declared Louis XVI. guilty, and on the following day [the speaking and voting lasted through the night of the 16th and the day after it] sentence of immediate death was pronounced by a majority of one [but the minority, in this view, included 26 votes that were cast for death but in favor of a postponement of the penalty, on grounds of political expediency], proposals for a respite and an appeal to the people having been rejected at the critical moment. The votes had been taken after a solemn call of the deputies at a sitting protracted for days; and the spectacle of the vast dim hall, of the shadowy figures of the awestruck judges meting out the fate of their former Sovereign, and tier upon tier of half-seen faces, looking, as in a theatre, on the drama below, and breaking out into discordant clamor, made a fearful impression on many eye-witnesses. One vote excited a sensation of disgust even among the most ruthless chiefs of the Mountain, though it was remarked that many of the abandoned women who crowded the galleries shrieked approbation. The Duke of Orleans, whose Jaco-

bin professions had caused him to be returned for Paris, with a voice in which effrontery mingled with terror, pronounced for the immediate execution of his kinsman. The minister of justice—Danton had resigned—announced on the 20th the sentence to the King. The captive received the message calmly, asked for three days to get ready to die (a request, however, at once refused), and prayed that he might see his family and have a confessor."—W. O'C. Morris, *The French Rev., and First Empire*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev.* (Am. ed.), v. 2, pp. 44-72.—A. F. Bertrand de Moleville, *Private Memoirs, relative to the last year of Louis XVI.*, ch. 39-40.—J. B. Cléry, *Journal of Occurrences at the Temple*.

A. D. 1792-1793 (December—February).—Determination to incorporate the Austrian Netherlands and to attack Holland.—Pitt's unavailing struggle for peace.—England driven to arms.—War with the Maritime Powers declared by the French.—"Since the beginning of December, the French government had contracted their far-reaching schemes within definite limits. They were compelled to give up the hope of revolutionizing the German Empire and establishing a Republic in the British Islands; but they were all the more determined in the resolve to subject the countries which had hitherto been occupied in the name of freedom, to the rule of France. This object was more especially pursued in Belgium by Danton and three other deputies, who were sent as Commissioners of the Convention to that country on the 30th of November. They were directed to enquire into the condition of the Provinces, and to consider Dumouriez's complaints against Pache [the Minister at War] and the Committee formed to purchase supplies for the army." Danton became resolute in the determination to incorporate Belgium and pressed the project inexorably. "It was a matter of course that England would interpose both by word and deed directly France prepared to take possession of Belgium. . . . England had guaranteed the possession of Belgium to the Emperor in 1790—and the closing of the Scheldt to the Dutch, and its political position in Holland to the House of Orange in 1788. Under an imperative sense of her own interests, she had struggled to prevent the French from gaining a footing in Antwerp and Ostend. Prudence, fidelity to treaties, the retrospect of the past and the hopes of the future—all called loudly upon her not to allow the balance of Europe to be disturbed, and least of all in Belgium."—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, bk. 5, ch. 5 (v. 2).—"The French Government resolved to attack Holland, and ordered its generals to enforce by arms the opening of the Scheldt. To do this was to force England into war. Public opinion was already pressing every day harder upon Pitt [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1793-1796]. . . . Across the Channel his moderation was only taken for fear. . . . The rejection of his last offers indeed made a contest inevitable. Both sides ceased from diplomatic communications, and in February 1793 France issued her Declaration of War."—J. R. Green, *Hist. of the English People*, bk. 9, ch. 4 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 22 (v. 6).—Earl Stanhope, *Life of Pitt*, ch. 16 (v. 2).—*Despatches of Earl Gower*, pp. 256-309.

A. D. 1793 (January).—The execution of the king.—“To this conclusion, then, hast thou come, O hapless Louis! The Son of Sixty Kings is to die on the Scaffold by form of Law. Under Sixty Kings this same form of law, form of Society, has been fashioning itself together these thousand years; and has become, one way and other, a most strange Machine. Surely, if needful, it is also frightful, this Machine; dead, blind; not what it should be; which with swift stroke, or by cold slow torture, has wasted the lives and souls of innumerable men. And behold now a King himself or say rather Kinghood in his person, is to expire here in cruel tortures;—like a Phalaris shut in the belly of his own red-heated Brazen Bull! It is ever so; and thou shouldst know it, O haughty tyrannous man: injustice breeds injustice; curses and falsehoods do verily return ‘always home,’ wide as they may wander. Innocent Louis bears the sins of many generations: he too experiences that man’s tribunal is not in this Earth; that if he had no higher one, it were not well with him. A King dying by such violence appeals impressively to the imagination; as the like must do, and ought to do. And yet at bottom it is not the King dying, but the man! Kingship is a coat: the grand loss is of the skin. The man from whom you take his Life, to him can the whole combined world do more? . . . A Confessor has come; Abbé Edgeworth, of Irish extraction, whom the King knew by good report, has come promptly on this solemn mission. Leave the Earth alone, then, thou hapless King; it with its malice will go its way, thou also canst go thine. A hard scene yet remains: the parting with our loved ones. Kind hearts, environed in the same grim peril with us; to be left here! Let the reader look with the eyes of Valet Cléry through these glass-doors, where also the Municipality watches; and see the cruelest of scenes: ‘At half-past eight, the door of the ante-room opened: the Queen appeared first, leading her Son by the hand; then Madame Royale and Madame Elizabeth: they all flung themselves into the arms of the King. Silence reigned for some minutes; interrupted only by sobs.’ . . . For nearly two hours this agony lasts; then they tear themselves asunder. ‘Promise that you will see us on the morrow.’ He promises:—Ah yes, yes; yet once; and go now, ye loved ones; cry to God for yourselves and me!—It was a hard scene, but it is over. He will not see them on the morrow. The Queen in passing through the ante-room, glanced at the Cerberus Municipals; and, with woman’s vehemence, said through her tears, ‘Vous êtes tous des scélérats.’ King Louis slept sound, till five in the morning, when Cléry, as he had been ordered, awoke him. Cléry dressed his hair: while this went forward, Louis took a ring from his watch, and kept trying it on his finger; it was his wedding-ring, which he is now to return to the Queen as a mute farewell. At half-past six, he took the Sacrament, and continued in devotion, and conference with Abbé Edgeworth. He will not see his family: it were too hard to bear. At eight the Municipals enter: the King gives them his Will, and messages and effects; which they, at first, brutally refuse to take charge of: he gives them a roll of gold pieces, a hundred and twenty-five louis; these are to be returned to Malesherbes, who had lent them. At nine, Santerre says the

hour is come. The King begs yet to retire for three minutes. At the end of three minutes, Santerre again says the hour is come. ‘Stamping on the ground with his right-foot, Louis answers: Partons, Let us go.’—How the rolling of those drums comes in, through the Temple bastions and bulwarks, on the heart of a queenly wife; soon to be a widow! He is gone, then, and has not seen us? . . . At the Temple Gate were some faint cries, perhaps from voices of pitiful women: Grâce! Grâce! Through the rest of the streets there is silence as of the grave. No man not armed is allowed to be there: the armed, did any even pity, dare not express it, each man overawed by all his neighbours. All windows are down, none seen looking through them. All shops are shut. No wheel-carriage rolls, this morning, in these streets but one only. 80,000 armed men stand ranked, like armed statues of men; cannons bristle, cannoneers with match burning, but no word or movement: it is as a city enchanted into silence and stone: one carriage with its escort, slowly rumbling, is the only sound. Louis reads, in his Book of Devotion, the Prayers of the Dying: clatter of this death-march falls sharp on the ear, in the great silence; but the thought would fain struggle heavenward, and forget the Earth. As the clock strikes ten, behold the Place de la Révolution, once Place de Louis Quinze: the Guillotine, mounted near the old Pedestal where once stood the Statue of that Louis! Far round, all bristles with cannons and armed men; spectators crowding in the rear; D’Orléans Egalité there in cabriolet. . . . Heedless of all Louis reads his Prayers of the Dying; not till five minutes yet has he finished; then the Carriage opens. What temper he is in? Ten different witnesses will give ten different accounts of it. He is in the collision of all tempers; arrived now at the black Mahlstrom and descent of Death: in sorrow, in indignation, in resignation struggling to be resigned. ‘Take care of M. Edgeworth,’ he straitly charges the Lieutenant who is sitting with them: then they two descend. The drums are beating: ‘Taisez-vous, Silence!’ he cries ‘in a terrible voice, d’une voix terrible.’ He mounts the scaffold, not without delay; he is in puce coat, breeches of gray, white stockings. He strips off the coat; stands disclosed in a sleeve-waistcoat of white flannel. The executioners approach to bind him: he spurs, resists; Abbé Edgeworth has to remind him how the Saviour, in whom men trust, submitted to be bound. His hands are tied, his head bare; the fatal moment is come. He advances to the edge of the Scaffold, ‘his face very red,’ and says: ‘Frenchmen, I die innocent: it is from the Scaffold and near appearing before God that I tell you so. I pardon my enemies; I desire that France—’ A General on horseback, Santerre or another, prances out with uplifted hand: ‘Tambours!’ The drums drown the voice. ‘Executioners, do your duty!’ The Executioners, desperate lest themselves be murdered (for Santerre and his Armed Ranks will strike, if they do not), seize the hapless Louis: six of them desperate, him singly desperate, struggling there; and bind him to their plank. Abbé Edgeworth, stooping, bespeaks him: ‘Son of Saint Louis, ascend to Heaven.’ The Axe clanks down; a King’s Life is shorn away. It is Monday the 21st of January 1793. He was aged 38 years four months and 28 days. Executioner

Samson shows the Head: fierce shouts of *Vive la République* rises, and swells; caps raised on bayonets, hats waving: students of the College of Four Nations take it up, on the far Quais; fling it over Paris. D'Orléans drives off in his cabriolet: the Townhall Councillors rub their hands, saying, 'It is done, It is done.' . . . In the coffee-houses that evening, says Prudhomme, Patriot shook hands with Patriot in a more cordial manner than usual. Not till some days after, according to Mercier, did public men see what a grave thing it was. A grave thing it indisputably is; and will have consequences. . . . At home this Killing of a King has divided all friends; and abroad it has united all enemies. Fraternity of Peoples, Revolutionary Propagandism; Atheism, Regicide; total destruction of social order in this world! All Kings, and lovers of Kings, and haters of Anarchy, rank in coalition; as in a war for life."—T. Carlyle, *The Fr. Rev.*, v. 3, bk. 2, ch. 8.

A. D. 1793 (February—April).—Increasing anarchy.—Degradation of manners.—Formation of the terrible Revolutionary Tribunal.—Treacherous designs of Dumouriez.—His invasion of Holland.—His defeat at Neerwinden and retreat.—His flight to the enemy.—"While the French were . . . throwing down the gauntlet to all Europe, their own country seemed sinking into anarchical dissolution. Paris was filled with tumult, insurrection and robbery. At the denunciations of Marat against 'forestallers,' the shops were entered by the mob, who carried off articles at their own prices, and sometimes without paying at all. The populace was agitated by the harangues of low itinerant demagogues. Rough and brutal manners were affected, and all the courtesies of life abolished. The revolutionary leaders adopted a dress called the 'carmagnole,' consisting of enormous black pantaloons, a short jacket, a three-coloured waistcoat, and a Jacobite wig of short black hair, a terrible moustache, the 'bonnet rouge,' and an enormous sabre. [The name Carmagnole was also given to a tune and a dance; it is supposed to have borne originally some reference not now understood to Carmagnola in Piedmont.] Moderate persons of no strong political opinions were denounced as 'suspected,' and their crime stigmatised by the newly coined word of 'moderantisme.' The variations of popular feeling were recorded like the heat of the weather, or the rising of a flood. The principal articles in the journals were entitled 'Thermometer of the Public Mind;' the Jacobins talked of . . . being 'up to the level.' Many of the provinces were in a disturbed state. A movement had been organising in Brittany ever since 1791, but the death of the Marquis de la Rouarie, its principal leader, had for the present suspended it. A more formidable insurrection was preparing in La Vendée. . . . It was in the midst of these disturbances, aggravated by a suspicion of General Dumouriez's treachery, which we shall presently have to relate, that the terrible court known as the Revolutionary Tribunal was established. It was first formally proposed in the Convention March 9th, by Carrier, the miscreant afterwards notorious by his massacres at Nantes, urged by Cambacérès on the 10th, and completed that very night at the instance of Danton, who rushed to the tribune, insisted that the Assembly should not

separate, till the new Court had been organised. . . . The extraordinary tribunal of August 1792 had not been found to work fast enough, and it was now superseded by this new one, which became in fact only a method of massacring under the form of law. The Revolutionary Tribunal was designed to take cognisance of all counter-revolutionary attempts, of all attacks upon liberty, equality, the unity and indivisibility of the Republic, the internal and external safety of the State. A commission of six members of the Convention was to examine and report upon the cases to be brought before it, to draw up and present the acts of accusation. The tribunal was to be composed of a jury to decide upon the facts, five judges to apply the law, a public accuser, and two substitutes; from its sentence there was no appeal. Meanwhile Dumouriez had returned to the army, very dissatisfied that he had failed in his attempts to save the King and baffle the Jacobins. He had formed the design of invading Holland, dissolving the Revolutionary Committee in that country, annulling the decree of Dec. 15th, offering neutrality to the English, a suspension of arms to the Austrians, reuniting the Belgian and Batavian republics, and proposing to France a re-union with them. In case of refusal, he designed to march upon Paris, dissolve the Convention, extinguish Jacobinism; in short, to play the part of Monk in England. This plan was confided to four persons only, among whom Danton is said to have been one. . . . Dumouriez, having directed General Miranda to lay siege to Maestricht, left Antwerp for Holland, Feb. 22nd, and by March 4th had seized Breda, Klundert and Gertruydenberg. Austria, at the instance of England, had pushed forward 112,000 men under Prince Josias of Saxe-Coburg. Clairfait, with his army, at this time occupied Berghem, where he was separated from the French only by the little river Roer and the fortress of Juliers. Coburg, having joined Clairfait, March 1st, crossed the Roer, defeated the French under Dampierre at Altenhoven, and thus compelled Miranda to raise the siege of Maestricht, and retire towards Tongres. Aix-la-Chapelle was entered by the Austrians after a smart contest, and the French compelled to retreat upon Liège, while the divisions under Stengel and Neully, being cut off by this movement, were thrown back into Limburg. The Austrians then crossed the Meuse, and took Liège, March 6th. Dumouriez was now compelled to concentrate his forces at Louvain. From this place he wrote a threatening letter to the Convention, March 11th, denouncing the proceedings of the ministry, the acts of oppression committed in Belgium, and the decree of December 15th. This letter threw the Committee of General Defence into consternation. It was resolved to keep it secret, and Danton and Lacroix set off for Dumouriez's camp, to try what they could do with him, but found him inflexible. His proceedings had already unmasked his designs. At Antwerp he had ordered the Jacobin Club to be closed, and the members to be imprisoned, at Brussels he had dissolved the legion of 'sans-culottes.' Dumouriez was defeated by Prince Coburg at Neerwinden, March 18th, and again on the 22nd at Louvain. In a secret interview with the Austrian Colonel Mack, a day or two after, at Ath, he announced to that

officer his intention to march on Paris and establish a constitutional monarchy, but nothing was said as to who was to wear the crown. The Austrians were to support Dumouriez's advance upon Paris, but not to show themselves except in case of need, and he was to have the command of what Austrian troops he might select. The French now continued their retreat, which, in consequence of these negotiations, was unmolested. The Archduke Charles and Prince Coburg entered Brussels March 25th, and the Dutch towns were shortly after retaken. When Dumouriez arrived with his van at Courtrai, he was met by three emissaries of the Jacobins, sent apparently to sound him. He bluntly told them that his design was to save France, whether they called him Cæsar, Cromwell or Monk, denounced the Convention as an assembly of tyrants, said that he despised their decrees. . . . At St. Amand he was met by Beurnonville, then minister of war, who was to supersede him in the command, and by four commissaries despatched by the Convention." Dumouriez arrested these, delivered them to Clairfait, and they were sent to Maestricht. "The allies were so sanguine that Dumouriez's defection would put an end to the Revolution, that Lord Auckland and Count Stahrenberg, the Austrian minister, looking upon the dissolution and flight of the Convention as certain, addressed a joint note to the States-General, requesting them not to shelter such members of it as had taken any part in the condemnation of Louis XVI. But Dumouriez's army was not with him. On the road to Condé he was fired on by a body of volunteers and compelled to fly for his life (April 4th)." The day following he abandoned his army and went over to the Austrian quarters at Tournay, with a few companions, thus ending his political and military career. "The situation of France at this time seemed almost desperate. The army of the North was completely disorganised through the treachery of Dumouriez; the armies of the Rhine and Moselle were retreating; those of the Alps and Italy were expecting an attack; on the eastern side of the Pyrenees the troops were without artillery, without generals, almost without bread, while on the western side the Spaniards were advancing towards Bayonne. Brest, Cherbourg, the coasts of Brittany, were threatened by the English. The ocean ports contained only six ships of the line ready for sea, and the Mediterranean fleet was being repaired at Toulon. But the energy of the revolutionary leaders was equal to the occasion."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 5 (v. 4).

ALSO IN A. Griffiths, *French Revolutionary Generals*, ch. 5.—F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the 18th Century*, v. 6, div. 2, ch. 2, sect. 1-2.—C. MacFarlane, *The Fr. Rev.*, v. 3, ch. 11.

A. D. 1793 (March—April).—The insurrection in La Vendée.—"Ever since the abolition of royalty and the constitution of 1790, that is, since the 10th of August, a condemnatory and threatening silence had prevailed in Normandy. Bretagne exhibited still more hostile sentiments, and the people there were engrossed by fondness for the priests and the gentry. Nearer to the banks of the Loire, this attachment amounted to insurrection; and lastly, on the left bank of that river, in the Bocage, Le Loroux, and La Vendée, the insurrection was complete, and large armies of

ten and twenty thousand men were already in the field. . . . It was particularly on this left bank, in Anjou, and Upper and Lower Poitou, that the famous war of La Vendée had broken out. It was in this part of France that the influence of time was least felt, and that it had produced least change in the ancient manners. The feudal system had there acquired a truly patriarchal character; and the Revolution, instead of operating a beneficial reform in the country, had shocked the most kindly habits and been received as a persecution. The Bocage and the Marais constitute a singular country, which it is necessary to describe, in order to convey an idea of the manners of the population, and the kind of society that was formed there. Setting out from Nantes and Saumur and proceeding from the Loire to the sands of Olonne, Luçon, Fontenay, and Niort, you meet with an unequal undulating soil, intersected by ravines and crossed by a multitude of hedges, which serve to fence in each field, and which have on this account obtained for the country the name of the Bocage. As you approach the sea the ground declines, till it terminates in salt marshes, and is everywhere cut up by a multitude of small canals, which render access almost impossible. This is what is called the Marais. The only abundant produce in this country is pasture, consequently cattle are plentiful. The peasants there grew only just sufficient corn for their own consumption, and employed the produce of their herds and flocks as a medium of exchange. It is well known that no people are more simple than those subsisting by this kind of industry. Few great towns had been built in these parts. They contained only large villages of two or three thousand souls. Between the two high-roads leading, the one from Tours to Poitiers, and the other from Nantes to La Rochelle, extended a tract thirty leagues in breadth, where there were none but cross-roads leading to villages and hamlets. The country was divided into a great number of small farms paying a rent of from five to six hundred francs, each let to a single family, which divided the produce of the cattle with the proprietor of the land. From this division of farms, the seigneurs had to treat with each family, and kept up a continual and easy intercourse with them. The simplest mode of life prevailed in the mansions of the gentry: they were fond of the chase, on account of the abundance of game; the gentry and the peasants hunted together, and they were all celebrated for their skill and vigour. The priests, men of extraordinary purity of character, exercised there a truly paternal ministry. . . . When the Revolution, so beneficent in other quarters, reached this country, with its iron level, it produced profound agitation. It had been well if it could have made an exception there, but that was impossible. . . . When the removal of the non-juring priests deprived the peasants of the ministers in whom they had confidence, they were vehemently exasperated, and, as in Bretagne, they ran into the woods and travelled to a considerable distance to attend the ceremonies of a worship, the only true one in their estimation. From that moment a violent hatred was kindled in their souls, and the priests neglected no means of fanning the flames. The 10th of August drove several Poitevin nobles back to their estates; the 21st of January estranged

them, and they communicated their indignation to those about them. They did not conspire, however, as some have conceived. The known dispositions of the country had incited men who were strangers to it to frame plans of conspiracy. One had been hatched in Bretagne, but none was formed in the Bocage; there was no concerted plan there; the people suffered themselves to be driven to extremity. At length, the levy of 300,000 men excited in the month of March a general insurrection. . . . Obligated to take arms, they chose rather to fight against the republic than for it. Nearly about the same time, that is, at the beginning of March, the drawing was the occasion of an insurrection in the Upper Bocage and in the Marais. On the 10th of March, the drawing was to take place at St. Florent, near Ancenis, in Anjou. The young men refused to draw. The guard endeavoured to force them to comply. The military commandant ordered a piece of cannon to be pointed and fired at the mutineers. They dashed forward with their bludgeons, made themselves masters of the piece, disarmed the guard, and were, at the same time, not a little astonished at their own temerity. A carrier, named Cathelineau, a man highly esteemed in that part of the country, possessing great bravery and powers of persuasion, quitting his farm on hearing the tidings, hastened to join them, rallied them, roused their courage, and gave some consistency to the insurrection by his skill in keeping it up. The very same day he resolved to attack a republican post consisting of eighty men. The peasants followed him with their bludgeons and their muskets. After a first volley, every shot of which told, because they were excellent marksmen, they rushed upon the post, disarmed it, and made themselves master of the position. Next day, Cathelineau proceeded to Chemillé, which he likewise took, in spite of 200 republicans and three pieces of cannon. A gamekeeper at the château of Maulevrier, named Stofflet, and a young peasant of the village of Chanzeau, had on their part collected a band of peasants. These came and joined Cathelineau, who conceived the daring design of attacking Chollet, the most considerable town in the country, the chief place of a district, and guarded by 500 republicans. . . . The victorious band of Cathelineau entered Chollet, seized all the arms that it could find, and made cartridges out of the charges of the cannon. It was always in this manner that the Vendéans procured ammunition. . . . Another much more general revolt had broken out in the Marais and the department of La Vendée. At Machecoul and Challans, the recruiting was the occasion of a universal insurrection. . . . Three hundred republicans were shot by parties of 20 or 30. . . . In the department of La Vendée, that is, to the south of the theatre of this war, the insurrection assumed still more consistence. The national guards of Fontenay, having set out on their march for Chantonnay, were repulsed and beaten. Chantonnay was plundered. General Verteuil, who commanded the 11th military division, on receiving intelligence of this defeat, dispatched General Marcé with 1,200 men, partly troops of the line, and partly national guards. The rebels who were met at St. Vincent, were repulsed. General Marcé had time to add 1,200 more men and nine pieces of cannon to his little army. In

marching upon St. Fulgent, he again fell in with the Vendéans in a valley and stopped to restore a bridge which they had destroyed. About four in the afternoon of the 18th of March, the Vendéans, taking the initiative, advanced and attacked him . . . and made themselves masters of the artillery, the ammunition, and the arms, which the soldiers threw away that they might be the lighter in their flight. These more important successes in the department of La Vendée properly so called, procured for the insurgents the name of Vendéans, which they afterwards retained, though the war was far more active out of La Vendée. The pillage committed by them in the Marais caused them to be called brigands, though the greater number did not deserve that appellation. The insurrection extended into the Marais from the environs of Nantes to Les Sables, and into Anjou and Poitou, as far as the environs of Vihiers and Parthenay. . . . Easter recalled all the insurgents to their homes, from which they never would stay away long. To them a war was a sort of sporting excursion of several days; they carried with them a sufficient quantity of bread for the time, and then returned to inflame their neighbours by the accounts which they gave. Places of meeting were appointed for the month of April. The insurrection was then general and extended over the whole surface of the country. It might be comprised in a line which, commencing at Nantes, would pass through Pornic, the Isle of Noirmoutiers, Les Sables, Luçon, Fontenay, Niort, and Parthenay, and return by Airvault, Thouar, Doué, and St. Florent, to the Loire. The insurrection, begun by men who were not superior to the peasants whom they commanded, excepting by their natural qualities, was soon continued by men of a higher rank. The peasants went to the mansions and forced the nobles to put themselves at their head. The whole Marais insisted on being commanded by Charette. . . . In the Bocage, the peasants applied to Messrs. de Bonchamps, d'Elbée, and de Laroche-Jacquelein, and forced them from their mansions to place them at their head." These gentlemen were afterwards joined by M. de Lescure, a cousin of Henri de Laroche-Jacquelein.—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev. (Am. ed.)*, v. 2, pp. 146-152.

ALSO IN Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, ch. 12, (v. 3).—Marquise de Larochejacquelein, *Memoirs*.—Henri Larochejacquelein and the War in La Vendée, (*Chambers Miscellany*, v. 2).—L. I. Guiney, *Monsieur Henri (de La Rochejacquelein)*.

A. D. 1793 (March—June).—Vigorous measures of the Revolutionary government.—The Committee of Public Safety.—The final struggle of Jacobins and Girondins.—The fall of the Girondins.—The news of the defeat of Dumouriez at Neerwinden, which reached Paris on the 21st, "brought about two important measures. Jean Debry, on behalf of the Diplomatic Committee, proposed that all strangers should be expelled from France within eight days who could not give a good reason for their residence, and on the same evening the Committee of General Defence was reorganized and placed on another footing. This committee had come into existence in January, 1793. It originally consisted of 21 members, who were not directly elected by the Convention, but were chosen from the seven most important commit-

tees. But now, after the news of Neerwinden, a powerful committee was directly elected. It consisted of 24 members, and the first committee contained nine Girondins, nine deputies of the Plain, and six Jacobins, including every representative man in the Convention. . . . The new Committee was given the greatest powers, and after first proposing to the Convention that the penalty of death should be decreed against every émigré over fourteen, and to every one who protected an émigré, it proposed that Dumouriez should be summoned to the bar of the Convention." Early in April, news of the desertion of Dumouriez and the retreat of Custine, "made the Convention decide on yet further measures to strengthen the executive. Marat, who, like Danton and Robespierre, was statesman enough to perceive the need of strengthening the executive, proposed that enlarged powers should be given to the committees; and Isnard, as the reporter of the Committee of General Defence, proposed the establishment of a smaller committee of nine, with supreme and unlimited executive powers—a proposal which was warmly supported by every statesman in the Convention. . . . It is noticeable that every measure which strengthened the terror when it was finally established was decreed while the Girondins could command a majority in the Convention, and that it was a Girondin, Isnard, who proposed the immense powers of the Committee of Public Safety [Comité de Salut Public]. Upon April 6 Isnard brought up a decree defining the powers of the new committee. It was to consist of nine deputies; to confer in secret; to have supreme executive power, and authority to spend certain sums of money without accounting for them, and it was to present a weekly report to the Convention. These immense powers were granted under the pressure of news from the frontier, and it was obvious that it would not be long before such a powerful executive could conquer the independence of the Convention. Isnard's proposals were opposed by Buzot, but decreed; and on April 7 the first Committee of Public Safety was elected. It consisted of the following members:—Barère, Delmas, Bréard, Cambon, Danton, Guyton-Morveau, Treilhard, Lacroix, and Robert Lindet. The very first proposal of the new committee was that it should appoint three representatives with every army from among the deputies of the Convention, with unlimited powers, who were to report to the committee itself. This motion was followed by a very statesmanlike one from Danton. He perceived the folly of the decree of November 18, which declared universal war against all kings. . . . On his proposition the fatal decree . . . was withdrawn, and it was made possible for France again to enter into the comity of European nations. It is very obvious that it was the foreign war which had developed the progress of the Revolution with such astonishing rapidity in France. It was Brunswick's manifesto which mainly caused the attack on the Tuileries on August 10; it was the surrender of Verdun which directly caused the massacres of September. It was the battle of Neerwinden which established the Revolutionary Tribunal, and that defeat and the desertion of Dumouriez which brought about the establishment of the Committee of Public Safety. The Girondins were chiefly responsible for the great

war, and its first result was to destroy them as a party. . . . Their early influence over the deputies of the Plain rested on a belief in their statesmanlike powers, but as time went on that influence steadily diminished. It was in vain for Danton to attempt to make peace in the Convention; bitter words on both sides had left too strong an impression ever to be effaced. The Jacobin leaders despised the Girondins; the Girondins hated the Jacobins for having won away power from them. The Jacobins formed a small but very united body, of which every member knew its own mind; they were determined to carry on the Republic at all costs, and to destroy the Girondins as quickly as they could. . . . The desertion of Dumouriez had caused strong measures to be taken by the Convention, . . . and all parties had concurred. . . . But as soon as these important measures had been taken, which the majority of the Convention believed would enable France once more to free her frontiers from the invaders, the Girondins and Jacobins turned upon each other with redoubled ardour, and the death-struggle between them recommenced. The Girondins reopened the struggle with an attack upon Marat. Few steps could have been more foolish, for Marat, though in many ways a real statesman, had from the exaggeration of his language never obtained the influence in the Convention to which his abilities entitled him. . . . But he remained the idol of the people of Paris, and in attacking him the Girondins exasperated the people of Paris in the person of their beloved journalist. On April 11 Guadet read a placard in the Convention, which Marat had posted on the walls of Paris, full of his usual libellous abuse of the Girondins. It was referred to the Committee of Legislation with other writings of Marat," and two days later, on the report of the Committee, it was voted by the Convention (half of its members being absent), that Marat should be sent before the Tribunal for trial. This called out immediate demonstrations from Marat's Parisian admirers. "On April 15, in the name of 35 sections of Paris, Pache and Hébert demanded the expulsion from the Convention of 22 of the leading Girondists as 'disturbers of the public peace,' including Brissot, Guadet, Vergniaud, Gensonné, Buzot, Barbaroux, Louvet, Pétion, and Lanjuinais. . . . On April 22 the trial of Marat took place. He was unanimously acquitted, although most of the judges of the Revolutionary Tribunal sympathized with the Girondins. . . . The acquittal of Marat was a fearful blow to the Girondin party; they had in no way discredited the Jacobins, and had only made themselves unpopular in Paris. . . . The Commune of Paris steadily organized the more advanced republicans of the city for an open attack upon the Girondins. . . . Throughout the month of May, preparations for the final struggle went on; it was recognized by both parties that they must appeal to force, and arrangements for appealing to force were made as openly for the coup d'état of May 31 as they had been for that of August 10. On the one side, the Commune of Paris steadily concentrated its armed strength and formed its plan of action; on the other, the leading Girondins met daily at the house of Valazé, and prepared to move decrees in the Convention." But the Girondins were still divided among themselves.

Some wished to appeal to the provinces, against Paris, which meant civil war; others opposed this as unpatriotic. On the 31st of May, and on the two days following, the Commune of Paris called out its mob to execute the determined coup d'état. On the last of these three days (June 2), the Convention surrounded, imprisoned and terrorized by armed ruffians, led by Henriot, lately appointed Commander of the National Guard, submissively decreed that the proscribed Girondin deputies, with others, to the number altogether of 31, should be placed under arrest in their own houses. This "left the members of the Mountain predominant in the Convention. The deputies of the Marsh or Plain were now docile to the voice of the Jacobin leaders," whose supremacy was now without dispute. On the preceding day, an attempt had been made, on the order of the Commune, to arrest M. Roland and two others of the ministers. Roland escaped, but Madame Roland, the more important Girondist leader, was taken and consigned to the Abbaye.—H. M. Stephens, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, v. 2, ch. 7-8.

ALSO IN H. A. Taine, *The Fr. Rev.*, bk. 4, ch. 13. W. Smyth, *Lects. on the Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, lect. 37 (v. 2).—H. Von Sybel, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, bk. 7, ch. 1-3 (v. 3).

A. D. 1793 (March—September).—Formation of the great European Coalition against Revolutionary France.—The seeds of disension and weakness in it.—"The impression made at St. Petersburg by the execution of Louis was fully as vivid as at London; already it was evident that these two capitals were the centres of the great contest which was approaching. . . . An intimate and confidential correspondence immediately commenced between Count Woronzoff, the Russian ambassador at London, and Lord Grenville, the British secretary of state for foreign affairs, which terminated in a treaty between the powers, signed in London on the 25th of March. By this convention, which laid the basis of the grand alliance which afterwards brought the war to a glorious termination, it was provided that the two powers should 'employ their respective forces, as far as circumstances shall permit, in carrying on the just and necessary war in which they find themselves engaged against France; and they reciprocally engage not to lay down their arms without restitution of all the conquests which may have been made upon either of the respective powers, or upon such other states or allies to whom, by common consent, they shall extend the benefit of this treaty.' . . . Shortly after [April 25], a similar convention was entered into between Great Britain and Sardinia, by which the latter power was to receive an annual subsidy of £200,000 during the whole continuance of the war, and the former to keep on foot an army of 50,000 men; and the English government engaged to procure for it entire restitution of its dominions as they stood at the commencement of the war. By another convention, with the cabinet of Madrid, signed at Aranjuez on the 25th of May, they engaged not to make peace till they had obtained full restitution for the Spaniards 'of all places, towns, and territories which belonged to them at the commencement of the war, and which the enemy may have taken during its continuance.' A similar treaty was entered into with the court of the Two

Sicilies, and with Prussia [July 12 and 14], in which the clauses, prohibiting all exportation to France, and preventing the trade of neutrals with it, were the same as in the Russian treaty. Treaties of the same tenor were concluded in the course of the summer with the Emperor of Germany [August 30], and the King of Portugal [September 26]. Thus was all Europe arrayed in a great league against Republican France, and thus did the regicides of that country, as the first fruits of their cruel triumph, find themselves excluded from the pale of civilized nations. . . . But while all Europe thus resounded with the note of military preparation against France, Russia had other and more interested designs in view. Amidst the general consternation at the triumphs of the French republicans, Catharine conceived that she would be permitted to pursue, without molestation, her ambitious designs against Poland [See POLAND: A. D. 1793-1796]. She constantly represented the disturbances in that kingdom as the fruit of revolutionary propagandism, which it was indispensable to crush in the first instance. . . . The ambitious views of Prussia were also . . . strongly turned in the same direction. . . . Nor was it only the ambitious projects of Russia and Prussia against the independence of Poland which already gave ground for gloomy augury as to the issue of the war. Its issue was more immediately affected by the jealousy of Austria and Prussia, which now broke out in the most undisguised manner, and occasioned such a division of the allied forces as effectually prevented any cordial or effective co-operation continuing to exist between them. The Prussian cabinet, mortified at the lead which the Imperial generals took in the common operations, insisted upon the formation of two independent German armies; one composed of Prussians, the other of Austrians, to one or other of which the forces of all the minor states should be joined: those of Saxony, Hanover, and Hesse being grouped around the standards of Prussia; those of Bavaria, Wirtemberg, Swabia, the Palatinate, and Franconia, following the double-headed eagles of Austria. By this means, all unity of action between the two grand allied armies was broken up. . . . Prince Cobourg was appointed generalissimo of the allied Armies from the Rhine to the German ocean." In April, a corps of 20,000 English had been landed in Holland, "under the command of the Duke of York, and being united to 10,000 Hanoverians and Hessians, formed a total of 30,000 men in British pay." Holland, as an ally of England, was already in the Coalition, the French having declared war, in February, against the two maritime powers, simultaneously.—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, ch. 13 (v. 4).

ALSO IN F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the 18th Century*, v. 6, div. 2, ch. 2, sect. 3.

A. D. 1793 (April—August): Minister Genet in America.—Washington's proclamation of neutrality. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1793.

A. D. 1793 (June).—Flight of most of the Girondists.—Their appeal to the country.—Insurrection in the provinces.—The rising at Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux, Toulon.—Progress of the Vendean revolt.—"After this day [of the events which culminated on the 2d of June, but which are commonly referred to as

being of 'the 31st of May,' when they began], when the people made no other use of their power than to display and to exercise the pressure of Paris over the representation, they separated without committing any excess. . . . La Montaigne caused the committees to be reinstated on the morrow, with the exception of that of public safety. They threw into the majority their most decided members. . . . They deposed those ministers suspected of attachment to the conquered; sent commissioners into the doubtful departments; annulled the project of the constitution proposed by the Girondists; and charged the committee of safety to draw up in eight days a project for the constitution entirely democratical. They pressed forward the recruiting and armament of the revolutionary army—that levy of patriotism en masse. They decreed a forced loan of a million upon the rich. They sent one after the other, accused upon accused, to the revolutionary tribunal. Their sittings were no longer deliberation, but cursory motions, decreed on the instant by acclamation, and sent immediately to the different committees for execution. They stripped the executive power of the little independence and responsibility it heretofore retained. Continually called into the bosom of their committees, ministers became no more than the passive executors of the measures they decreed. From this day, also, discussion was at an end; action was all. The disappearance of the Girondists deprived the Revolution of its voice. Eloquence was proscribed with Vergniaud, with the exception of those few days when the great party chiefs, Danton and Robespierre, spoke, not to refute opinions, but to intimate their will, and promulgate their orders. The Assemblies became almost mute. A dead silence reigned henceforth in the Convention. In the meanwhile the 22 Girondists [excepting Vergniaud, Gensonné, Ducos, Tonfrède, and a few others, who remained under the decree of arrest, facing all consequences], the members of the Commission of Twelve, and a certain number of their friends, warned of their danger by this first blow of ostracism, fled into their departments, and hurried to protest against the mutilation of the country. . . . Robespierre, Danton, the Committee of Public Safety, and even the people themselves, seemed to shut their eyes to these evasions, as if desirous to be rid of victims whom it would pain them to strike. Buzot, Barbaroux, Guadet, Louvet, Salles, Pétion, Bergoing, Lesage, Cressy, Kervélégan and Lanjuinais, threw themselves into Normandy; and after having traversed it, inciting all the departments between Paris and the Ocean, established at Caen the focus and centre of insurrection against the tyranny of Paris. They gave themselves the name of the Central Assembly of Resistance to Oppression. Biroteau and Chasset had arrived at Lyons. The armed sections of this town were agitated with contrary and already bloody commotion [the Jacobin municipality having been overthrown, after hard fighting, and its chief, Chalier, put to death]. Brissot fled to Moulins, Robaut St. Etienne to Nismes. Grangeneuve, sent by Vergniaud, Tonfrède, and Ducos, to Bordeaux, raised troops ready to march upon the capital. Toulouse followed the same impulse of resistance to Paris. The departments of the west were on fire, and rejoiced to see the republic, torn into contending factions, offer

them the aid of one of the two parties for the restoration of royalty. The mountainous centre of France . . . was agitated. . . . Marseilles enrolled 10,000 men at the voice of Rebecqui and the young friends of Barbaroux. They imprisoned the commissioners of the Convention, Roux and Antiboul. Royalty, always brooding in the south, insensibly transformed this movement of patriotism into a monarchical insurrection. Rebecqui, in despair . . . at seeing loyalty avail itself of the rising in the south, escaped remorse by suicide, throwing himself into the sea. Lyons and Bordeaux likewise imprisoned the envoys of the Convention as Maratists. The first columns of the combined army of the departments began to move in all directions; 6,000 Marseillais were already at Avignon, ready to reascend the Rhone, and form a junction with the insurgents of Nismes and of Lyons. Brittany and Normandy uniting, concentrated their first forces at Evreux."—A de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Girondists*, bk. 43 (v. 3).—The royalists of the west, "during this almost general rising of the departments, continued to extend their enterprises. After their first victories, the Vendéans seized on Bressure, Argenton, and Thouars. Entirely masters of their own country, they proposed getting possession of the frontiers, and opening the way to revolutionary France, as well as communications with England. On the 6th of June, the Vendean army, composed of 40,000 men, under Cathelineau, Lescure, Stofflet, and La Rochejacquelin, marched on Saumur, which it took by storm. It then prepared to attack and capture Nantes, to secure the possession of its own country, and become masters of the course of the Loire. Cathelineau, at the head of the Vendean troops, left a garrison in Saumur, took Angers, crossed the Loire, pretended to advance upon Tours and Lemans, and then rapidly threw himself upon Nantes, which he attacked on the right bank, while Charette was to attack it on the left."—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, ch. 8.

A. D. 1793 (June—October).—The new Jacobin Constitution postponed.—Concentration of power in the Committee of Public Safety.—The irresistible machine of revolutionary government.—"It was while affairs were in this critical condition that the Mountain undertook the sole conduct of the government in France. They had hitherto resisted all attempts of the Girondists to establish a new constitution in place of that of 1791. They now undertook the work themselves, and in four days drew up a constitution, as simple as it was democratic, which was issued on the 24th of June. Every citizen of the age of 21 could vote directly in the election of deputies, who were chosen for a year at a time and were to sit in a single assembly. The assembly had the sole power of making laws, but a period was fixed during which the constituents could protest against its enactments. The executive power was entrusted to 24 men, who were chosen by the assembly from candidates nominated by electors chosen by the original voters. Twelve out of the 24 were to be renewed every six months. But this constitution was intended merely to satisfy the departments, and was never put into practice. The condition of France required a greater concentration of power, and this was supplied by the Committee of Public

Safety. Ever since the 6th of April the original members of the Committee had been re-elected, but on the 10th of July its composition was changed. Danton ceased to be a member, and Barère was joined by Robespierre, St. Just, Couthon, Billaud-Varennes, Collot d'Herbois, and, in a short time, Carnot. These men became the absolute rulers of France. The Committee had no difficulty in carrying their measures in the Convention, from which the opposition party had disappeared. All the state obligations were rendered uniform and inscribed in 'the great book of the national debt.' The treasury was filled by a compulsory loan from the rich. Every income between 1,000 and 10,000 francs had to pay ten per cent., and every excess over 10,000 francs had to be contributed in its entirety for one year. To recruit the army a levée en masse was decreed. 'The young men shall go to war; the married men shall forge arms and transport supplies; the wives shall make tents and clothes and serve in the hospitals; the children shall tear old linen into lint; the aged shall resort to the public places to excite the courage of the warriors and hatred against kings.' Nor were measures neglected against domestic enemies. On the 6th of September a revolutionary army, consisting of 6,000 men and 1,200 artillery men, was placed at the disposal of the Committee to carry out its orders throughout France. On the 17th the famous 'law of the suspects' was carried. Under the term 'suspect' were included all those who by words, acts or writings had shown themselves in favour of monarchy or of federalism, the relatives of the emigrants, etc., and they were to be imprisoned until the peace. As the people were in danger of famine, a maximum price, already established for corn, was decreed for all necessities; if a merchant gave up his trade he became a suspect, and the hoarding of provisions was punished by death. On the 10th of October the Convention definitely transferred its powers to the Committee, by subjecting all officials to its authority and by postponing the trial of the new constitution until the peace."—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, ch. 23, sect. 11.—The Committee of Public Safety—the "Revolutionary Government," as Danton had named it, on the 2d of August, when he demanded the fearful powers that were given to it—"disposed of all the national forces; it appointed and dismissed the ministers, generals, Representatives on Mission, the judges and juries of the Revolutionary Tribunal. The latter instrument became its strong arm; it was, in fact, a court martial worked by civil magistrates. By its agents it directed the departments and armies, the political situation without and within, striking down at the same time the rebels within and the enemies without: for, together with the constitution were, of course, suspended the municipal laws and the political machinery of the communes; and thus cities and villages hitherto indifferent or opposed to the Revolution were republicanized. By the Tribunal it disposed of the persons of individuals; by requisition and the law of maximum (with which we are going to be better acquainted) it disposed of their fortunes. It can, indeed, be said that the whole of France was placed in a state of siege; but that was the price of its salvation. . . . But Danton has committed a great mistake,—one that he and

especially France, will come to rue. He has declined to become a member of the Revolutionary Government, which has been established on his motion. 'It is my firm resolve not to be a member of such a government,' he had said. In other words, he has declined re-election as a member of the Committee de Salut Public, now it has been erected into a dictatorship. He unfortunately lacked all ambition. . . . When afterwards, on Sept. 8, one Gaston tells the Convention, 'Danton has a mighty revolutionary head. No one understands so well as he to execute what he himself proposes. I therefore move that he be added to the Revolutionary Government, in spite of his protest,' and it is so unanimously ordered, he again peremptorily declines. 'No, I will not be a member; but as a spy on it I intend to work.' A most fateful resignation! for while he still for a short time continues to exercise his old influence on the government, both from the outside, in his own person, and inside the Committee, in the person of Héault de Sechelles, selected in his place, he very soon loses ground more and more,—so much so even that Héault, his friend, is 'put in quarantine,' as was said in the Committee. And very natural. A statesman cannot have power when he shirks responsibility, and without power he soon loses all influence with the multitude. Those who now succeed him in power are Robespierre, Barère, Billaud-Varennes, and Carnot,—the two last very good working members, good men of the second rank, but after Danton not a single man is left fit to be leader."—L. Gronlund, *Ça Ira! or Danton in the French Revolution*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 1, ch. 2.—H. M. Stephens, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, v. 2, ch. 9.—H. C. Lockwood, *Constitutional Hist. of Fr.*, ch. 1, and app. 2.

A. D. 1793 (July).—The assassination of Marat.—"Amongst those who had placed faith in the Girondists and their ideals was a young woman of Normandy, Charlotte Corday. . . . When the mob of Paris rose and drove with insult from the Convention those who in her eyes were the heroic defenders of the universal principles of truth and justice, she bitterly resented the wrong that had been done, not only to the men themselves, but to that France of which she regarded them as the true representatives. Owing to Marat's persistent cry for a dictatorship and for shedding of blood, it was he who, in the departments, was accounted especially responsible both for the expulsion of the Girondists and for the tyranny which now began to weigh as heavily upon the whole country as it had long weighed upon the capital. Incapable as all then were of comprehending the causes which had brought about the fall of the Girondists, Charlotte Corday imagined that by putting an end to this man's life, she could also put an end to the system of government which he advocated. Informing her friends that she wished to visit England, she left Caen and travelled in the diligence to Paris. On her arrival she purchased a knife, and afterwards obtained entrance into Marat's house on the pretext that she brought news which she desired to communicate to him. She knew that he would be eager to obtain intelligence of the movements of the Girondist deputies still in Normandy. Marat was ill at the time, and in a bath when Charlotte

Corday was admitted. She gave him the names of the deputies who were at Caen. 'In a few days,' he said, as he wrote them hastily down, 'I will have them all guillotined in Paris.' As she heard these words she plunged the knife into his body and killed him on the spot. The cry uttered by the murdered man was heard, and Charlotte, who did not attempt to escape, was captured and conveyed to prison amid the murmurs of an angry crowd. It had been from the first her intention to sacrifice her life for the cause of her country, and, glorying in her deed, she met death with stoical indifference. 'I killed one man,' she said, when brought before the revolutionary court, 'in order to save the lives of 100,000 others.' . . . His [Marat's] murder brought about contrary results to those which the woman who ignorantly and rashly had flung away her life hoped by the sacrifice to effect. . . . He was regarded as a martyr by no small portion of the working population of Paris. . . . His murder excited indignation beyond the comparatively narrow circle of those who took an active part in political life, while at the same time it added a new impulse to the growing cry for blood."—B. M. Gardiner, *The Fr. Rev.*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN C. Mac Farlane, *The Fr. Rev.*, v. 3, ch. 13.—J. Michelet, *Women of the Fr. Rev.*, ch. 18–19.—Mrs. R. K. Van Alstine, *Charlotte Corday*.—A. Dobson, *Four French Women*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1793 (July–December). The civil war.—Sieges of Lyons and Toulon.—Submission of Caen, Marseilles and Bordeaux.—Crushing of the Vendéans.—"The insurgents in Calvados [Normandy] were easily suppressed; at the very first skirmish at Vernon [July 13], the insurgent troops fled. Wimpfen endeavoured to rally them in vain. The moderate class, those who had taken up the defence of the Girondists, displayed little ardour or activity. When the constitution was accepted by the other departments, it saw the opportunity for admitting that it had been in error, when it thought it was taking arms against a mere factious minority. This retraction was made at Caen, which had been the headquarters of the revolt. The Mountain commissioners did not sully this first victory with executions. General Carteaux on the other hand, marched at the head of some troops against the sectionary army of the south; he defeated its force, pursued it to Marseilles, entered the town [August 23] after it, and Provence would have been brought into subjection like Calvados, if the royalists, who had taken refuge at Toulon, after their defeat, had not called in the English to their aid, and placed in their hands this key to France. Admiral Hood entered the town in the name of Louis XVII., whom he proclaimed king, disarmed the fleet, sent for 8,000 Spaniards by sea, occupied the surrounding forts, and forced Carteaux, who was advancing against Toulon, to fall back on Marseilles. Notwithstanding this check, the conventionalists succeeded in isolating the insurrection, and this was a great point. The Mountain commissioners had made their entry into the rebel capitals; Robert Lindet into Caen; Tallien into Bordeaux; Barras and Fréron into Marseilles. Only two towns remained to be taken—Toulon and Lyons. A simultaneous attack from the south, west, and centre was no longer apprehended, and in the interior the enemy was only on the defensive. Lyons was besieged by

Kellermann, general of the army of the Alps; three corps pressed the town on all sides. The veteran soldiers of the Alps, the revolutionary battalions and the newly levied troops, reinforced the besiegers every day. The people of Lyons defended themselves with all the courage of despair. At first, they relied on the assistance of the insurgents of the south; but these having been repulsed by Carteaux, the Lyonnese placed their last hope in the army of Piedmont, which attempted a diversion in their favour, but was beaten by Kellermann. Pressed still more energetically, they saw their first position carried. Famine began to be felt, and courage forsook them. The royalist leaders, convinced of the inutility of longer resistance, left the town, and the republican army entered the walls [October 9], where they awaited the orders of the convention. A few months after, Toulon itself [in the siege of which Napoleon Bonaparte commanded the artillery], defended by veteran troops and formidable fortifications, fell into the power of the republicans. The battalions of the army of Italy, reinforced by those which the taking of Lyons left disposable, pressed the place closely. After repeated attacks and prodigies of skill and valour, they made themselves masters of it, and the capture of Toulon finished what that of Lyons had begun [December 19]. Everywhere the convention was victorious. The Vendéans had failed in their attempt upon Nantes, after having lost many men, and their general-in-chief, Cathelineau. This attack put an end to the aggressive and previously promising movement of the Vendean insurrection. The royalists repassed the Loire, abandoned Saumur, and resumed their former cantonments. They were, however, still formidable; and the republicans, who pursued them, were again beaten in La Vendée. General Biron, who had succeeded General Berruyer, unsuccessfully continued the war with small bodies of troops; his moderation and defective system of attack caused him to be replaced by Canclaux and Rossignol, who were not more fortunate than he. There were two leaders, two armies, and two centres of operation. . . . The committee of public safety soon remedied this, by appointing one sole general-in-chief, Lechelle, and by introducing war on a large scale into La Vendée. This new method, aided by the garrison of Mayence, consisting of 17,000 veterans, who, relieved from operations against the coalesced powers after the capitulation, were employed in the interior, entirely changed the face of the war. The royalists underwent four consecutive defeats, two at Châtillon, two at Cholet [the last being October 17]. Lescure, Bonchamps, and d'Elbée were mortally wounded; and the insurgents, completely beaten in Upper Vendée, and fearing that they should be exterminated if they took refuge in Lower Vendée, determined to leave their country to the number of 80,000 persons. This emigration through Brittany, which they hoped to arouse to insurrection, became fatal to them. Repulsed before Granville, utterly routed at Mons [Le Mans, December 12], they were destroyed at Savenay [December 23], and barely a few thousand men, the wreck of this vast emigration, returned to Vendée. These disasters, irreparable for the royalist cause, the taking of their land of Noirmoutiers from Charette, the dispersion of the troops of that leader, the death of Laroche jac-

quelin, rendered the republicans masters of the country. The committee of public safety, thinking, not without reason, that its enemies were beaten but not subjugated, adopted a terrible system of extermination to prevent them from rising again. General Thurreau surrounded Vendée with sixteen entrenched camps; twelve movable columns, called the infernal columns, overran the country in every direction, sword and fire in hand, scoured the woods, dispersed the assemblies, and diffused terror throughout this unhappy country."—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.* (Am. ed.), v. 2, pp. 328–335, and 398–410.—Marchioness de Larochefajuelain *Memoirs*.—A. des Echerolles, *Early Life*, v. 1, ch. 5–7.

A. D. 1793 (July–December).—Progress of the war of the Coalition.—Dissensions among the Allies.—Unsuccessful siege of Dunkirk.—French Victories of Hondschotten and Wattignies.—Operations on the Rhine and elsewhere.—“The civil war in which France for a moment appeared engulfed was soon confined to a few narrowing centres. What, in the meantime, had been the achievements of the mighty Coalition of banded Europe? Success, that might have been great, was attained on the Alpine and Pyrenean frontiers; and had the Piedmontese and Spaniards been well led they could have overrun Provence and Rousillon, and made the insurrection of the South fatal. But here, as elsewhere, the Allies did little; and, though defeated in almost every encounter, the republican levies held their ground against enemies who nowhere advanced. It was, however, in the North and the North-east that the real prize of victory was placed; and no doubt can exist that had unanimity in the councils of the Coalition prevailed, or had a great commander been in its camp, Paris might have been captured without difficulty, and the Revolution been summarily put down. But the Austrians, the Prussians, and the English, were divided in mind; they had no General capable of rising above the most ordinary routine of war; and the result was that the allied armies advanced tardily on an immense front, each leader thinking of his own plans only, and no one venturing to press forward boldly, or to pass the fortresses on the hostile frontiers, though obstacles like these could be of little use without the aid of powerful forces in the field. In this manner half the summer was lost in besieging Mayence, Valenciennes, and Condé; and when, after the fall of these places [July–August], an attempt was made to invade Picardy, dissensions between the Allies broke out, and the British contingent was detached to besiege Dunkirk, while the Austrians lingered in French Flanders, intent on enlarging by conquest Belgium, at that period an Austrian Province. Time was thus gained for the French armies, which, though they had made an honorable resistance, had been obliged to fall back at all points, and were in no condition to oppose their enemy; and the French army in the North, though driven nearly to the Somme, within a few marches of the capital, was allowed an opportunity to recruit its strength, and was not, as it might have been easily, destroyed. A part of the hastily raised levies was now incorporated in its ranks; and as these were largely composed of seasoned men

from the old army of the Bourbon Monarchy, and from the volunteers of Valmy and Jemmapes, a respectable force was before long mustered. At the peremptory command of the Jacobin Government, this was at once directed against the invaders, who did not know what an invasion meant. The Duke of York, assailed with vigor and skill, was compelled to raise the siege of Dunkirk [by the French victory at Hondschotten, September 8]; and, to the astonishment of Europe, the divided forces of the halting and irresolute Coalition began to recede before the enemies, who saw victory yielded to them, and who, feeble soldiers as they often were, were nevertheless fired by ardent patriotism. As the autumn closed the trembling balance of fortune inclined decidedly on the side of the Republic. The French recruits, hurried to the frontier in masses, became gradually better soldiers, under the influence of increasing success. Carnot, a man of great but overrated powers, took the general direction of military affairs; and though his strategy was not sound, it was much better than the imbecility of his foes. At the same time, the Generals of the fallen Monarchy having disappeared, or, for the most part, failed, brilliant names began to emerge from the ranks, and to lead the suddenly raised armies; and though worthless selections were not seldom made, more than one private and sergeant gave proof of capacity of no common order. Terror certainly added strength to patriotism, for thousands were driven to the camp by force, and death was the usual penalty of a defeated chief; but it was not the less a great national movement, and high honor is justly due to a people which, in a situation that might have seemed hopeless, made such heroic and noble efforts, even though it triumphed through the weakness of its foe. Owing to a happy inspiration of Carnot, a detachment was rapidly marched from the Rhine, where the Prussians remained in complete inaction; and with this reinforcement Jourdan gained a victory at Wattignies [October 16] over the Austrians, and opened the way into the Low Countries. At the close of the year the youthful Hoche, once a corporal, but a man of genius, who had given studious hours to the theory of war, divided Brunswick from the Austrian Würmsers by a daring and able march through the Vosges; and the baffled Allies were driven out of Alsace, the borders of which they had just invaded. By these operations the great Northern frontier, the really vulnerable part of France, was almost freed from the invaders' presence; and, though less was achieved on the Southern frontier, the enemies of the Republic began to lose courage.”—W. O'C. Morris, *The Fr. Rev.*, ch. 6.—“The Prussians had remained wholly inactive for two months after the fall of Mayence, contenting themselves with watching the French in their lines at Weissenburg. Wearied at length by the torpor of his opponents, Moreau assumed the initiative, and attacked the Prussian corps at Pirmasens. This bold attempt was repulsed (Sept. 14) with the loss of 4,000 men; but it was not till a month later (Oct. 13) that the Allies resumed the offensive, when the Weissenburg lines were stormed by a mixed force of Austrians and Prussians, and the French fled in confusion almost to Strasburg. But this important advance led to no results, though the defeat of the

Republican movement was hailed by a royalist movement in Alsace. The Austrians, immovable in their plans of conquest, refused to occupy Strasbourg in the name of Louis XVII.; and the unfortunate royalists, abandoned to Republican vengeance, were indiscriminately consigned to the guillotine by a decree of the Convention, while the confederate army was occupied in the siege of Landau. But the lukewarmness of the Prussians had now become so evident, that it was only by the most vehement remonstrances of the Austrian cabinet that they were prevented from seceding altogether from the league; and the Republicans, taking advantage of the disunion of their enemies, again attacked the Allies (Dec. 26), who were routed and driven over the Rhine [abandoning the siege of Landau]; while the victors, following up their success, retook Spire, and advanced to the gates of Mannheim. The operations in the Pyrenees and on the side of Savoy, during this campaign, led to no important results. On the western extremity of the Pyrenees, the Spaniards [had] entered France in the middle of April, routed their opponents in several encounters, and drove them into St. Jean Pied-de-Poet. An invasion of Roussillon, at the same time, was equally successful; and the Spaniards maintained themselves in the province till the end of the year, taking the fortresses of Bellegarde and Collioure, and routing two armies which attempted to dislodge them, at Truellas (Sept. 22) and Boulon (Dec. 7). An attempt of the Sardinians to expel the French from their conquests in Savoy was less fortunate; and, at the close of the campaign, both parties remained in their former position."—A. Alison, *Epitome of Hist. of Europe*, pp. 58–59 (ch. 13, v. 4 of complete work).

ALSO IN: H. Von Sybel, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, bk. 8, ch. 2 (v. 3).—E. Baines, *Hist. of the Wars of the Fr. Rev.*, v. 1, ch. 9–11.

A. D. 1793 (August).—Emancipation in San Domingo proclaimed. See HAYTI: A. D. 1632–1803.

A. D. 1793 (September–December). The "Reign of Terror" becomes the "Order of the Day."—Trial and execution of Marie Antoinette, Madame Roland, and the Girondists.—"On the 16th of September, the Faubourg Saint-Antoine surrounded the Hôtel de Ville, clamoring for 'Bread.' Hébert and Chaumette appeased the mob by vociferous harangues against rich men and monopolists, and by promising to raise a revolutionary army with orders to scour the country, empty the granaries, and put the grain within reach of the people. 'The next thing will be a guillotine for the monopolists,' added Hébert. This had been demanded by memorials from the most ultra provincial Jacobins. The next day the Convention witnessed the terrible reaction of this scene. At the opening of the session Merlin de Douai proposed and carried a vote for the division of the revolutionary tribunal into four sections, in order to remedy the dilatoriness complained of by Robespierre and the Jacobins. The municipality soon arrived, followed by a great crowd; Chaumette, in a furious harangue, demanded a revolutionary army with a travelling guillotine. The ferocious Billaud-Varennes declared that this was not enough, and that all suspected persons must be arrested immediately.

Danton interposed with the powerful eloquence of his palmy days; he approved of an immediate decree for the formation of a revolutionary army, but made no mention of the guillotine. . . . Danton's words were impetuous, but his ideas were politic and deliberate. His motions were carried, amid general acclamation. But the violent propositions of Billaud-Varennes and others were also carried. The decree forbidding domiciliary visits and night arrests, which had been due to the Girondists, was revoked. A deputation from the Jacobins and the sections demanded the indictment of the 'monster' Brissot with his accomplices, Vergniaud, Gensonné, and other 'miscreants.' 'Lawgivers,' said the spokesman of the deputation, 'let the Reign of Terror be the order of the day!' Barère, in the name of the Committee of Public Safety, obtained the passage of a decree organizing an armed force to restrain counter-revolutionists and protect supplies. Fear led him to unite with the most violent, and to adopt the great motto of the Paris Commune, 'Let the Reign of Terror be the order of the day!' 'The royalists are conspiring,' he said; 'they want blood. Well they shall have that of the conspirators, of the Brissots and Marie Antoinettes!' The association of these two names shows what frenzy prevailed in the minds of the people. The next day September 6, two of the most formidable Jacobins, the cold, implacable Billaud-Varennes and the fiery Collet d'Herbois, were added to the Committee of Public Safety. Danton persisted in his refusal to return to it. This proves how mistaken the Girondists had been in accusing him of aspiring to the dictatorship. He kept aloof from the Committee chiefly because he knew that they were lost, and did not wish to contribute to their fall. Before leaving the ministry Garat had tried to prevent the Girondists from being brought to trial; upon making known his wish to Robespierre and Danton, he found Robespierre implacable, while Danton, with tears coursing down his rugged cheeks replied, 'I cannot save them!' . . . On the 10th of October Saint-Just, in the name of the Committee of Public Safety, read to the Assembly an important report upon the situation of the Republic. It was violent and menacing to others beside the enemies of the Mountain; Hébert and his gang might well tremble. He inveighed not only against those who were plundering the government, but against the whole administration. . . . Saint-Just's report had been preceded on the 3d of October by a report from the new Committee of Public Safety, concluding with the indictment of 40 deputies; 39 were Girondists or friends of the Gironde; the fortieth was the ex-Duke of Orleans. Twenty-one of these 39 were now in the hands of their enemies, and of these 21 only 9 belonged to the first deputies indicted on the 2d of June; the remainder had left Paris hoping to organize outside resistance, and had been declared outlawed. The deputies subsequently added to this number were members of the Right who had signed protests against the violation of the national representation on that fatal day. . . . It was decided at the same session to bring the 40 deputies, together with Marie Antoinette, to trial. The Jacobins and the commune had long been demanding the trial of the unhappy queen, and were raising loud clamors over the plots for her

deliverance. She might perhaps have escaped from the Temple if she would have consented to leave her children. During July a sorrow equal to that of the 21st of January had been inflicted on her; she had been separated from her young son under the pretence that she treated him like a king, and was bringing him up to make 'a tyrant of him.' The child was placed in another part of the Temple, and his education was intrusted to a vulgar and brutal shoemaker, named Simon. Nevertheless the fate of Marie Antoinette at this epoch was still doubtful; neither the Committee of Public Safety nor the ministry desired her death. While Lebrun, the friend of the Girondists, was minister of foreign affairs, a project had been formed which would have saved her life. Danton knew of it and aided it. . . . This plan was a negotiation with Venice, Tuscany, and Naples, the three Italian States yet neutral, who were to pledge themselves to maintain their wavering neutrality, in consideration of a guaranty of the safety of Marie Antoinette and her family. Two diplomatic agents who afterwards held high posts in France, Marat and Sémonville, were intrusted with this affair. As they were crossing from Switzerland into Italy, they were arrested, in violation of the law of nations, upon the neutral territory of the Grisons by an Austrian detachment (July 25). . . . At tidings of the arrest of the French envoys, Marie Antoinette was separated from her daughter and sister-in-law Elizabeth, and transferred to the Conciergerie. On the 14th of October she appeared before the revolutionary tribunal. To the accusation of the public prosecutor, Fouquier-Tinville, made up of calumnies against her private life, and for the most part well-founded imputations against her political conduct, she opposed a plausible defence, which effaced as far as possible her part in the late government. . . . The following questions were put to the jurors: 'Has Marie Antoinette aided in movements designed to assist the foreign enemies of the Republic to open French territory to them and to facilitate the progress of their arms? Has she taken part in a conspiracy tending to incite civil war?' The answer was in the affirmative, and the sentence of death was passed on her. The decisive portions which we now possess of the queen's correspondence with Austria had not then been made public; but enough was known to leave no doubt of her guilt, which had the same moral excuses as that of her husband. . . . She met death [October 16] with courage and resignation. The populace who had hated her so much did not insult her last moments. . . . A week after the queen's death the Girondists were summoned before the revolutionary tribunal. Brissot and Lasource alone had tried to escape this bloody ordeal, and to stir up resistance against it in the South. Vergniaud, Gensonné, and Valazé remained unshaken in their resolve to await trial. Gensonné, who had been placed in the keeping of a Swiss whose life he had saved on the 10th of August, and who had become a gendarme, might have escaped, but he refused to profit by this man's gratitude. . . . The act of indictment drawn up by the ex-Feuillant Amar was only a repetition of the monstrous calumnies which had circulated through the clubs and the journals. Brissot was accused of having ruined the colonies by

advocating the liberation of slaves, and of having drawn foreign arms upon France by declaring war on kings. The whole trial corresponded to this beginning. . . . On the 29th the Jacobins appeared at the bar of the Convention, and called for a decree giving the jurors of the revolutionary tribunal the right to bring the proceedings to a close as soon as they believed themselves sufficiently enlightened. Robespierre and Barère supported the Jacobin demand. Upon Robespierre's motion it was decreed that after three days' proceedings, the jurors might declare themselves ready to render their verdict. The next day the jurors availed themselves of their privilege, and declared themselves sufficiently informed, although they had not heard the evidence for acquittal, neither the accused nor their counsel having been allowed to plead their cause. Brissot, Vergniaud, Gensonné, Valazé, Bishop Fauchet, Ducos, Boyer-Fonfrède, Lasource, and their friends were declared guilty of having conspired against the unity and indivisibility of the Republic, and against the liberty and safety of the French people. . . . Danton, who had not been an accomplice in their death, had retired to his mother's home at Arcis-sur-Aube, that he might not be a witness thereof. The condemned were brought back to hear their sentence. The greater part of them rose up with a common impulse, and cried, 'We are innocent! People, they are deceiving you!' The crowd remained motionless and silent. . . . At midnight they partook of a last repast, passing the rest of the night in converse about their native land, their remnant of life being cheered by news of victory and pleasant sallies from young Ducos, who might have escaped, but preferred to share his friend Fonfrède's fate. Vergniaud had been given a subtle poison by Condorcet, but threw it away, choosing to die with his companions. One of his noble utterances gives us the key to his life. 'Others sought to consummate the Revolution by terror; I would accomplish it by love.' Next day, October 31, at noon, the prisoners were led forth, and as the five carts containing them left the Conciergerie, they struck up the national hymn . . . and shouts of 'Long live the Republic.' The sounds died away as their number decreased, but did not cease until the last of the 21 mounted the fatal platform. . . . The murderers of the Girondists were not likely to spare the illustrious woman who was at once the inspiration and the honor of that party, and the very same day Madame Roland who had been for five months a prisoner at St. Pelagie and the Abbaye, was transferred to the Conciergerie. Hébert and his followers had long clamored for her head. During her captivity she wrote her Memoirs, which unfortunately have not been preserved complete; no other souvenir of the Revolution equals this, although it is not always reliable, for Madame Roland had feminine weaknesses of intellect, despite her masculine strength of soul; she was prejudiced against all who disagreed with her, and regarded caution and compromise with a noble but impolitic scorn. . . . The 18th Brumaire (November 10), she was summoned before the revolutionary tribunal; when she left her cell, clad in white, her dark hair floating loosely over her shoulders, a smile on her lips and her face sparkling with life and animation. . . . She was condemned in advance,

not being allowed a word in her own defence, and was declared guilty of being an author or accomplice 'of a monstrous conspiracy against the unity and indivisibility of the Republic.' She heard her sentence calmly, saying to the judges: 'You deem me worthy the fate of the great men you have murdered. I will try to display the same courage on the scaffold.' She was taken directly to the Place de la Revolution, a man condemned for treason being placed in the same cart, who was overwhelmed with terror. She passed the mournful journey in soothing him, and on reaching the scaffold bid him mount first, that his sufferings might not be prolonged. As she took her place in turn, her eye fell on a colossal statue of Liberty, erected August 10, 1793. 'O Liberty,' she cried, 'what crimes are committed in thy name!' Some say that she said, 'O Liberty, how they have deceived thee!' Thus died the noblest woman in history since the incomparable Joan, who saved France! . . . The bloody tribunal never paused; famous men of every party succeeded each other at the fatal bar, the ex-Duke of Orleans among them, but four days earlier than Madame Roland. . . . The day after Madame Roland's trial began that of the venerable Bailli, ex-mayor of Paris and ex-president of the Constituent Assembly, a man who played a great part early in the Revolution, but faded out of sight with the constituent power."—Henry Martin, *Popular Hist. of France, 1789–1877*, v. 1, ch. 16.

ALSO IN A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Girondists*, ch. 46–52 (v. 3).—C. D. Yonge, *Life of Marie Antoinette*, ch. 39.—Mme Campan, *Memoirs of the Private Life of Marie Antoinette*, v. 2, conclusion.—S. Marceau, *Reminiscences of a Regicide*, ch. 11.—Count Beugnot, *Life*, v. 1, ch. 6.—Lord R. Gower, *Last Days of Marie Antoinette*.

A. D. 1793 (October).—Life in Paris during the Reign of Terror.—Gaiety in the Prisons.—The Tricoteuses, or knitting women.—Revolutionary costumes and modes of speech.—The guillotine as plaything and ornament.—"By the end of October, 1793, the Committee of General Security had mastered Paris, and established the Reign of Terror there by means of the Revolutionary Tribunal, and could answer to the Great Committee of Public Safety for the tranquillity of the capital. There were no more riots; men were afraid even to express their opinions, much less to quarrel about them; the system of denunciation made Paris into a hive of unpaid spies, and ordinary crimes, pocket-picking and the like, vanished as if by magic. Yet it must not be supposed that Paris was gloomy or dull; on the contrary, the vast majority of citizens seemed glad to have an excuse to avoid politics, of which they had had a surfeit during the last four years, and to turn their thoughts to the literary side of their favourite journals, to the theatres, and to art. . . . The dull places of Paris were the Revolutionary Committees, the Jacobin Club, the Convention, the Hôtel de Brienne, where the Committee of General Security sat, and the Pavillon de l'Égalité, formerly the Pavillon de Flore, in the Tuileries, where the Great Committee of Public Safety laboured. . . . Elsewhere men were lighthearted and gay, following their usual avocations, and busy in their pursuit of pleasure or

of gain. It is most essential to grasp the fact that there was no particular difference, for the vast majority of the population, in living in Paris during the Reign of Terror and at other times. The imagination of posterity, steeped in tales of the tumbrils bearing their burden to the guillotine, and of similar stories of horror, has conceived a ghastly picture of life at that extraordinary period, and it is only after living for months amongst the journals, memoirs, and letters of the time that one can realize the fact that to the average Parisian the necessity of getting his dinner or his evening's amusement remained the paramount thought of his daily life. . . . Strange to say, nowhere was life more happy and gay than in the prisons of Paris, where the inmates lived in the constant expectation that the haphazard chance of being brought before the Revolutionary Tribunal and condemned to death might befall them at any moment. . . . A little more must be said about the market-women, the tricoteuses, or knitting-women of infamous memory. These market-women had been treated as heroines ever since their march to Versailles in October, 1789. . . . They formed their societies after the fashion of the Jacobin Club, presided over by Renée Audu, Agnès Lefevre, Marie Louise Bouju, and Rose Lacombe, and went about the streets of Paris insulting respectably dressed people, and hounding on the sans-culottes to deeds of atrocity. These Mænads were encouraged by Marat, and played an important part in the street history of Paris, up to the Reign of Terror, when their power was suddenly taken from them. On May 21, 1793, they were excluded by a decree from the galleries of the Convention; on May 26 they were forbidden to form part of any political assembly; and when they appealed from the Convention to the Commune of Paris, Chaumette abruptly told them 'that the Republic had no need of Joans of Arc.' Thus deprived of active participation in politics, the market-women became the tricoteuses, or knitting-women, who used to take their seats in the Place de la Révolution, and watch the guillotine as they knitted. Their active power for good or harm was gone. . . . Life during the Terror in Paris . . . differed in little things, in little affectations of liberty and equality, which are amusing to study. The fashions of dress everywhere betrayed the new order of things. A few men, such as Robespierre, might still go about with powdered hair and in knee-breeches, but the ordinary male costume of the time was designed to contrast in every way with the costume of a dandy of the 'ancien régime.' Instead of breeches, the fashion was to wear trousers; instead of shoes, top-boots; and instead of shaving, the young Parisian prided himself on letting his moustache grow. In female costume a different motive was at work. Only David's art disciples ventured to imitate the male apparel of ancient Greece and Rome, but such imitation became the fashion among women. Waists disappeared; and instead of stiffened skirts and narrow bodices, women wore short loose robes, which they fancied resembled Greek chitons; sandals took the place of high-heeled shoes; and the hair, instead of being worked up into elaborate edifices, was allowed to flow down freely. For ornaments, gun-metal and steel took the place of gold, silver and precious stones. . . . The favourite design was the guillotine. Little guillotines

were worn as brooches, as earrings and as clasps, and the women of the time simply followed the fashion without realizing what it meant. Indeed, the worship of the guillotine was one of the most curious features of the epoch. Children had toy guillotines given them; models were made to cut off imitation heads, when wine or sweet syrup flowed in place of blood; and hymns were written to La Sainte Guillotine, and jokes made upon it, as the 'national razor.' . . . It is well known that the desire to emphasize the abolition of titles was followed by the abolition of the terms 'Monsieur' and 'Madame,' and that their places were taken by 'Citizen' and 'Citizeness;' and also how the use of the second person plural was dropped, and it was considered a sign of a good republican to tutoyer every one, that is, to call them 'thou' and 'thee.' . . . The Reign of Terror in Paris seems to us an age of unique experiences, a time unparalleled in the history of the world; yet to the great majority of contemporaries it did not appear so; they lived their ordinary lives, and it was only in exceptional cases that the serenity of their days was interrupted, or that their minds were exercised by anything more than the necessity of earning their daily bread."—H. M. Stephens, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, v. 2, ch. 10.

Also in J. Michelet, *Women of the Fr. Rev.*, ch. 20-30.

A. D. 1793 (October).—The new republican calendar.—"Before the year ended the legislators of Paris voted that there was no God, and destroyed or altered nearly everything that had any reference to Christianity. Robespierre, who would have stopped short at deism, and who would have preserved the external decencies, was overruled and intimidated by Hébert and his frowzy crew, who had either crept into the governing committees or had otherwise made themselves a power in the state. . . . All popular journalists, patriots, and public bodies, had begun dating 'First Year of Liberty,' or 'First Year of the Republic;' and the old calendar had come to be considered as superstitious and slavish, as an abomination in the highest degree disgraceful to free and enlightened Frenchmen. Various petitions for a change had been presented; and at length the Convention had employed the mathematicians Romme and Monge, and the astronomer Laplace, to make a new republican calendar for the new era. These three philosophers, aided by Fabre d'Eglantine, who, as a poet, furnished the names, soon finished their work, which was sanctioned by the Convention and decreed into universal use as early as the 5th of October. It divided the year into four equal seasons, and twelve equal months of 30 days each. The five odd days which remained were to be festivals, and to bear the name of 'Sansculottides.' . . . One of these five days was to be consecrated to Genius, one to Industry, the third to Fine Actions, the fourth to Rewards, the fifth to Opinion. . . . In leap-years, when there would be six days to dispose of, the last of those days or Sansculottides was to be consecrated to the Revolution, and to be observed in all times with all possible solemnity. The months were divided into three decades, or portions of ten days each, and, instead of the Christian sabbath, once in seven days, the *décadi*, or tenth day, was to be the day of rest. . . . The decimal method of calculation . . . was to pre-

side over all divisions: thus, instead of our twenty-four hours to the day, and sixty minutes to the hour, the day was divided into ten parts, and the tenth was to be subdivided by tens and again by tens to the minutest division of time. New dials were ordered to mark the time in this new way, but, before they were finished, it was found that the people were puzzled and perplexed by this last alteration, and therefore this part of the calendar was adjourned for a year, and the hours, minutes and seconds were left as they were. As the republic commenced on the 21st of September close on the [autumnal] equinox, the republican year was made to commence at that season. The first month in the year (Fabre d'Eglantine being god-father to them all) was called Vendémiaire, or the vintage month, the second Brumaire, or the foggy month, the third Frimaire, or the frosty month. These were the three autumn months. Nivôse, Pluviôse, and Ventôse, or the snowy, rainy and windy, were the three winter months. Germinal, Floreal, and Prairial, or the bud month, the flower month, and the meadow month, formed the spring season. Messidor, Thermidor and Fructidor, or reaping month, heat month, and fruit month, made the summer, and completed the republican year. In more ways than one all this was calculated for the meridian of Paris, and could suit no other physical or moral climate. . . . But the strangest thing about this republican calendar was its duration. It lasted till the 1st of January, 1806."—C. Mac Farlane, *The Fr. Rev.*, v. 4, ch. 3.—The Republican Calendar for the Year Two of the Republic (Sept. 22, 1793—Sept. 21, 1794) is synchronized with the Gregorian Calendar as follows: 1 Vendémiaire=Sept. 22; 1 Brumaire=Oct. 22; 1 Frimaire=Nov. 21; 1 Nivôse=Dec. 21; 1 Pluviôse=Jan. 20; 1 Ventôse=Feb. 19; 1 Germinal=March 21; 1 Floreal=April 20; 1 Prairial=May 20; 1 Messidor=June 19; 1 Thermidor=July 19; 1 Fructidor=Aug. 18; 1st to 5th Sansculottides=Sept. 17-21.—H. M. Stephens, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, v. 2, app. 12.

Also in A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev. (Am. ed.)*, v. 2, pp. 364-365.

A. D. 1793 (November).—Abandonment of Christianity.—"The Worship of Reason instituted.—"The earliest steps towards a public abandonment of Christianity appear to have been taken by Fouché, the future minister of Police, and Duke of Otranto. . . . He published at Nevers (October 10, 1793) a decree" ordaining that "no forms of religious worship be practised except within their respective temples;" that "ministers of religion are forbidden, under pain of imprisonment, to wear their official costumes in any other places besides their temples;" and that the inscription, "Death is an eternal sleep," should be placed over the entrance to the cemetery. "This decree was reported to the municipality of Paris by Chaumette, the fanatical procureur of the Commune, and was warmly applauded. . . . The atheistical cabal of which he was the leader (his chief associates being the infamous Hébert, the Prussian baron Anacharsis Clootz, and Chabot, a renegade priest), now judged that public feeling was ripe for an avowed and combined onslaught on the profession of Christianity. . . . They decreed that on the 10th of November the 'Worship of Reason' should be inaugurated at Notre Dame.

On that day the venerable cathedral was profaned by a series of sacrilegious outrages unparalleled in the history of Christendom. A temple dedicated to 'Philosophy' was erected on a platform in the middle of the choir. A motley procession of citizens of both sexes, headed by the constituted authorities, advanced towards it; on their approach, the Goddess of Reason, impersonated by Mademoiselle Maillard, a well known figurante of the opera, took her seat upon a grassy throne in front of the temple; a hymn, composed in her honour by the poet Chenier, was sung by a body of young girls dressed in white and bedecked with flowers; and the multitude bowed the knee before her in profound adoration. It was the 'abomination of desolation sitting in the holy place.' At the close of this grotesque ceremony the whole cortège proceeded to the hall of the Convention, carrying with them their 'goddess,' who was borne aloft in a chair of state on the shoulders of four men. Having deposited her in front of the president, Chaumette harangued the Assembly. . . . He proceeded to demand that the ci-devant metropolitical church should henceforth be the temple of Reason and Liberty; which proposition was immediately adopted. The 'goddess' was then conducted to the president, and he and other officers of the House saluted her with the 'fraternal kiss,' amid thunders of applause. After this, upon the motion of Thuriot, the Convention in a body joined the mass of the people, and marched in their company to the temple of Reason, to witness a repetition of the impieties above described. These demonstrations were zealously imitated in the other churches of the capital. . . . The interior of St. Eustache was transformed into a 'guinguette,' or place of low public entertainment. . . . At St. Gervais a ball was given in the chapel of the Virgin. In other churches theatrical spectacles took place. . . . Representatives of the people thought it no shame to quit their curule chairs in order to dance the 'carmagnole' with abandoned women in the streets attired in sacerdotal garments. On Sunday, the 17th of November, all the parish churches of Paris were closed by authority, with three exceptions. . . . Chaumette, at a sitting of the Commune on the 26th of November, called for further measures for the extermination of every vestige of Christian worship; and the Council of the Commune, on his demand, ordered the closing of all churches and temples, of every religious denomination; made priests and ministers of religion responsible for any troubles that might arise from religious opinions, and commanded the arrest as a "suspect" of any person who should ask for the reopening of a church. "The example set by Paris, at this melancholy period, was faithfully repeated, if not surpassed in atrocity, throughout the provinces. Religion was proscribed, churches closed, Christian ordinances interdicted; the dreary gloom of atheistical despotism overspread the land. . . . These infamies were too monstrous to be tolerated for any length of time. . . . Robespierre, who had marked the symptoms of a coming reaction, boldly seized the opportunity, and denounced without mercy the hypocritical faction which disputed his own march towards absolute dictatorship."—W. H. Jarvis, *The Gallican Church and the Revolution*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Girondists*, bk. 52 (v. 3).—T. Carlyle, *The Fr. Rev.*,

bk. 5, ch. 4 (v. 3).—E. de Pressense, *Religion and the Reign of Terror*, bk. 2, ch. 2.

A. D. 1793-1794 (October—April).—The Terror in the Provinces.—Republican vengeance at Lyons, Marseilles, Toulon, Bordeaux, Nantes.—Fusillades and Noyades.—"The insurgents of Lyons, Marseilles, Toulon, and Bordeaux, were punished with pitiless severity. Lyons had revolted, and the convention decreed [October 12] the destruction of the city, the confiscation of the property of the rich, for the benefit of the patriots, and the punishment of the insurgents by martial law. Couthon, a commissioner well tried in cruelty, hesitated to carry into execution this monstrous decree, and was superseded by Collot d'Herbois and Fouché. Thousands of workmen were employed in the work of destruction: whole streets fell under their pickaxes: the prisons were gorged: the guillotine was too slow for revolutionary vengeance, and crowds of prisoners were shot, in murderous 'mitrallades.' . . . At Marseilles, 12,000 of the richest citizens fled from the vengeance of the revolutionists, and their property was confiscated, and plundered. When Toulon fell before the strategy of Bonaparte, the savage vengeance and cruelty of the conquerors were indulged without restraint. . . . The dockyard labourers were put to the sword: gangs of prisoners were brought out and executed by fusillades: the guillotine also claimed its victims: the sans-culottes rioted in confiscation and plunder. At Bordeaux, Tallien threw 15,000 citizens into prison. Hundreds fell under the guillotine; and the possessions and property of the rich were offered up to outrage and robbery. But all these atrocities were far surpassed in La Vendée. . . . The barbarities of warfare were yet surpassed by the vengeance of the conquerors, when the insurrection was, at last, overcome. At Nantes, the monster Carrier outstripped his rivals in cruelty and insatiable thirst for blood. Not contented with wholesale mitrallades, he designed that masterpiece of cruelty, the noyades; and thousands of men, women and children who escaped the muskets of the rabble soldiery were deliberately drowned in the waters of the Loire. In four months, his victims reached 15,000. At Angers, and other towns in La Vendée, these hideous noyades were added to the terrors of the guillotine and the fusillades."—Sir T. E. May, *Democracy in Europe*, ch. 14.—"One begins to be sick of 'death vomited in great floods.' Nevertheless, hearest thou not, O Reader (for the sound reaches through centuries), in the dead December and January nights, over Nantes Town,—confused noises, as of musketry and tumult, as of rage and lamentation; mingling with the everlasting moan of the Loire waters there? Nantes Town is sunk in sleep; but Représentant Carrier is not sleeping, the wool-capped Company of Marat is not sleeping. Why unmoors that flatbottomed craft, that 'gabarre'; about eleven at night; with Ninety Priests under hatches? They are going to Belle Isle? In the middle of the Loire stream, on signal given, the gabarre is scuttled; she sinks with all her cargo. 'Sentence of Deportation,' writes Carrier, 'was executed vertically.' The Ninety Priests, with their gabarre-coffin, lie deep! It is the first of the Noyades [November 16], what we may call 'Drownages' of Carrier; which have become

famous forever. Guillotining there was at Nantes, till the Headsman sank worn out: then fusillading 'in the Plain of Saint-Mauve,' little children fusilladed, and women with children at the breast; children and women, by the hundred and twenty; and by the five hundred, so hot is La Vendée: till the very Jacobins grew sick, and all but the Company of Marat cried, Hold! Wherefore now we have got Noyading; and on the 24th night of Frosty year 2, which is 14th of December 1793, we have a second Noyade; consisting of '138 persons.' Or why waste a gabarre, sinking it with them? Flung them out; flung them out, with their hands tied: pour a continual hail of lead over all the space, till the last struggler of them be sunk! Unsound sleepers of Nantes, and the Sea-Villages thereabouts, hear the musketry amid the night-winds; wonder what the meaning of it is. And women were in that gabarre; whom the Red Nightcaps were stripping naked; who begged, in their agony, that their smocks might not be stript from them. And young children were thrown in, their mothers vainly pleading: 'Wolfings,' answered the Company of Marat, 'who would grow to be wolves.' By degrees, daylight itself witnesses Noyades: women and men are tied together, feet and feet, hands and hands; and flung in: this they call Mariage Républicain, Republican Marriage. Cruel is the panther of the woods, the she-bear bereaved of her whelps: but there is in man a hatred crueller than that. Dumb, out of suffering now, as pale swoln corpses, the victims tumble confusedly seaward along the Loire stream; the tide rolling them back: clouds of ravens darken the River; wolves prowl on the shoal-places: Carrier writes, 'Quel torrent révolutionnaire, What a torrent of Revolution!' For the man is rabid; and the Time is rabid. These are the Noyades of Carrier; twenty-five by the tale, for what is done in darkness comes to be investigated in sunlight: not to be forgotten for centuries. . . . Men are all rabid; as the Time is. Representative Lebon, at Arras, dashes his sword into the blood flowing from the Guillotine; exclaims, 'How I like it!' Mothers, they say, by his orders, have to stand by while the Guillotine devours their children: a band of music is stationed near; and, at the fall of every head, strikes up its 'Ça-ira.'—T. Carlyle, *The Fr. Rev.*, v. 3, bk. 5, ch. 3.

ALSO IN H. M. Stephens, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, v. 2, ch. 11.—H. A. Taine, *The Fr. Rev.*, bk. 5, ch. 1, sect. 9 (v. 3).—*Horrors of the Prison of Arras* ("The Reign of Terror: A Collection of Authentic Narratives," v. 2).—Duchesse de Duras, *Prison Journals during the Fr. Rev.*—A. des Echerolles, *Early Life*, v. 1, ch. 7-13, and v. 2, ch. 1.—See, also, below: 1794 JUNE—JULY.

A. D. 1793-1794 (November—June).—The factions of the Mountain devour one another.—Destruction of the Hébertists.—Danton and his followers brought to the knife.—Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety.—The Feast of the Supreme Being.—"Robespierre was unutterably outraged by the proceedings of the atheists. They perplexed him as a politician intent upon order, and they afflicted him sorely as an ardent disciple of the Savoyard Vicar. Hébert, however, was so strong that it needed some courage to attack him, nor did Robespierre dare to withstand him to the face. But he did not flinch from making

an energetic assault upon atheism and the excesses of its partisans. His admirers usually count his speech of the 21st of November one of the most admirable of his oratorical successes. . . . 'Atheism [he said] is aristocratic. The idea of a great being who watches over oppressed innocence and punishes triumphant crime is essentially the idea of the people. This is the sentiment of Europe and the Universe; it is the sentiment of the French nation. That people is attached neither to priests, nor to superstitions, nor to ceremonies; it is attached only to worship in itself, or in other words to the idea of an incomprehensible Power, the terror of wrong-doers, the stay and comfort of virtue, to which it delights to render words of homage that are all so many anathemas against injustice and triumphant crime.' This is Robespierre's favourite attitude, the priest posing as statesman. . . . Danton followed practically the same line, though saying much less about it. 'If Greece,' he said in the Convention, 'had its Olympian games, France too shall solemnize her sansculottid days. . . . If we have not honoured the priest of error and fanaticism, neither do we wish to honour the priest of incredulity: we wish to serve the people. I demand that there shall be an end of these anti-religious masquerades in the Convention.' There was an end of the masquerading, but the Hébertists still kept their ground. Danton, Robespierre, and the Committee were all equally impotent against them for some months longer. The revolutionary force had been too strong to be resisted by any government since the Paris insurgents had carried both king and assembly in triumph from Versailles in the October of 1789. It was now too strong for those who had begun to strive with all their might to build a new government out of the agencies that had shattered the old to pieces. For some months the battle which had been opened by Robespierre's remonstrance against atheistic intolerance, degenerated into a series of masked skirmishes. . . . Collot D'Herbois had come back in hot haste from Lyons. . . . Carrier was recalled from Nantes. . . . The presence of these men of blood gave new courage and resolution to the Hébertists. Though the alliance was informal, yet as against Danton, Camille Desmoulins, and the rest of the Indulgents, as well as against Robespierre, they made common cause. Camille Desmoulins attacked Hébert in successive numbers of a journal ['Le Vieux Cordelier'] that is perhaps the one truly literary monument of this stage of the revolution. Hébert retaliated by impugning the patriotism of Desmoulins in the Club, and the unfortunate wit, notwithstanding the efforts of Robespierre on his behalf, was for a while turned out of the sacred precincts. . . . Even Danton himself was attacked (December, 1793) and the integrity of his patriotism brought into question. Robespierre made an energetic defence of his great rival in the hierarchy of revolution. . . . Robespierre, in whom spasmodical courage and timidity ruled by rapid turns, began to suspect that he had been premature; and a convenient illness, which some supposed to have been feigned, excused his withdrawal for some weeks from a scene where he felt that he could no longer see clear. We cannot doubt that both he and Danton were perfectly assured that the anarchic party must unavoidably roll headlong

into the abyss. But the hour of doom was uncertain. To make a mistake in the right moment, to hurry the crisis, was instant death. Robespierre was a more adroit calculator than Danton. . . . His absence during the final crisis of the anarchic party allowed events to ripen, without committing him to that initiative in dangerous action which he had dreaded on the 10th of August, as he dreaded it on every other decisive day of this burning time. The party of the Commune became more and more daring in their invectives against the Convention and the Committees. At length they proclaimed open insurrection. But Paris was cold, and opinion was divided. In the night of the 13th of March, Hébert, Chaumette, Clootz, were arrested. The next day Robespierre recovered sufficiently to appear at the Jacobin Club. He joined his colleagues of the Committee of Public Safety in striking the blow. On the 24th of March the Ultra-Revolutionist leaders were beheaded. The first bloody breach in the Jacobin ranks was speedily followed by the second. The Right wing of the opposition to the Committee soon followed the Left down the ways to dusty death, and the execution of the Anarchists only preceded by a week the arrest of the Moderates. When the seizure of Danton had once before been discussed in the Committee, Robespierre resisted the proposal violently. We have already seen how he defended Danton at the Jacobin Club. . . . What produced this sudden tack? . . . His acquiescence in the ruin of Danton is intelligible enough on the grounds of selfish policy. The Committee [of Public Safety] hated Danton for the good reason that he had openly attacked them, and his cry for clemency was an inflammatory and dangerous protest against their system. Now Robespierre, rightly or wrongly, had made up his mind that the Committee was the instrument by which, and which only, he could work out his own vague schemes of power and reconstruction. And, in any case, how could he resist the Committee? . . . All goes to show that Robespierre was really moved by nothing more than his invariable dread of being left behind, of finding himself on the weaker side, of not seeming practical and political enough. And having made up his mind that the stronger party was bent on the destruction of the Dantonists, he became fiercer than Billaud himself. . . . Danton had gone, as he often did, to his native village of Arcis-sur-Aube, to seek repose and a little clearness of sight in the night that wrapped him about. He was devoid of personal ambition; he never had any humour for mere factious struggles. . . . It is not clear that he could have done anything. The balance of force, after the suppression of the Hébertists, was irretrievably against him, as calculation had already revealed to Robespierre. . . . After the arrest, and on the proceedings to obtain the assent of the Convention to the trial of Danton and others of its members, one only of their friends had the courage to rise and demand that they should be heard at the bar. Robespierre burst out in cold rage; he asked whether they had undergone so many heroic sacrifices, counting among them these acts of 'painful severity,' only to fall under the yoke of a band of domineering intriguers; and he cried out impatiently that they would brook no claim of privilege, and suffer no rotten idol. The word was felici-

tously chosen, for the Convention dreaded to have its independence suspected, and it dreaded this all the more because at this time its independence did not really exist. The vote against Danton was unanimous, and the fact that it was so is the deepest stain on the fame of this assembly. On the afternoon of the 16th Germinal (April 5, 1794), Paris in amazement and some stupefaction saw the once dreaded Titan of the Mountain fast bound in the tumbrel, and faring towards the sharp-clanging knife [with Camille Desmoulins and others]. 'I leave it all in a frightful welter,' Danton is reported to have said. 'Not a man of them has an idea of government. Robespierre will follow me; he is dragged down by me. Ah, better be a poor fisherman than meddle with the governing of men!' . . . After the fall of the anarchists and the death of Danton, the relations between Robespierre and the Committees underwent a change. He, who had hitherto been on the side of government, became in turn an agency of opposition. He did this in the interest of ultimate stability, but the difference between the new position and the old is that he now distinctly associated the idea of a stable republic with the ascendancy of his own religious conceptions. . . . The base of Robespierre's scheme of social reconstruction now came clearly into view; and what a base! An official Supreme Being and a regulated Terror. . . . How can we speak with decent patience of a man who seriously thought that he should conciliate the conservative and theological elements of the society at his feet, by such an odious opera-piece as the Feast of the Supreme Being. This was designed as a triumphant ripost to the Feast of Reason, which Chaumette and his friends had celebrated in the winter. . . . Robespierre persuaded the Convention to decree an official recognition of the Supreme Being, and to attend a commemorative festival in honour of their mystic patron. He contrived to be chosen president for the decade in which the festival would fall. When the day came (20th Prairial, June 8, 1794), he clothed himself with more than even his usual care. As he looked out from the windows of the Tuileries upon the jubilant crowd in the gardens, he was intoxicated with enthusiasm. 'O Nature,' he cried, 'how sublime thy power, how full of delight! How tyrants must grow pale at the idea of such a festival as this!' In pontifical pride he walked at the head of the procession, with flowers and wheat-ears in his hand, to the sound of chants and symphonies and choruses of maidens. On the first of the great basins in the gardens, David, the artist, had devised an allegorical structure for which an inauspicious doom was prepared. Atheism, a statue of life size, was throned in the midst of an amiable group of human Vices, with Madness by her side, and Wisdom menacing them with lofty wrath. Great are the perils of symbolism. Robespierre applied a torch to Atheism, but alas, the wind was hostile, or else Atheism and Madness were damp. They obstinately resisted the torch, and it was hapless Wisdom who took fire. . . . The whole mummery was pagan. . . . It stands as the most disgusting and contemptible anachronism in history."—J. Morley, *Robespierre (Critical Miscellanies, Second Series)*.

Also in T. Carlyle, *The Fr. Rev.*, v. 3, bk. 6.
—G. H. Lewes, *Life of Robespierre*, ch. 19-20.—
L. Gronlund, *Ça ira; or Danton in the Fr. Rev.*,

ch. 6.—J. Claretie, *Camille Desmoulins and his Wife*, ch 5-6.

A. D. 1794 (March—July).—Withdrawal of Prussia from the European Coalition as an ally, to become a mercenary.—Successes of the Republic.—Conquest of the Austrian Netherlands.—Advance to the Rhine.—Loss of Corsica.—Naval defeat off Ushant.—“While the alliance of the Great Powers was on the point of dissolution from selfishness and jealousy, the French, with an energy and determination, which, considering their unparalleled difficulties, were truly heroic, had assembled armies numbering nearly a million of men. The aggregate of the allied forces did not much exceed 300,000. The campaign on the Dutch and Flemish frontiers of France was planned at Vienna, but had nearly been disconcerted at the outset by the refusal of the Duke of York to serve under General Clairfait. . . . The Emperor settled the difficulty by signifying his intention to take the command in person. Thus one incompetent prince who knew little, was to be commanded by another incompetent prince who knew nothing, about war; and the success of a great enterprise was made subservient to considerations of punctilio and etiquette. The main object of the Austrian plan was to complete the reduction of the frontier fortresses by the capture of Landrecy on the Sambre, and then to advance through the plains of Picardy on Paris;—a plan which might have been feasible the year before. . . . The King of Prussia formally withdrew from the alliance [March 13]; but condescended to assume the character of a mercenary. In the spring of the year, by a treaty with the English Government, his Prussian Majesty undertook to furnish 62,000 men for a year, in consideration of the sum of £1,800,000, of which Holland, by a separate convention, engaged to supply somewhat less than a fourth part. The organisation of the French army was effected under the direction of Carnot. . . . The policy of terror was nevertheless applied to the administration of the army. Cstine and Houchard, who had commanded the last campaign, . . . were sent to the scaffold, because the arms of the republic had failed to achieve a complete triumph under their direction. . . . Pichegru, the officer now selected to lead the hosts of France, went forth to assume his command with the knife of the executioner suspended over his head. His orders were to expel the invaders from the soil and strongholds of the republic, and to reconquer Belgium. The first step towards the fulfilment of this commission was the recovery of the three great frontier towns, Condé, Valenciennes, and Quesnoy. The siege of Quesnoy was immediately formed; and Pichegru, informed of or anticipating the plans of the Allies, disposed a large force in front of Cambray, to intercept the operations of . . . the allied army upon Landrecy. . . . On the 17th [of April] a great action was fought in which the allies obtained a success, sufficient to enable them to press the siege of Landrecy. . . . Pichegru, a few days after [April 26, at the redoubts of Troisville] sustained a signal repulse from the British, in an attempt to raise the siege of Landrecy; but by a rapid and daring movement, he improved his defeat, and seized the important post of Moucron. The results were, that Clairfait was

forced to fall back on Tournay; Courtray and Menin surrendered to the French; and thus the right flanks of the Allies were exposed. Landrecy, which, about the same time, fell into the hands of the Allies, was but a poor compensation for the reverses in West Flanders. The Duke of York, at the urgent instance of the Emperor, marched to the relief of Clairfait; but, in the meantime, the Austrian general, being hard pressed, was compelled to fall back upon a position which would enable him for a time to cover Bruges, Ghent, and Ostend. The English had also to sustain a vigorous attack near Tournay; but the enemy were defeated with the loss of 4,000 men. It now became necessary to risk a general action to save Flanders, by cutting off that division of the French army which had outflanked the Allies. By bad management and want of concert this movement, which had been contrived by Colonel Mack, the chief military adviser of the Emperor, was wholly defeated [at Tourcoign, May 18]. . . . The French took 1,500 prisoners and 60 pieces of cannon. A thousand English soldiers lay dead on the field, and the Duke [of York] himself escaped with difficulty. Four days after, Pichegru having collected a great force, amounting, it has been stated, to 100,000 men, made a grand attack upon the allied army [at Pont Achin]. . . . The battle raged from five in the morning until nine at night, and was at length determined by the bayonet. . . . In consequence of this check, Pichegru fell back upon Lisle.” It was after this repulse that “the French executive, on the flimsy pretence of a supposed attempt to assassinate Robespierre, instigated by the British Government, procured a decree from the Convention, that no English or Hanoverian prisoners should be made. In reply to this atrocious edict, the Duke of York issued a general order, enjoining forbearance to the troops under his command. Most of the French generals . . . refused to become assassins. . . . The decree was carried into execution in a few instances only. . . . The Allies gained no military advantage by the action of Pont Achin on the 22nd of May. . . . The Emperor . . . abandoned the army and retired to Vienna. He left some orders and proclamations behind him, to which nobody thought it worth while to pay any attention. On the 5th of June, Pichegru invested Ypres, which Clairfait made two attempts to retain, but without success. The place surrendered on the 17th; Clairfait retreated to Ghent; Walmoden abandoned Bruges; and the Duke of York, forced to quit his position at Tournay, encamped near Oudenarde. It was now determined by the Prince of Coburg, who resumed the chief command after the departure of the Emperor, to risk the fate of Belgium on a general action, which was fought at Fleurus on the 26th of June. The Austrians, after a desperate struggle, were defeated at all points by the French army of the Sambre under Jourdan. Charleroi having surrendered to the French . . . and the Duke of York being forced to retreat, any further attempt to save the Netherlands was hopeless. Ostend and Mons, Ghent, Tournay, and Oudenarde, were successively evacuated; and the French were established at Brussels. When it was too late, the English army was reinforced. . . . It now only remained for the French to recapture the fort-

resses on their own frontier which had been taken from them in the last campaign. . . . Landrecy . . . fell without a struggle. Quesnoy . . . made a gallant [but vain] resistance. . . . Valenciennes and Condé . . . opened their gates. . . . The victorious armies of the Republic were thus prepared for the conquest of Holland. . . . The Prince of Orange made an appeal to the patriotism of his countrymen; but the republicans preferred the ascendancy of their faction to the liberties of their country. . . . The other military operations of the year, in which England was engaged, do not require prolonged notice. The Corsicans, under the guidance of their veteran chief, Paoli, . . . sought the aid of England to throw off the French yoke, and offered in return allegiance of his countrymen to the British Crown. . . . A small force was despatched, and, after a series of petty operations, Corsica was occupied by British troops, and proclaimed a part of the British dominions. An expedition on a greater scale was sent to the West Indies. Martinique, St. Lucie and Guadaloupe were easily taken; but the large island of St. Domingo, relieved by a timely arrival of succours from France, offered a formidable [and successful] resistance. . . . The campaign on the Rhine was undertaken by the Allies under auspices ill calculated to inspire confidence, or even hope. The King of Prussia, not content with abandoning the cause, had done everything in his power to thwart and defeat the operations of the Allies. . . . On the 22d of May, the Austrians crossed the Rhine and attacked the French in their intrenchments without success. On the same day, the Prussians defeated a division of the Republican army [at Kaiserslautern], and advanced their head-quarters to Deux-Ponts. Content with this achievement, the German armies remained inactive for several weeks, when the French, having obtained reinforcements, attacked the whole line of the German posts. . . . Before the end of the year the Allies were in full retreat, and the Republicans in their turn had become the invaders of Germany. They occupied the Electorate of Treves, and they captured the important fort of Mannheim. Mentz also was placed under a close blockade. . . . At sea, England maintained her ancient reputation. The French had made great exertions to fit out a fleet, and 26 ships of the line were assembled in the port of Brest," for the protecting of a merchant fleet, laden with much needed food-supplies, expected from America. Lord Howe, with an English fleet of 25 ships of the line, was on the watch for the Brest fleet when it put to sea. On the 1st of June he sighted and attacked it off Ushant, performing the celebrated manœuvre of breaking the enemy's line. Seven of the French ships were taken, one was sunk during the battle, and 18, much crippled, escaped. The victory caused great exultation in England, but it was fruitless, for the American convoy was brought safely into Brest.—W. Massey, *Hist. of England during the reign of George III.*, ch. 35 (v. 3).

ALSO IN Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe, 1789–1815*, ch. 16 (v. 4).—F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the 18th Century*, v. 6, div. 2, ch. 2, sec. 3.—Capt. A. T. Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power upon the French Rev. and Empire*, ch. 8 (v. 1).

A. D. 1794 (June—July).—The monstrous Law of the 22d Prairial.—The climax of the

Reign of Terror.—A summary of its horrors.

—"On the day of the Feast of the Supreme Being, the guillotine was concealed in the folds of rich hangings. It was the 20th of Prairial. Two days later Couthon proposed to the Convention the memorable Law of the 22d Prairial [June 10]. Robespierre was the draftsman, and the text of it still remains in his own writing. This monstrous law is simply the complete abrogation of all law. Of all laws ever passed in the world it is the most nakedly iniquitous. . . . After the probity and good judgment of the tribunal, the two cardinal guarantees in state trials are accurate definition, and proof. The offence must be capable of precise description, and the proof against an offender must conform to strict rule. The Law of Prairial violently infringed all three of these essential conditions of judicial equity. First, the number of the jury who had power to convict was reduced. Second, treason was made to consist in such vague and infinitely elastic kinds of action as inspiring discouragement, misleading opinion, depraving manners, corrupting patriots, abusing the principles of the Revolution by perfidious applications. Third, proof was to lie in the conscience of the jury; there was an end of preliminary inquiry, of witnesses in defence, and of counsel for the accused. Any kind of testimony was evidence, whether material or moral, verbal or written, if it was of a kind 'likely to gain the assent of a man of reasonable mind.' Now, what was Robespierre's motive in devising this infernal instrument? . . . To us the answer seems clear. We know what was the general aim in Robespierre's mind at this point in the history of the Revolution. His brother Augustin was then the representative of the Convention with the army of Italy, and General Bonaparte was on terms of close intimacy with him. Bonaparte said long afterwards . . . that he saw long letters from Maximilian to Augustin Robespierre, all blaming the Conventional Commissioners [sent to the provinces]—Tallien, Fouché, Barras, Collot, and the rest—for the horrors they perpetrated, and accusing them of ruining the Revolution by their atrocities. Again, there is abundant testimony that Robespierre did his best to induce the Committee of Public Safety to bring those odious malefactors to justice. The text of the Law . . . discloses the same object. The vague phrases of depraving manners and applying revolutionary principles perfidiously, were exactly calculated to smite the band of violent men whose conduct was to Robespierre the scandal of the Revolution. And there was a curious clause in the law as originally presented, which deprived the Convention of the right of preventing measures against its own members. Robespierre's general design in short was to effect a further purgation of the Convention. . . . If Robespierre's design was what we believe it to have been, the result was a ghastly failure. The Committee of Public Safety would not consent to apply his law against the men for whom he had specially designed it. The frightful weapon which he had forged was seized by the Committee of General Security, and Paris was plunged into the fearful days of the Great Terror. The number of persons put to death by the Revolutionary Tribunal before the Law of Prairial had been comparatively moderate. From the creation of the Tribunal in April 1793, down to the

execution of the Hébertists in March 1794, the number of persons condemned to death was 505. From the death of the Hébertists down to the death of Robespierre, the number of the condemned was 2,158. One-half of the entire number of victims, namely, 1,356, were guillotined after the Law of Prairial. . . . A man was informed against; he was seized in his bed at five in the morning; at seven he was taken to the Conciergerie; at nine he received information of the charge against him; at ten he went into the dock; by two in the afternoon he was condemned; by four his head lay in the executioner's basket."—J. Morley, *Robespierre (Critical Miscellanies: Second Series)*.—"Single indictments comprehended 20 or 30 people taken promiscuously—great noblemen from Paris, day labourers from Marseilles, sailors from Brest, peasants from Alsace—who were accused of conspiring together to destroy the Republic. All examination, discussion, and evidence were dispensed with; the names of the victims were hardly read out to the jury, and it happened, more than once, that the son was mistaken for the father—an entirely innocent person for the one really charged—and sent to the guillotine. The judges urged the jury to pass sentences of death, with loud threats; members of the Government committees attended daily, and applauded the bloody verdicts with ribald jests. On this spot at least the strife of parties was hushed."—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, bk. 10, ch. 1 (v. 4).—"The first murders committed in 1793 proceeded from a real irritation caused by danger. Such perils had now ceased; the republic was victorious; people now slaughtered not from indignation, but from the atrocious habit which they had contracted. . . . According to the law, the testimony of witnesses was to be dispensed with only when there existed material or moral proofs; nevertheless no witnesses were called, as it was alleged that proofs of this kind existed in every case. The jurors did not take the trouble to retire to the consultation room. They gave their opinions before the audience, and sentence was immediately pronounced. The accused had scarcely time to rise and to mention their names. One day, there was a prisoner whose name was not upon the list of the accused, and who said to the Court, 'I am not accused; my name is not on your list.' 'What signifies that?' said Fouquier, 'give it quick!' He gave it, and was sent to the scaffold like the others. . . . The most extraordinary blunders were committed. . . . More than once victims were called long after they had perished. There were hundreds of acts of accusation quite ready, to which there was nothing to add but the designation of the individuals. . . . The printing-office was contiguous to the hall of the tribunal: the forms were kept standing, the title, the motives, were ready composed; there was nothing but the names to be added. These were handed through a small loop-hole to the overseer. Thousands of copies were immediately worked off and plunged families into mourning and struck terror into the prisons. The hawkers came to sell the bulletin of the tribunal under the prisoners' windows, crying, 'Here are the names of those who have gained prizes in the lottery of St. Guillotine.' The accused were executed on the breaking up of the court, or at latest on the morrow, if the day was too far ad-

vanced. Ever since the passing of the Law of the 22d of Prairial, victims perished at the rate of 50 or 60 a day. 'That goes well,' said Fouquier-Tinville; 'heads fall like tiles;' and he added, 'It must go better still next decade; I must have 450 at least.'"—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev. (Am. ed.)*, v. 3, pp. 63–66.—"One hundred and seventy-eight tribunals, of which 40 are ambulatory, pronounce in every part of the territory sentences of death which are immediately executed on the spot. Between April 6, 1793, and Thermidor 9, year II. [July 27, 1794], that of Paris has 2,625 persons guillotined, while the provincial judges do as much work as the Paris judges. In the small town of Orange alone, they guillotine 331 persons. In the single town of Arras they have 299 men and 93 women guillotined. At Nantes, the revolutionary tribunals and military committees have, on the average, 100 persons a day guillotined, or shot, in all 1771. In the city of Lyons the revolutionary committee admit 1684 executions, while Cadillot, one of Robespierre's correspondents, advises him of 6,000.—The statement of these murders is not complete, but 17,000 have been enumerated. . . . Even excepting those who had died fighting or who, taken with arms in their hands, were shot down or sabred on the spot, there were 10,000 persons slaughtered without trial in the province of Anjou alone. . . . It is estimated that, in the eleven western departments, the dead of both sexes and of all ages exceeded 400,000.—Considering the programme and principles of the Jacobin sect, this is no great number; they might have killed a good many more. But time was wanting; during their short reign they did what they could with the instrument in their hands. Look at their machine. . . . Organised March 30 and April 6, 1793, the Revolutionary Committees and the Revolutionary Tribunal had but seventeen months in which to do their work. They did not drive ahead with all their might until after the fall of the Girondists, and especially after September, 1793, that is to say for a period of eleven months. Its loose wheels were not screwed up and the whole was not in running order under the impulse of the central motor until after December, 1793, that is to say during eight months. Perfected by the Law of Prairial 22, it works for the past two months faster and better than before. . . . Baudot and Jean Bon St. Andre, Carrier, Antonelle and Guffroy had already estimated the lives to be taken at several millions, and, according to Collot d'Herbois, who had a lively imagination, 'the political perspiration should go on freely, and not stop until from twelve to fifteen million Frenchmen had been destroyed.'"—H. A. Taine, *The Fr. Rev.*, bk. 8, ch. 1 (v. 3).

ALSO IN W. Smyth, *Lects. on the Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, lects. 39–42 (v. 2).—Abbé Dumesnil, *Recollections of the Reign of Terror*.—Count Beugnot, *Life*, v. 1, ch. 7–8.—J. Wilson, *The Reign of Terror and its Secret Police (Studies in Modern Mind, etc.)*, ch. 7.—*The Reign of Terror: A collection of authentic narratives*, 2 v.

A. D. 1794 (July).—The Fall of Robespierre.—End of the Reign of Terror.—Robespierre "was already feeling himself unequal to the task laid upon him. He said himself on one occasion: 'I was not made to rule, I was made to combat the enemies of the Revolution;' and so the possession of supreme power produced in him

no feeling of exultation. On the contrary, it preyed upon his spirits, and made him fancy himself the object of universal hatred. A guard now slept nightly at his house, and followed him in all his walks. Two pistols lay ever at his side. He would not eat food till some one else had tasted from the dish. His jealous fears were awakened by every sign of popularity in another. Even the successes of his generals filled him with anxiety, lest they should raise up dangerous rivals. He had, indeed . . . grounds enough for anxiety. In the Committee of Public Safety every member, except St. Just and Couthon, viewed him with hatred and suspicion. Carnot resented his interferences. The Terrorists were contemptuous of his religious festivals, and disliked his decided supremacy. The friends of Mercy saw with indignation that the number of victims was increasing. The friends of Disorder found themselves restrained, and were bored by his long speeches about virtue and simplicity of life. He was hated for what was good and for what was evil in his government; and meanwhile the national distress was growing, and the cry of starvation was heard louder than ever. Fortunately there was a splendid harvest in 1794; but before it was gathered in Robespierre had fallen. A somewhat frivolous incident did much to discredit him. A certain old woman named Catherine Théot, living in an obscure part of Paris, had taken to seeing visions. Some of the Terrorists produced a paper, purporting to be written by her, and declaring that Robespierre was the Messiah. The paper was a forgery, but it served to cover Robespierre with ridicule, and to rouse in him a fierce determination to suppress those whom he considered his enemies in the Committee and the Convention. For some time he had taken little part in the proceedings of either of these bodies. His reliance was chiefly on the Jacobin Club, the reorganized Commune, and the National Guards, still under the command of Henriot. But on July 26th [8th Thermidor] Robespierre came to the Convention and delivered one of his most elaborate speeches, maintaining that the affairs of France had been mismanaged; that the army had been allowed to become dangerously independent; that the Government must be strengthened and simplified; and that traitors must be punished. He made no definite proposals, and did not name his intended victims. The real meaning of the speech was evidently that he ought to be made Dictator, but that in order to obtain his end, it was necessary to conceal the use he meant to make of his power. The members of the Convention naturally felt that some of themselves were aimed at. Few felt themselves safe; but Robespierre's dominance had become so established that no one ventured at first to criticize. It was proposed, and carried unanimously, that the speech should be printed and circulated throughout France. Then at length a deputy named Cambon rose to answer Robespierre's attacks on the recent management of the finances. Finding himself favourably listened to, he went on to attack Robespierre himself. Other members of the hitherto docile Convention now took courage; and it was decided that the speech should be referred to the Committees before it was printed. The crisis was now at hand. Robespierre went down as usual to the Jacobin Club,

where he was received with the usual enthusiasm. The members swore to die with their leader, or to suppress his enemies. On the following day [9th Thermidor] St. Just attacked Billaud and Collot. Billaud [followed and supported by Tallien] replied by asserting that on the previous night the Jacobins had pledged themselves to massacre the deputies. Then the storm burst. A cry of horror and indignation arose; and as Billaud proceeded to give details of the alleged conspiracy, shouts of 'Down with the tyrant!' began to rise from the benches. Robespierre vainly strove to obtain a hearing. He rushed about the chamber, appealing to the several groups. As he went up to the higher benches on the Left, he was met with the cry, 'Back, tyrant, the shade of Danton repels you!' and when he sought shelter among the deputies on the Right, and actually sat down in their midst, they indignantly exclaimed, 'Wretch, that was Vergniaud's seat!' Baited on all sides, his attempts to speak became shrieks, which were scarcely audible, however, amid the shouts and interruptions that rose from all the groups. His voice grew hoarser . . . till at length it failed him altogether. Then one of the Mountain cried, 'The blood of Danton chokes him!' Amid a scene of indescribable excitement and uproar, a decree was passed that Robespierre and some of his leading followers should be arrested. They were seized by the officers of the Convention, and hurried off to different prisons; so that, in case of a rescue, only one of them might be released. There was room enough for fear. The Commune organized an insurrection, as soon as they heard what the Convention had done; and by a sudden attack the prisoners were all delivered from the hands of their guards. Both parties now hastily gathered armed forces. Those of the municipality were by far the most numerous, and Henriot confidently ordered them to advance. But the men refused to obey. The Sections mostly declared for the Convention, and thus by an unexpected reaction the Robespierian leaders found themselves almost deserted. A detachment of soldiers forced their way into the room where the small band of fanatics were drawing up a Proclamation. A pistol was fired; and no one knows with certainty whether Robespierre attempted suicide, or was shot by one of his opponents. At any rate his jaw was fractured, and he was laid out, a ghastly spectacle, on an adjacent table. The room was soon crowded. Some spat at the prostrate form. Others stabbed him with their knives. Soon he was dragged [along with Couthon, St. Just, Henriot, and others] before the Tribunal which he himself had instituted. The necessary formalities were hurried through, and the mangled body was borne to the guillotine, where what remained to him of life was quickly extinguished. Then, from the crowd, a man stepped quickly up to the blood-stained corpse, and uttered over him the words, 'Yes, Robespierre, there is a God!'" —J. E. Symes. *The Fr. Rev.*, ch. 13.—"Samson's work done, there bursts forth shout on shout of applause. Shout, which prolongs itself not only over Paris, but over France, but over Europe, and down to this generation. Deservedly, and also undeservedly. O unhappiest Advocate of Arras, wert thou worse than other Advocates? Stricter man, according to his Formula, to his Credo and his Cant, of prohibitions,

benevolences, pleasures-of-virtue, and suchlike, lived not in that age. A man fitted, in some luckier settled age, to have become one of those incorruptible barren Pattern-Figures, and have had marble-tablets and funeral-sermons. His poor landlord, the Cabinet-maker in the Rue Saint-Honoré, loved him; his Brother died for him. May God be merciful to him and to us! This is the end of the Reign of Terror; new glorious Revolution named 'of Thermidor'; of Thermidor 9th, year 2; which being interpreted into old slave-style means 27th of July, 1794."—T. Carlyle, *The Fr. Rev.*, bk. 6, ch. 7 (v. 3). "He [Robespierre] had qualities, it is true, which we must respect; he was honest, sincere, self-denying and consistent. But he was cowardly, relentless, pedantic, unloving, intensely vain and morbidly envious. . . . He has not left the legacy to mankind of one grand thought, nor the example of one generous and exalted action."—G. H. Lewes, *Life of Robespierre*. *Conclusion*.—"The ninth of Thermidor is one of the great epochs in the history of Europe. It is true that the three members of the Committee of Public Safety [Billaud, Collot, and Barère], who triumphed were by no means better men than the three [Robespierre, Couthon, and St. Just], who fell. Indeed, we are inclined to think that of these six statesmen the least bad were Robespierre and St. Just, whose cruelty was the effect of sincere fanaticism operating on narrow understandings and acrimonious tempers. The worst of the six was, beyond all doubt, Barère, who had no faith in any part of the system which he upheld by persecution."—Lord Macaulay, *Barère's Memoirs* (*Essays*, v. 5).

ALSO IN G. Everitt, *Guillotine the Great*, ch. 2.—J. W. Croker, *Robespierre* (*Quarterly Rev.*, Sept., 1835, v. 34).—W. Chambers, *Robespierre* (*Chambers' Edin. Journal*, 1852).

A. D. 1794-1795 (July—April). Reaction against the Reign of Terror.—The Thermidorians and the Jeunesse Dorée.—End of the Jacobin Club.—Insurrection of Germinal 12.—Fall of the Montagnards.—The White Terror in the Provinces.—"On the morning of the 10th of Thermidor all the people who lived near the prisons of Paris crowded on the roofs of their houses and cried, 'All is over! Robespierre is dead!' The thousands of prisoners, who had believed themselves doomed to death, imagined themselves rescued from the tomb. Many were set free the same day, and all the rest regained hope and confidence. Their feeling of deliverance was shared throughout France. The Reign of Terror had become a sort of nightmare that stifled the nation, and the Reign of Terror and Robespierre were identical in the sight of the great majority. . . . The Convention presented a strange aspect. Party remnants were united in the coalition party called the 'Thermidorians.' Many of the Mountaineers and of those who had been fiercest in their missions presently took seats with the Right or Centre; and the periodic change of Committees, so long contested, was determined upon. Lots were drawn, and Barère, Lindet, and Prieur went out; Carnot, indispensable in the war, was re-elected until the coming spring; Billaud and Collot, feeling out of place in the new order of things, resigned. Danton's friends now prevailed; but, alas! the Dantonists were not Danton."—H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of*

France from the First Rev., ch. 22 (v. 1).—"The Reign of Terror was practically over, but the ground-swell which follows a storm continued for some time longer. Twenty-one victims suffered on the same day with Robespierre, 70 on the next; altogether 114 were condemned and executed in the three days which followed his death. . . . A strong reaction against the 'Terreur' now set in. Upwards of 10,000 'suspects' were set free, and Robespierre's law of the 22 Prairial was abolished. Fréron, a leading Thermidorien, organized a band of young men who called themselves the Jeunesse Dorée [gilded youth], or Muscadins, and chiefly frequented the Palais Royal. They wore a ridiculous dress, 'à la Victime' [large cravat, black or green collar, and crape around the arm, signifying relationship to some of the victims of the revolutionary tribunal.—Thiers], and devoted themselves to punishing the Jacobins. They had their hymn, 'Le réveil du Peuple,' which they sang about the street, often coming into collision with the sans-culottes shouting the Marseillaise. On the 11th of November the Muscadins broke open the hall of the celebrated club, turned out the members, and shut it up for ever. . . . The committees of Salut Public and Sureté Générale were entirely remodelled and their powers much restrained; also the Revolutionary Tribunal was reorganized on the lines advocated by Camille Desmoulins in his proposal for a Comité de Clémence—which cost him his life. Carrier and Lebon suffered death for their atrocious conduct in La Vendée and [Arras]; 73 members who had protested against the arrest of the Girondins were recalled, and the survivors of the leading Girondists, Louvet, Lanjuinais, Isnard, Laréveillière-Lépeaux and others, 22 in number, were restored to their seats in the Convention."—Sergeant Marceau, *Reminiscences of a Regicide*, pt. 2, ch. 12.—"Billaud, Collot, and other marked Terrorists, already denounced in the Convention by Danton's friends, felt that danger was every day drawing nearer to themselves. Their fate was to all appearance sealed by the readmission to the Convention (December 8) of the 73 deputies of the right, imprisoned in 1793 for signing protests against the expulsion of the Girondists. By the return of these deputies the complexion of the Assembly was entirely altered. . . . They now sought to undo the work of the Convention since the insurrection by which their party had been overwhelmed. They demanded that confiscated property should be restored to the relatives of persons condemned by the revolutionary courts; that emigrants who had fled in consequence of Terrorist persecutions should be allowed to return; that those deputies proscribed on June 2, 1793, who yet survived, should be recalled to their seats. The Mountain, as a body, violently opposed even the discussion of such questions. The Thermidorians split into two divisions. Some in alarm rejoined the Mountain; while others, headed by Tallien and Fréron, sought their safety by coalescing with the returned members of the right. A committee was appointed to report on accusations brought against Collot, Billaud, Barère, and Vadier (December 27, 1794). In a few weeks the survivors of the proscribed deputies entered the Convention amidst applause (March 8, 1795). . . . There was at this time great misery prevalent in Paris, and imminent peril of insurrection.

After Robespierre's fall, maximum prices were no longer observed, and assignats were only accepted in payment of goods at their real value compared with coin. The result was a rapid rise in prices, so that in December prices were double what they had been in July, and were continuing to rise in proportion as assignats decreased in value. . . . The maximum laws, already a dead letter, were repealed (December 24). The abolition of maximum prices and requisitions increased the already lavish expenditure of the Government, which, to meet the deficit in its revenues, had no resource but to create more assignats, and the faster these were issued the faster they fell in value and the higher prices rose. In July 1794, they had been worth 34 per cent. of their nominal value. In December they were worth 22 per cent., and in May 1795 they were worth only 7 per cent. . . . At this time a pound of bread cost eight shillings, of rice thirteen, of sugar seventeen, and other articles were all proportionately dear. It is literally true that more than half the population of Paris was only kept alive by occasional distributions of meat and other articles at low prices, and the daily distribution of bread at three half-pence a pound. In February, however, this source of relief threatened to fail. . . . On April 1, or Germinal 12, bread riots, begun by women, broke out in every section. Bands collected and forced their way into the Convention, shouting for bread, but offering no violence to the deputies. . . . The crowd was already dispersing when forces arrived from the sections and cleared the House. The insurrection was a spontaneous rising for bread, without method or combination. The Terrorists had sought, but vainly, to obtain direction of it. Had they succeeded, the Mountain would have had an opportunity of proscribing the right. Their failure gave the right the opportunity of proscribing the left. The transportation to Cayenne of Billaud, Collot, Barère, and Vadier was decreed, and the arrest of fifteen other Montagnards, accused without proof, in several cases without probability, of having been accomplices of the insurgents. . . . The insurrection of Germinal 12 gave increased strength to the party of reaction. The Convention, in dread of the Terrorists, was compelled to look to it for support. . . . In the departments famine, disorder, and crime prevailed, as well as in Paris. . . . From the first the reaction proceeded in the departments with a more rapid step and in bolder form than in Paris. . . . In the departments of the south-east, where the Royalists had always possessed a strong following, emigrants of all descriptions readily made their way back; and here the opponents of the Republic, instigated by a desire for vengeance, or merely by party spirit, commenced a reaction stained by crimes as atrocious as any committed during the course of the revolution. Young men belonging to the upper and middle classes were organised in bands bearing the names of companies of Jesus and companies of the Sun, and first at Lyons, then at Aix, Toulon, Marseilles, and other towns, they broke into the prisons and murdered their inmates without distinction of age or sex. Besides the Terrorist and the Jacobin, neither the Republican nor the purchaser of State lands was safe from their knives; and in the country numerous isolated murders were committed.

This lawless and brutal movement, called the White Terror in distinction to the Red Terror preceding Thermidor 9, was suffered for weeks to run its course unchecked, and counted its victims by many hundreds, spreading over the whole of Provence, besides the departments of Rhône, Gard, Loire, Ain, and Jura."—B. M. Gardiner, *The Fr. Rev.*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev. (Am. ed.)*, v. 3, pp. 109-136; 149-175; 193-225.—H. von Sybel, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, bk. 12, ch. 1-3.—J. Mallet du Pan, *Memoirs and Cor.*, v. 2, ch. 5.—A. des Echerolles, *Early Life*, v. 2, ch. 8.

A. D. 1794-1795 (October—May).—Subjugation of Holland.—Overthrow of the Stadtholdership.—Establishment of the Batavian Republic.—Peace of Basle with Prussia.—Successes on the Spanish and Italian frontiers.—Crumbling of the Coalition.—"Pichegru having taken Bois le Duc, October 9th, the Duke of York retreated to the Ar, and thence beyond the Waal. Venloo fell October 27th, Maestricht November 4th, and the capture of Nimeguen on the 9th, which the English abandoned after the fall of Maestricht, opened to the French the road into Holland. The Duke of York resigned the command to General Walmoden, December 2nd, and returned into England. His departure showed that the English government had abandoned all hope of saving Holland. It had, indeed, consented that the States-General should propose terms of accommodation to the French; and two Dutch envoys had been despatched to Paris to offer to the Committee of Public Welfare the recognition by their government of the French Republic, and the payment of 200,000,000 florins within a year. But the Committee, suspecting that these offers were made only with the view of gaining time, paid no attention to them. The French were repulsed in their first attempt to cross the Waal by General Duncan with 8,000 English; but a severe frost enabled them to pass over on the ice, January 11th, 1795. Nothing but a victory could now save Holland. But Walmoden, instead of concentrating his troops for the purpose of giving battle, retreated over the Yssel, and finally over the Ems into Westphalia, whence the troops were carried to England by sea from Bremen. . . . General Alvinzi, who held the Rhine between Emmerich and Arnheim, having retired upon Wesel, Pichegru had only to advance. On entering Holland, he called upon the patriots to rise, and his occupation of the Dutch towns was immediately followed by a revolution. The Prince of Orange, the hereditary Stadtholder, embarked for England, January 19th, on which day Pichegru's advanced columns entered Amsterdam. Next day the Dutch fleet, frozen up in the Texel, was captured by the French hussars. Before the end of January the reduction of Holland had been completed, and a provincial [provisional ?] government established at the Hague. The States-General, assembled February 24th, 1795, having received, through French influence, a new infusion of the patriot party, pronounced the abolition of the Stadtholderate, proclaimed the sovereignty of the people and the establishment of the Batavian Republic. A treaty of Peace with France followed, May 16th, and an offensive alliance against all enemies whatsoever till the end of the war, and against England for

ever. The sea and land forces to be provided by the Dutch were to serve under French commanders. Thus the new republic became a mere dependency of France. Dutch Flanders, the district on the left bank of the Hondt, Maestricht, Venloo, were retained by the French as a just indemnity for the expenses of the war, on which account the Dutch were also to pay 100,000,000 florins; but they were to receive, at the general peace, an equivalent for the ceded territories. By secret articles, the Dutch were to lend the French seven ships of war, to support a French army of 25,000 men, &c. Over and above the requisitions of the treaty, they were also called upon to reclothe the French troops, and to furnish them with provisions. In short, though the Dutch patriots had 'fraternised' with the French, and received them with open arms, they were treated little better than a conquered people. Secret negotiations had been for some time going on between France and Prussia for a peace. . . . Frederick William II., . . . satisfied with his acquisitions in Poland, to which the English and Dutch subsidies had helped him, . . . abandoned himself to his voluptuous habits," and made overtures to the French. "Perhaps not the least influential among Frederick William's motives, was the refusal of the maritime Powers any longer to subsidise him for doing nothing. . . . The Peace of Basle, between the French Republic and the King of Prussia, was signed April 5th 1795. The French troops were allowed to continue the occupation of the Rhenish provinces on the left bank. An article, that neither party should permit troops of the enemies of either to pass over its territories, was calculated to embarrass the Austrians. France agreed to accept the mediation of Prussia for princes of the Empire. . . . Prussia should engage in no hostile enterprise against Holland, or any other country occupied by French troops; while the French agreed not to push their enterprises in Germany beyond a certain line of demarcation, including the Circles of Westphalia, Higher and Lower Saxony, Franconia, and that part of the two Circles of the Rhine situate on the right bank of the Main. . . . Thus the King of Prussia, originally the most ardent promoter of the Coalition, was one of the first to desert it. By signing the Peace of Basle, he sacrificed Holland, facilitated the invasion of the Empire by the French, and thus prepared the ruin of the ancient German constitution." In the meantime the French had been pushing war with success on their Spanish frontier, recovering the ground which they had lost in the early part of 1794. In the eastern Pyrenees, Dugommier "retook Bellegarde in September, the last position held by the Spaniards in France, and by the battle of the Montagne Noire, which lasted from November 17th to the 20th, opened the way into Catalonia. But at the beginning of this battle Dugommier was killed. Figuières surrendered November 24th, through the influence of the French democratic propaganda. On the west, Moncey captured St. Sebastian and Fuentarabia in August, and was preparing to attack Pampluna, when terrible storms . . . compelled him to retreat on the Bidassoa, and closed the campaign in that quarter. On the side of Piedmont, the French, after some reverses, succeeded in making themselves masters of Mont Cenis

and the passes of the Maritime Alps, thus holding the keys of Italy; but the Government, content with this success, ventured not at present to undertake the invasion of that country." The King of Sardinia, Victor Amadeus, remained faithful to his engagements with Austria, although the French tempted him with an offer of the Milanese, "and the exchange of the island of Sardinia for territory more conveniently situated. With the Grand Duke of Tuscany they were more successful. . . . On February 9th 1795, a treaty was signed by which the Grand Duke revoked his adhesion to the Coalition. . . . Thus Ferdinand was the first to desert the Emperor, his brother. The example of Tuscany was followed by the Regent of Sweden."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 7 (v. 4).

Also in C. M. Davies, *Hist. of Holland*, pt. 4, ch. 3 (v. 3).—L. P. Segur, *Hist. of the Reign of Frederick William II. of Prussia*, v. 3.

A. D. 1794-1796.—Brigandage in La Vendée.—Chouannerie in Brittany.—The Disastrous Quiberon expedition.—End of the Vendean War.—"Since the defeat at Savenay, the Vendée was no longer the scene of grand operations, but of brigandage and atrocities without result. The peasants, though detesting the Revolution, were anxious for peace; but, as there were still two chiefs, Charette and Stofflet, in the field, who hated each other, this wish could scarcely be gratified. General Thuriou, sent by the former Revolutionary Committee, had but increased this detestation by allowing pillage and incendiarism. After the death of Robespierre he was replaced by General Claucaux, who had orders to employ more conciliatory measures. The defeat of the rebel troops at Savenay, and their subsequent dispersion, had led to a kind of guerilla warfare throughout the whole of Brittany, known by the name of Chouannerie. ['A poor peasant, named Jean Cottureau, had distinguished himself in this movement above all his companions, and his family bore the name of Chouans (Chat-huans) or night-owls. . . . The name of Chouan passed from him to all the insurgents of Bretagne, although he himself never led more than a few hundred peasants, who obeyed him, as they said, out of friendship.'—H. Von Sybel, *Hist. of the Fr. Rev.*, v. 4, p. 238]. . . . The Chouans attacked the public conveyances, infested the high roads, murdered isolated bands of soldiers and functionaries. Their chiefs were Scepeaux, Bourmont, Cadoudal, but especially Puisaye . . . formerly general of the Girondins, and who wanted to raise a more formidable insurrection than had hitherto been organised. Against them was sent Hoche [September, 1794], who accustomed his soldiers to pacify rather than destroy, and taught them to respect the habits, but above all the religion, of the inhabitants. After some difficult negotiations with Charette peace was concluded (15th February), but the suppression of the Chouans was more difficult still, and Hoche . . . displayed in this ungrateful mission all the talents and humanity for which he was ever celebrated. Puisaye himself was in England, having obtained Pitt's promise of a fleet and an army, but his aide-de-camp concluded in his absence a treaty similar to that of Charette. . . . Stofflet surrendered the last. Not much dependence could be placed on either of

these pacifications, Charette himself having confessed in a letter to the Count de Provence that they were but a trap for the Republicans; but they proved useful, nevertheless, by accustoming the country to peace." This deceptive state of peace came to an end early in the summer of 1795. "The conspiracy organised in London by Puisaye, assisted and subsidised by Pitt, . . . fitted out a fleet, which harassed the French naval squadron, and then set sail for Brittany, where the expedition made itself master of the peninsula of Quiberon and the fort Penthièvre (27th June). The Brittany peasants, suspicious of the Vendéans and hating the English, did not respond to the call for revolt, and occasioned a loss of time to the invaders, of which Hoche took advantage to bring together his troops and to march on Quiberon, where he defeated the vanguard of the émigrés, and surrounded them in the peninsula. Puisaye [who had, it is said, about 10,000 men, émigrés and Chouans] attempted to crush Hoche by an attack in the rear, but was eventually out-manœuvred, Fort Penthièvre was scaled during the night, and the émigrés were routed; whilst the English squadron was caught in a hurricane and could not come to their assistance, save with one ship, which fired indiscriminately on friend and foe alike. Most of the Royalists rushed into the sea, where nearly all of them perished. Scarcely a thousand men remained, and these fought heroically. It is said that a promise was given to them that if they surrendered their lives should be spared, and, accordingly, 711 laid down their arms (21st July). By order of the Convention . . . these 711 émigrés were shot. . . . From his camp at Belleville, Charette, one of the insurgent generals, responded to this execution by the massacre of 2,000 Republican prisoners." In the following October another expedition of Royalists, fitted out in England under the auspices of Pitt, "landed at the Ile Dieu . . . , a small island about eight miles from the mainland of Poitou, and was composed of 2,500 men, who were destined to be the nucleus of several regiments; it also had on board a large store of arms, ammunition, and the Count d'Artois. Charette, named general commander of the Catholic forces, was awaiting him with 10,000 men. The whole of the Vendée was ready to rise the moment the prince touched French soil, but frivolous and undecided, he waited six weeks in idleness, endeavouring to obtain from England his recall. Hoche, to whom the command of the Republican forces had been entrusted, took advantage of this delay to cut off Charette from his communications, while he held Stofflet and the rest of the Brittany chiefs in check, and occupied the coast with 30,000 men. The Count d'Artois, whom Pitt would not recall, entreated the English commander to set sail for England (Dec. 17th, 1795), and the latter, unable to manage his fleet on a coast without shelter, complied with his request, leaving the prince on his arrival to the deserved contempt of even his own partisans. Charette in despair attempted another rising, hoping to be seconded by Stofflet, but he was beaten on all sides by Hoche. This general, who combined the astuteness of the statesman with the valour of the soldier, succeeded in a short time in pacifying the country by his generous but firm behaviour towards the inhabitants. Charette, tracked from shelter to shelter, was finally compelled to surrender, brought to Nantes, and shot (March 24th).

The same lot had befallen Stofflet a month before at Angers. After these events Hoche led his troops into Brittany, where he succeeded in putting an end to the 'chouannerie.' The west returned to its normal condition."—H. Van Laun, *The French Revolutionary Epoch*, bk. 2, ch. 2, and bk. 3, ch. 1 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev.* (Am. ed.), v. 3, pp. 144-145; 188-193; 230-240; 281-305; 343-345; 358-363; 384-389.

A. D. 1795 (April).—The question of the Constitution.—Insurrection of the 1st Prairial and its failure.—Disarming of the Faubourgs.—End of Sansculottism.—Bourgeoisie dominant again.—"The events of the 12th of Germinal decided nothing. The faubourgs had been repulsed, but not conquered. . . . After so many questions decided against the democrats, there still remained one of the utmost importance—the constitution. On this depended the ascendancy of the multitude or of the bourgeoisie. The supporters of the revolutionary government then fell back on the democratic constitution of '93, which presented to them the means of resuming the authority they had lost. Their opponents, on the other hand, endeavoured to replace it by a constitution which would secure all the advantage to them, by concentrating the government a little more, and giving it to the middle class. For a month, both parties were preparing for this last contest. The constitution of 1793, having been sanctioned by the people, enjoyed a great prestige. It was accordingly attacked with infinite precaution. At first its assailants engaged to carry it into execution without restriction; next they appointed a commission of eleven members to prepare the 'lois organiques' which were to render it practicable; by and by, they ventured to suggest objections to it on the ground that it distributed power too loosely, and only recognised one assembly dependent on the people, even in its measures of legislation. At last, a sectionary deputation went so far as to term the constitution of '93 a decemviral constitution, dictated by terror. All its partisans, at once indignant and filled with fears, organized an insurrection to maintain it. . . . The conspirators, warned by the failure of the risings of the 1st and 12th Germinal, omitted nothing to make up for their want of direct object and of organization. On the 1st Prairial (20th of May) in the name of the people, insurgent for the purpose of obtaining bread and their rights, they decreed the abolition of the revolutionary government, the establishment of the democratic constitution of '93, the dismissal and arrest of the members of the existing government, the liberation of the patriots, the convocation of the primary assemblies on the 25th Prairial, the convocation of the legislative assembly, destined to replace the convention, on the 25th Messidor, and the suspension of all authority not emanating from the people. They determined on forming a new municipality, to serve as a common centre; to seize on the barriers, telegraph, cannon, tocsins, drums, and not to rest till they had secured repose, happiness, liberty, and means of subsistence for all the French nation. They invited the artillery, gendarmes, horse and foot soldiers, to join the banners of the people, and marched on the convention. Meantime, the latter was deliberating on the means of preventing the insurrection. . . . The committees came in all haste to

apprise it of its danger; it immediately declared its sitting permanent, voted Paris responsible for the safety of the representatives of the republic, closed its doors, outlawed all the leaders of the mob, summoned the citizens of the sections to arms, and appointed as their leaders eight commissioners, among whom were Legendre, Henri la Riviere, Kervelegan, &c. These deputies had scarcely gone, when a loud noise was heard without. An outer door had been forced, and numbers of women rushed into the galleries, crying 'Bread and the constitution of '93!' . . . The galleries were . . . cleared; but the insurgents of the faubourgs soon reached the inner doors, and, finding them closed, forced them with hatchets and hammers, and then rushed in amidst the convention. The Hall now became a field of battle. The veterans and gendarmes, to whom the guard of the assembly was confided, cried 'To arms!' The deputy Auguis, sword in hand, headed them, and succeeded in repelling the assailants, and even made a few of them prisoners. But the insurgents, more numerous, returned to the charge, and again rushed into the house. The deputy Feraud entered precipitately, pursued by the insurgents, who fired some shots in the house. They took aim at Boissy d'Anglas, who was occupying the president's chair. . . . Feraud ran to the tribune, to shield him with his body; he was struck at with pikes and sabres, and fell dangerously wounded. The insurgents dragged him into the lobby, and, mistaking him for Fréron, cut off his head and placed it on a pike. After this skirmish they became masters of the Hall. Most of the deputies had taken flight. There only remained the members of the Crête [the 'Crest'—a name now given to the remnant of the party of 'The Mountain'] and Boissy d'Anglas, who, calm, his hat on, heedless of threat and insult, protested in the name of the convention against this popular violence. They held out to him the bleeding head of Feraud; he bowed respectfully before it. They tried to force him, by placing pikes at his breast, to put the propositions of the insurgents to the vote; he steadily and courageously refused. But the Crêtois, who approved of the insurrection, took possession of the bureaux and of the tribune, and decreed, amidst the applause of the multitude, all the articles contained in the manifesto of the insurrection." Meantime "the commissioners despatched to the sections had quickly gathered them together. . . . The aspect of affairs then underwent a change; Legendre, Kervelegan, and Auguis besieged the insurgents, in their turn, at the head of the sectionaries," and drove them at last from the hall of the convention. "The assembly again became complete; the sections received a vote of thanks, and the deliberations were resumed. All the measures adopted in the interim were annulled, and fourteen representatives, to whom were afterwards joined fourteen others, were arrested, for organizing the insurrection or approving it in their speeches. It was then midnight; at five in the morning the prisoners were already six leagues from Paris. Despite this defeat, the Faubourgs did not consider themselves beaten; and the next day they advanced en masse with their cannon against the convention. The sections, on their side, marched for its defence." But a collision was averted by negotiations, and the insurgents

withdrew, "after having received an assurance that the Convention would assiduously attend to the question of provisions, and would soon publish the organic laws of the constitution of '93. . . . Six democratic Mountaineers, Goujon, Bourbotte, Romme, Duroy, Duquesnoy, and Soubrany, were brought before a military commission . . . and . . . condemned to death. They all stabbed themselves with the same knife, which was transferred from one to the other, exclaiming, 'Vive la République!' Romme, Goujon, and Duquesnoy were fortunate enough to wound themselves fatally; the other three were conducted to the scaffold in a dying state, but faced death with serene countenances. Meantime, the Faubourgs, though repelled on the 1st, and diverted from their object on the 2nd of Prairial, still had the means of rising," and the convention ordered them to be disarmed. "They were encompassed by all the interior sections. After attempting to resist, they yielded, giving up some of their leaders, their arms, and artillery. . . . The inferior class was entirely excluded from the government of the state; the revolutionary committees which formed its assemblies were destroyed; the cannoneers forming its armed force were disarmed; the constitution of '93, which was its code, was abolished; and here the rule of the multitude terminated. . . . From that period, the middle class resumed the management of the revolution without, and the assembly was as united under the Girondists as it had been, after the 2nd of June, under the Mountaineers."—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: Duchesse d'Abrantes, *Memoirs*, ch. 12-14 (p. 1).—T. Carlyle, *The French Rev.*, v. 3, bk. 7, ch. 4-6.—G. Long, *France and its Revolutions*, ch. 53.

A. D. 1795 (June—September).—Framing and adoption of the Constitution of the Year III.—Self-renewing decrees of the Convention.—Hostility in Paris to them.—Intrigues of the Royalists.—"The royalist party, beaten on the frontiers, and deserted by the court of Spain, on which it placed most reliance, was now obliged to confine itself to intrigues in the interior; and it must be confessed that, at this moment, Paris offered a wide field for such intrigues. The work of the constitution was advancing; the time when the Convention was to resign its powers, when France should meet to elect fresh representatives, when a new Assembly should succeed that which had so long reigned, was more favourable than any other for counter-revolutionary manœuvres. The most vehement passions were in agitation in the sections of Paris. The members of them were not royalists, but they served the cause of royalty without being aware of it. They had made a point of opposing the Terrorists; they had animated themselves by the conflict; they wished to persecute also; and they were exasperated against the Convention, which would not permit this persecution to be carried too far. They were always ready to remember that Terror had sprung from its bosom; they demanded of it a constitution and laws, and the end of the long dictatorship which it had exercised. . . . Behind this mass the royalists concealed themselves. . . . The constitution had been presented by the commission of eleven. It was discussed during the three months of Messidor, Thermidor, and Fructidor [June—August], and was successively decreed with very little alteration."

The principal features of the constitution so framed, known as the Constitution of the Year III., were the following: "A Council, called 'The Council of the Five Hundred,' composed of 500 members, of, at least, thirty years of age, having exclusively the right of proposing laws, one-third to be renewed every year. A Council called 'The Council of the Ancients,' composed of 250 members, of, at least, forty years of age, all either widowers or married, having the sanction of the laws, to be renewed also by one-third. An executive Directory, composed of five members, deciding by a majority, to be renewed annually by one-fifth, having responsible ministers. . . . The mode of nominating these powers was the following: All the citizens of the age of twenty-one met of right in primary assembly on every first day of the month of Prairial, and nominated electoral assemblies. These electoral assemblies met every 20th of Prairial, and nominated the two Councils; and the two Councils nominated the Directory. . . . The judicial authority was committed to elective judges. . . . There were to be no communal assemblies, but municipal and departmental administrations, composed of three, five, or more members, according to the population; they were to be formed by way of election. . . . The press was entirely free. The emigrants were banished for ever from the territory of the republic; the national domains were irrevocably secured to the purchasers; all religions were declared free, but were neither acknowledged nor paid by the state. . . . One important question was started. The Constituent Assembly, from a parade of disinterestedness, had excluded itself from the new legislative body [the Legislative Assembly of 1791]; would the Convention do the same?" The members of the Convention decided this question in the negative, and "decreed, on the 5th of Fructidor (August 23d), that the new legislative body should be composed of two-thirds of the Convention, and that one new third only should be elected. The question to be decided was, whether the Convention should itself designate the two-thirds to be retained, or whether it should leave that duty to the electoral assemblies. After a tremendous dispute, it was agreed on the 13th of Fructidor (August 30), that this choice should be left to the electoral assemblies. It was decided that the primary assemblies should meet on the 20th of Fructidor (September 6th), to accept the constitution and the two decrees of the 5th and the 13th of Fructidor. It was likewise decided that, after giving their votes upon the constitution and the decrees, the primary assemblies should again meet and proceed forthwith, that is to say, in the year III. (1795), to the elections for the 1st of Prairial in the following year." The right of voting upon the constitution was extended, by another decree, to the armies in the field. "No sooner were these resolutions adopted, than the enemies of the Convention, so numerous and so diverse, were deeply mortified by them. . . . The Convention, they said, was determined to cling to power; . . . it wished to retain by force a majority composed of men who had covered France with scaffolds. . . . All the sections of Paris, excepting that of the Quinze-Vingts, accepted the Constitution and rejected the decrees. The result was not the same in the rest of France. . . . On the 1st of Vendémiaire, year IV. (September 23, 1795), the

general result of the votes was proclaimed. The constitution was accepted almost unanimously, and the decrees by an immense majority of the voters." The Convention now decreed that the new legislative body should be elected in October and meet November 6.—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev. (Am. ed.)*, v. 3, pp. 305-315.

ALSO IN: H. Von Sybel, *Hist. of the French Rev.*, bk. 12, ch. 4 (v. 4).—H. C. Lockwood, *Constitutional Hist. of France*, ch. 1, and app. 3.—J. Mallet du Pan, *Memoirs and Corr.*, v. 2, ch. 8.

A. D. 1795 (June–December).—Death of the late King's son (Louis XVII.).—Treaty of Basle with Spain.—Acquisition of Spanish San Domingo.—Ineffectual campaign on the Rhine.—Victory at Loano.—"The Committees had formed great plans for the campaign of 1795; meaning to invade the territories of the allies, take Mayence, and enter Southern Germany, go down into Italy, and reach the very heart of Spain. But Carnot, Lindet, and Prieur were no longer on the Committee, and their successors were not their equals; army discipline was relaxed; a vulgar reactionist had replaced Carnot in the war department and was working ruin. . . . The attack in Spain was to begin with the Lower Pyrenees, by the capture of Pampeluna and a march upon Castile, but famine and fever decimated the army of the Western Pyrenees, and General Monecy was forced to postpone all serious action till the summer. At the other end of the Pyrenees, the French and Spaniards were fighting aimlessly at the entry to Catalonia. The war was at a standstill; but the negotiations went on between the two countries. The king of Spain, as in honor bound, made the liberation of his young kinsman, the son of Louis XVI., a condition of peace. This the Republic would not grant, but the prisoner's death (June 8, 1795) removed the obstacle. The counter-revolutionists accused the Committees of poisoning the child styled by the royalist party Louis XVII. This charge was false; the poor little prisoner died of scrofula, developed by inaction, ennui, and the sufferings of a pitiless imprisonment, increased by the cruel treatment of his jailers, a cobbler named Simon and his wife. A rumor was also spread that the child was not dead, but had been taken away and an impostor substituted, who had died. Only one of the royal family now remained in the Temple, Louis XVI.'s daughter, afterwards the Duchesse d'Angoulême. Spain interceded for her, and she was exchanged. . . . Peace with Spain was also hastened by French successes beyond the Pyrenees; General Marceau, being reinforced, took Vittoria and Bilboa, and pushed on to the Ebro. On the 22d of July, Barthelèmi, the able French diplomatist, signed a treaty of peace with Spain at Basle, restoring her Biscayan and Catalanian provinces, and accepting Spanish mediation in favor of the king of Naples, Duke of Parma, king of Portugal, and 'the other Italian powers,' including, though not mentioning, the Pope; and Spain yielded her share of San Domingo, which put a brighter face on French affairs in America. . . . Guadeloupe, Santa Lucia, and St. Eustache were restored to the French. . . . Spain soon made overtures for an alliance with France, wishing to put down the English desire to rule the seas; and, before the new treaty was signed, the army of the Eastern Pyrenees was sent to reinforce the armies of the Alps and Italy, who had only held

their positions in the Apennines and on the Ligurian coast against the Austrians and Piedmontese by sheer force of will; but in the autumn of 1795 the face of affairs was changed. Now that Prussia had left the coalition, war on the Rhine went on between France and Austria, sustained by the South German States; France had to complete her mastery of the left bank by taking Mayence and Luxembourg; and Austria's aim was to dispute them with her. The French government charged Marceau to besiege Mayence during the winter of 1794-95, but did not furnish him the necessary resources, and, France not holding the right bank, Kléber could only partially invest the town, and both his soldiers and those blockading Luxembourg suffered greatly from cold and privation. Early in March, 1795, Pichegru was put in command of the armies of the Rhine and Moselle, and Jourdan was ordered to support him on the left (the Lower Rhine) with the army of Sambre-et-Meuse. Austria took no advantage of the feeble state of the French troops, and Luxembourg, one of the strongest posts in Europe, receiving no help, surrendered (June 24) with 800 cannon and huge store of provisions. The French now had the upper hand, Pichegru and Jourdan commanding 160,000 men on the Rhine. One of these men was upright and brave, but the other had treason in his soul; though everybody admired Pichegru, 'the conqueror of Holland.' . . . In August, 1795, an agent of the Prince of Condé, who was then at Brisgau, in the Black Forest, with his corps of emigrants, offered Pichegru, who was in Alsace, the title of Marshal of France and Governor of Alsace, the royal castle of Chambord, a million down, an annuity of 200,000 livres, and a house in Paris, in the 'king's' name, thus flattering at once his vanity and his greed. . . . He was checked by no scruples; utterly devoid of moral sense, he hoped to gain his army by money and wine, and had no discussion with the Prince of Condé save as to the manner of his treason." In the end, Pichegru was not able to make his treason as effective as he had bargained to do; but he succeeded in spoiling the campaign of 1795 on the Rhine. Jourdan crossed the river and took Dusseldorf, with 168 cannon, on the 6th of September, expecting a simultaneous movement on the part of Pichegru, to occupy the enemy in the latter's front. But Pichegru, though he took Mannheim, on the 18th of September, threw a corps of 10,000 men into the hands of the Austrians, by placing it where it could be easily overwhelmed, and permitted his opponent, Wurmsier, to send reinforcements to Clairfait, who forced Jourdan, in October, to retreat across the Rhine. "Pichegru's perfidy had thwarted a campaign which must have been decisive, and Jourdan's retreat was followed by the enemy's offensive return to the left bank [retaking Mannheim and raising the siege of Mayence], and by reverses which would have been fatal had they coincided with the outburst of royalist and reactionary plots and insurrections in the West, and in Paris itself; but they had luckily been stifled some time since, and as the Convention concluded its career, the direction of the war returned to the hands which guided it so well in 1793 and 1794."—H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France from the First Rev., ch. 24* (v. 1).—"The peace with Spain . . . enabled the government to detach the whole Pyrenean army to the support of General Scherer, who had succeeded Kellermann in the

command of the army of Italy. On the 23d of November, the French attacked the Austrians in their position at Loano, and, after a conflict of two days, the enemy's centre was forced by Massena and Augereau, and the Imperialists fled with the loss of 7,000 men, 80 guns, and all their stores. But the season was too far advanced to prosecute this success, and the victors took up winter quarters on the ground they had occupied. . . . The capture of the Cape of Good Hope (Sept. 16) by the British under Sir James Craig, was the only other important event of this year."—*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe, sect. 154 and 157* (ch. 18 of the complete work).

ALSO IN: A. Griffiths, *French Revolutionary Generals, ch. 13*.—E. Baines, *Hist. of the Wars of the French Rev., bk. 1, ch. 19-20* (v. 1).—A. de Beauchesne, *Louis XVII.: His Life, his Sufferings, his Death*.

A. D. 1795 (October–December).—The Insurrection of the 13th Vendémiaire, put down by Napoleon Bonaparte.—Dissolution of the National Convention.—Organization of the government of the Directory.—Licentiousness of the time.—"The Parisians . . . proclaimed their hostility to the Convention and its designs. The National Guard, consisting of armed citizens, almost unanimously sided with the enemies of the Convention; and it was openly proposed to march to the Tuilleries, and compel a change of measures by force of arms. The Convention perceiving their unpopularity and danger, began to look about them anxiously for the means of defence. There were in and near Paris 5,000 regular troops, on whom they thought they might rely, and who of course condemned the National Guard as only half soldiers. They had besides some hundreds of artillery men; and they now organised what they called 'the Sacred Band,' a body of 1,500 ruffians, the most part of them old and tried instruments of Robespierre. With these means they prepared to arrange a plan of defence; and it was obvious that they did not want materials, provided they could find a skilful and determined head. The insurgent sections placed themselves under the command of Danican, an old general of no great skill or reputation. The Convention opposed to him Menou; and he marched at the head of a column into the section Le Pelletier to disarm the National Guard of that district—one of the wealthiest of the capital. The National Guard were found drawn up in readiness to receive him at the end of the Rue Vivienne; and Menou, becoming alarmed, and hampered by the presence of some of the 'Representatives of the People,' entered into a parley, and retired without having struck a blow. The Convention judged that Menou was not master of nerves for such a crisis; and consulted eagerly about a successor to his command. Barras, one of their number, had happened to be present at Toulon and to have appreciated the character of Buonaparte. He had, probably, been applied to by Napoleon in his recent pursuit of employment. Deliberating with Tallien and Carnot, his colleagues, he suddenly said, 'I have the man whom you want; it is a little Corsican officer, who will not stand upon ceremony.' These words decided the fate of Napoleon and of France. Buonaparte had been in the Odeon Theatre when the affair of Le Pelletier occurred, had run out, and witnessed the result. He now happened to be in the gallery, and heard the dis-

cussion concerning the conduct of Menou. He was presently sent for, and asked his opinion as to that officer's retreat. He explained what had happened, and how the evil might have been avoided, in a manner which gave satisfaction. He was desired to assume the command, and arranged his plan of defence as well as the circumstances might permit; for it was already late at night, and the decisive assault on the Tuilleries was expected to take place next morning. Buonaparte stated that the failure of the march of Menou had been chiefly owing to the presence of the 'Representatives of the People,' and refused to accept the command unless he received it free from all such interference. They yielded: Barras was named commander-in-chief; and Buonaparte second, with the virtual control. His first care was to despatch Murat, then a major of chasseurs, to Sablons, five miles off, where fifty great guns were posted. The Sectionaries sent a stronger detachment for these cannon immediately afterwards; and Murat, who passed them in the dark, would have gone in vain had he received his orders but a few minutes later. On the 4th of October (called in the revolutionary almanac the 13th Vendémiaire) the affray accordingly occurred. Thirty thousand National Guards advanced about two P. M., by different streets, to the siege of the palace: but its defence was now in far other hands than those of Louis XVI. Buonaparte, having planted artillery on all the bridges, had effectually secured the command of the river, and the safety of the Tuilleries on one side. He had placed cannon also at all the crossings of the streets by which the National Guard could advance towards the other front; and having posted his battalions in the garden of the Tuilleries and Place du Caroussel, he awaited the attack. The insurgents had no cannon; and they came along the narrow streets of Paris in close and heavy columns. When one party reached the church of St. Roche, in the Rue St. Honoré, they found a body of Buonaparte's troops drawn up there, with two cannons. It is disputed on which side the firing began; but in an instant the artillery swept the streets and lanes, scattering grape-shot among the National Guards, and producing such confusion that they were compelled to give way. The first shot was a signal for all the batteries which Buonaparte had established; the quays of the Seine, opposite to the Tuilleries, were commanded by his guns below the palace and on the bridges. In less than an hour the action was over. The insurgents fled in all directions, leaving the streets covered with dead and wounded; the troops of the Convention marched into the various sections, disarmed the terrified inhabitants, and before nightfall everything was quiet. This eminent service secured the triumph of the Conventionists. . . . Within five days from the Day of the Sections Buonaparte was named second in command of the army of the interior; and shortly afterwards, Barras finding his duties as Director sufficient to occupy his time, gave up the command-in-chief of the same army to his 'little Corsican officer.'—J. G. Lockhart, *Life of Napoleon Buonaparte*, ch. 3.—The victory of the 13th Vendémiaire "enabled the Convention immediately to devote its attention to the formation of the Councils proposed by it, two-thirds of which were to consist of its own members. The first third, which was freely elected, had already been nominated by the Reactionary party.

The members of the Directory were chosen, and the deputies of the Convention, believing that for their own interests the regicides should be at the head of the Government, nominated La Réveillère-Lepeaux, Sièyes, Rewbel, Le Tourneur, and Barras. Sièyes refused to act, and Carnot was elected in his place. Immediately after this, the Convention declared its session at an end, after it had had three years of existence, from the 21st September, 1792, to the 28th October, 1795 (4th Brumaire, Year IV.). . . . The Directors were all, with the exception of Carnot, of moderate capacity, and concurred in rendering their own position the more difficult. At this period there was no element of order or good government in the Republic; anarchy and uneasiness everywhere prevailed, famine had become chronic, the troops were without clothes, provisions or horses; the Convention had spent an immense capital represented by assignats, and had sold almost half of the Republican territory, belonging to the proscribed classes . . . ; the excessive degree of discredit to which paper money had fallen, after the issue of thirty-eight thousand millions, had destroyed all confidence and all legitimate commerce. . . . Such was the general poverty, that when the Directors entered the palace which had been assigned to them as a dwelling, they found no furniture there, and were compelled to borrow of the porter a few straw chairs and a wooden table, on the latter of which they drew up the decree by which they were appointed to office. Their first care was to establish their power, and they succeeded in doing this by frankly following at first the rules laid down by the Constitution. In a short time industry and commerce began to raise their heads, the supply of provisions became tolerably abundant, and the clubs were abandoned for the workshops and the fields. The Directory exerted itself to revive agriculture, industry, and the arts, re-established the public exhibitions, and founded primary, central, and normal schools. . . . This period was distinguished by a great licentiousness in manners. The wealthy classes, who had been so long forced into retirement by the Reign of Terror, now gave themselves up to the pursuit of pleasure without stint, and indulged in a course of unbridled luxury, which was outwardly displayed in balls, festivities, rich costumes and sumptuous equipages. Barras, who was a man of pleasure, favoured this dangerous sign of the reaction, and his palace soon became the rendezvous of the most frivolous and corrupt society. In spite of this, however, the wealthy classes were still the victims, under the government of the Directory, of violent and spoliative measures."—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France*, v. 2. pp. 270-273.

A. D. 1796 (April—October).—Triple attack on Austria.—Bonaparte's first campaign in Italy.—Submission of Sardinia.—Armistice with Naples and the Pope.—Pillage of art treasures.—Hostile designs upon Venice.—Expulsion of the Austrians from Lombardy.—Failure of the campaign beyond the Rhine.—"With the opening of the year 1796 the leading interest of European history passes to a new scene. . . . The Directory was now able . . . to throw its whole force into the struggle with Austria. By the advice of Bonaparte a threefold movement was undertaken against Vienna, by way of Lombardy, by the valley of the Danube,

and by the valley of the Main. General Jourdan, in command of the army that had conquered the Netherlands, was ordered to enter Germany by Frankfort; Moreau, a Breton law-student in 1792, now one of the most skilful soldiers in Europe, crossed the Rhine at Strashurg; Bonaparte himself, drawing his scanty supplies along the coast-road from Nice, faced the allied forces of Austria and Sardinia upon the slopes of the Maritime Apennines, forty miles to the west of Genoa. . . . Bonaparte entered Italy proclaiming himself the restorer of Italian freedom, but with the deliberate purpose of using Italy as a means of recruiting the exhausted treasury of France. His correspondence with the Directory exposes with brazen frankness this well-considered system of plunder and deceit, in which the general and the Government were cordially at one. . . . The campaign of 1796 commenced in April, in the mountains above the coast-road connecting Nice and Genoa. . . . Bonaparte . . . for four days . . . reiterated his attacks at Montenotte and at Millesimo, until he had forced his own army into a position in the centre of the Allies [Austrians and Piedmontese]; then, leaving a small force to watch the Austrians, he threw the mass of his troops upon the Piedmontese, and drove them back to within thirty miles of Turin. The terror-stricken Government, anticipating an outbreak in the capital itself, accepted an armistice from Bonaparte at Cherasco (April 28). . . . The armistice, which was soon followed by a treaty of peace between France and Sardinia, ceding Savoy to the Republic, left him free to follow the Austrians, untroubled by the existence of some of the strongest fortresses of Europe behind him. In the negotiations with Sardinia, Bonaparte demanded the surrender of the town of Valenza, as necessary to secure his passage over the river Po. Having thus artfully led the Austrian Beaulieu to concentrate his forces at this point, he suddenly moved eastward along the southern bank of the river, and crossed at Piacenza, 50 miles below the spot where Beaulieu was awaiting him. . . . The Austrian general, taken in the rear, had no alternative but to abandon Milan and all the country west of it, and to fall back upon the line of the Adda. Bonaparte followed, and on the 10th of May attacked the Austrians at Lodi. He himself stormed the bridge of Lodi at the head of his Grenadiers. The battle was so disastrous to the Austrians that they could risk no second engagement, and retired upon Mantua and the line of the Mincio. Bonaparte now made his triumphal entry into Milan (May 15). . . . In return for the gift of liberty, the Milanese were invited to offer to their deliverers 20,000,000 francs, and a selection from the paintings in their churches and galleries. The Dukes of Parma and Modena, in return for an armistice, were required to hand over forty of their best pictures, and a sum of money proportioned to their revenues. The Dukes and the townspeople paid their contributions with a good grace: the peasantry of Lombardy, whose cattle were seized in order to supply an army that marched without any stores of its own, rose in arms, and threw themselves into Pavia, after killing all the French soldiers who fell in their way. The revolt was instantly suppressed, and the town of Pavia given up to pillage. . . . Instead of crossing the Apennines, Bonaparte advanced against the Austrian positions upon the

Mincio. . . . A battle was fought and lost by the Austrians at Borghetto. . . . Beaulieu's strength was exhausted; he could meet the enemy no more in the field, and led his army out of Italy into the Tyrol, leaving Mantua to be invested by the French. The first care of the conqueror was to make Venice pay for the crime of possessing territory intervening between the eastern and western extremes of the Austrian district. Bonaparte affected to believe that the Venetians had permitted Beaulieu to occupy Peschiera before he seized upon Brescia himself. . . . 'I have purposely devised this rupture,' he wrote to the Directory (June 7th), 'in case you should wish to obtain five or six millions of francs from Venice. If you have more decided intentions, I think it would be well to keep up the quarrel.' The intention referred to was the disgraceful project of sacrificing Venice to Austria in return for the cession of the Netherlands. . . . The Austrians were fairly driven out of Lombardy, and Bonaparte was now free to deal with Southern Italy. He advanced into the States of the Church, and expelled the Papal Legate from Bologna. Ferdinand of Naples . . . asked for a suspension of hostilities against his own kingdom . . . and Bonaparte granted the king an armistice on easy terms. The Pope, in order to gain a few months' truce, had to permit the occupation of Ferrara, Ravenna, and Ancona, and to recognise the necessities, the learning, the taste, and the virtue of his conquerors by a gift of 20,000,000 francs, 500 manuscripts, 100 pictures, and the busts of Marcus and Lucius Brutus. . . . Tuscany had indeed made peace with the French Republic a year before, but . . . while Bonaparte paid a respectful visit to the Grand Duke at Florence, Murat descended upon Leghorn, and seized upon everything that was not removed before his approach. Once established in Leghorn, the French declined to quit it. . . . Mantua was meanwhile invested, and thither Bonaparte returned. Towards the end of July an Austrian relieving army, nearly double the strength of Bonaparte's, descended from the Tyrol. It was divided into three corps: one, under Quasdanovich, advanced by the road on the west of Lake Garda; the others, under Wurmser, the commander-in-chief, by the roads between the lake and the river Adige. . . . Bonaparte . . . instantly broke up the siege of Mantua, and withdrew from every position east of the river. On the 30th July, Quasdanovich was attacked and checked at Lonato. . . . Wurmser, unaware of his colleague's repulse, entered Mantua in triumph, and then set out, expecting to envelop Bonaparte between two fires. But the French were ready for his approach. Wurmser was stopped and defeated at Castiglione (Aug. 3), while the western Austrian divisions were still held in check at Lonato. . . . In five days the skill of Bonaparte and the unsparing exertions of his soldiery had more than retrieved all that appeared to have been lost. The Austrians retired into the Tyrol, leaving 15,000 prisoners in the hands of the enemy. Bonaparte now prepared to force his way into Germany by the Adige, in fulfilment of the original plan of the campaign. In the first days of September he again routed the Austrians, and gained possession of Roveredo and Trent. Wurmser hereupon attempted to shut the French up in the mountains by a movement southwards; but,

while he operated with insufficient forces between the Brenta and the Adige, with a view of cutting Bonaparte off from Italy, he was himself [defeated at Bassano, September 8, and] cut off from Germany, and only escaped capture by throwing himself into Mantua with the shattered remnant of his army. The road into Germany through the Tyrol now lay open; but in the midst of his victories Bonaparte learnt that the northern armies of Moreau and Jourdan, with which he had intended to co-operate in an attack upon Vienna, were in full retreat. Moreau's advance into the valley of the Danube had, during the months of July and August, been attended with unbroken military and political success. The Archduke Charles, who was entrusted with the defence of the Empire," fell back before Moreau, in order to unite his forces with those of Wartensleben, who commanded an army which confronted Jourdan. "The design of the Archduke succeeded in the end, but it opened Germany to the French for six weeks, and revealed how worthless was the military constitution of the Empire, and how little the Germans had to expect from one another. . . . At length the retreating movement of the Austrians stopped [and the Archduke fought an indecisive battle with Moreau at Neresheim, August 11]. Leaving 30,000 men on the Lech to disguise his motions from Moreau, Charles turned suddenly northwards from Neuburg on the 17th August, met Wartensleben at Amberg, and attacked Jourdan . . . with greatly superior numbers. Jourdan was defeated [September 3, at Würzburg] and driven back in confusion towards the Rhine. The issue of the campaign was decided before Moreau heard of his colleague's danger. It only remained for him to save his own army by a skilful retreat," in the course of which he defeated the Austrian general Latour at Biberach, October 2, and fought two indecisive battles with the Archduke, at Emmendingen, October 19, and at Huningen on the 24th.—C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 1, ch. 3.

ALSO IN: A. Griffiths, *French Revolutionary Generals*, ch. 14-15.—General Jomini, *Life of Napoleon*, v. 1, ch. 2.—E. Baines, *Hist. of the Wars of the French Rev.*, bk. 1, ch. 22 (v. 1).—C. Adams, *Great Campaigns*, 1796-1870, ch. 1.

A. D. 1796 (September).—Evacuation of Corsica by the English.—Its reoccupation by the French.—"Corsica, which had been delivered to the English by Paoli, and occupied by them as a fourth kingdom annexed to the crown of the King of Great Britain, had just been evacuated by its new masters. They had never succeeded in subduing the interior of the island, frequent insurrections had kept them in continual alarm, and free communication between the various towns could only be effected by sea. The victories of the French army in Italy, under the command of one of their countrymen, had redoubled this internal ferment in Corsica, and the English had decided on entirely abandoning their conquest. In September 1796 they withdrew their troops, and also removed from Corsica their chief partisans, such as General Paoli, Pozzo di Borgo, Beraldi and others, who sought an asylum in England. On the first intelligence of the English preparations for evacuating the island, Buonaparte despatched General Gentili thither at the head of two or three hundred banished Corsicans, and with this little band Gentili took possession of the

principal strongholds. . . . On the 5th Frimaire, year V. (November 25, 1796), I received a decree of the Executive Directory . . . appointing me Commissioner-Extraordinary of the Government in Corsica, and ordering me to proceed thither at once."—Count Miot de Melito, *Memoirs*, ch. 4.

A. D. 1796 (October).—Failure of peace negotiations with England.—Treaties with Naples and Genoa.—"It was France itself, more even than Italy, which was succumbing under the victories in Italy, and was falling rapidly under the military despotism of Bonaparte; while what had begun as a mere war of defence was already becoming a war of aggression against everybody. . . . The more patriotic members of the legislative bodies were opposed to what they considered only a war of personal ambitions, and were desirous of peace, and a considerable peace party was forming throughout the country. The opportunity was taken by the English government for making proposals for peace, and a passport was obtained from the directory for lord Malmesbury, who was sent to Paris as the English plenipotentiary. Lord Malmesbury arrived in Paris on the 2nd of Brumaire (the 23rd of October, 1796), and next day had his first interview with the French minister Delacroix, who was chosen by the directory to act as their representative. There was from the first an evident want of cordiality and sincerity on the part of the French government in this negotiation; and the demands they made, and the political views entertained by them, were so unreasonable, that, after it had dragged on slowly for about a month, it ended without a result. The directory were secretly making great preparations for the invasion of Ireland, and they had hopes of making a separate and very advantageous peace with Austria. Bonaparte had, during this time, become uneasy on account of his position in Italy," and "urged the directory to enter into negotiations with the different Italian states in his rear, such as Naples, Rome, and Genoa, and to form an offensive and defensive alliance with the king of Sardinia, so that he might be able to raise reinforcements in Italy. For this purpose he asked for authority to proclaim the independence of Lombardy and of the states of Modena; so that, by forming both into republics, he might create a powerful French party, through which he might obtain both men and provisions. The directory was not unwilling to second the wishes of Bonaparte, and on the 19th of Vendémiaire (the 10th of October) a peace was signed with Naples, which was followed by a treaty with Genoa. This latter state paid two millions of francs as an indemnity for the acts of hostility formerly committed against France, and added two millions more as a loan." The negotiation for an offensive alliance with Sardinia failed, because the king demanded Lombardy.—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, v. 2, p. 758.

ALSO IN: W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng. in the 18th Century*, ch. 27 (v. 7).—E. Burke, *Letters on a Regicide Peace*.

A. D. 1796-1797 (October—April).—Bonaparte's continued victories in Italy.—His advance into Carinthia and the Tyrol.—Peace preliminaries of Leoben.—"The failure of the French invasion of Germany . . . enabled the Austrians to make a fresh effort for the relief of [Würms] in Mantua. 40,000 men under Alvinzi and 18,000 under Davidowich entered Italy from the Tyrol and marched by different routes to-

wards Verona. Bonaparte had employed the recent interlude in consolidating French influence in Italy. Against the wishes of the Directors he dethroned the duke of Modena, and formed his territories into the Cispadane Republic. Then he tried to induce Piedmont and Venice to join France, but both states preferred to retain their neutral position. This was another of the charges which the general was preparing against Venice. On the news of the Austrian advance, Bonaparte marched against Alvinzi, and checked him at Carmignano (6 November). But meanwhile Davidowich had taken Trent and was approaching Rivoli. Bonaparte, in danger of being surrounded, was compelled to give way, and retreated to Verona, while Alvinzi followed him. Never was the French position more critical, and nothing but a very bold move could save them. With reckless courage Bonaparte attacked Alvinzi at Arcola, and after three days' hard fighting [November 15-17, on the dykes and causeways of a marshy region] won a complete victory. He then forced Davidowich to retreat to the Tyrol. The danger was averted, and the blockade of Mantua was continued. But Austria, as if its resources were inexhaustible, determined on a fourth effort in January, 1797. Alvinzi was again entrusted with the command, while another detachment under Provera advanced from Friuli. Bonaparte collected all his forces, marched against Alvinzi, and crushed him at Rivoli (15 Jan.). But meanwhile Provera had reached Mantua, where Bonaparte, by a forced march, overtook him, and won another complete victory in the battle of La Favorita. The fate of Mantua was at last decided, and the city surrendered on the 2nd of February. With a generosity worthy of the glory which he had obtained, Bonaparte allowed Würmser and the garrison to march out with the honours of war. He now turned to Romagna, occupied Bologna and terrified the Pope into signing the treaty of Tolentino. The temporal power was allowed to exist, but within very curtailed limits. Not only Avignon, but the whole of Romagna, with Ancona, was surrendered to France. Even these terms, harsh as they were, were not so severe as the Directors had wished. But Bonaparte was beginning to play his own game; he saw that Catholicism was regaining ground in France, and he wished to make friends on what might prove after all the winning side. Affairs in Italy were now fairly settled: two republics, the Cisalpine in Lombardy, and the Cispadane, which included Modena, Ferrara, and Bologna, had been created to secure French influence in Italy. . . . The French had occupied the Venetian territory from Bergamo to Verona, and had established close relations with those classes who were dissatisfied with their exclusion from political power. When the republic armed against the danger of a revolt, Bonaparte treated it as another ground for that quarrel which he artfully fomented for his own purposes. But at present he had other objects more immediately pressing than the oppression of Venice. Jourdan's army on the Rhine had been entrusted to Hoche, whose ambition had long chafed at the want of an opportunity, and who was burning to acquire glory by retrieving the disasters of the last campaign. Bonaparte, on the other hand, was eager to anticipate a possible rival, and determined to hurry on his own invasion of Austria, in order to keep the war and the

negotiations in his own hands. The task of meeting him was entrusted to the archduke Charles, who had won such a brilliant reputation in 1796, but who was placed at a great disadvantage to his opponent by having to obey instructions from Vienna. The French carried all before them, Joubert occupied Tyrol, Masséna forced the route to Carinthia, and Bonaparte himself, after defeating the archduke on the Tagliamento, occupied Trieste and Carniola. The French now marched over the Alps, driving the Austrians before them. At Leoben, which they reached on 7th April, they were less than eighty miles from Vienna. Here Austrian envoys arrived to open negotiations. They consented to surrender Belgium, Lombardy, and the Rhine frontier, but they demanded compensation in Bavaria. This demand Bonaparte refused, but offered to compensate Austria at the expense of a neutral state, Venice. The preliminaries of Leoben, signed on the 18th April, gave to Austria, Istria, Dalmatia, and the Venetian provinces between the Oglio, the Po, and the Adriatic. At this moment, Hoche and Moreau, after overcoming the obstacles interposed by a sluggish government, were crossing the Rhine to bring their armies to bear against Austria. They had already gained several successes when the unwelcome news reached them from Leoben, and they had to retreat. Bonaparte may have failed to extort the most extreme terms from Austria, but he had at any rate kept both power and fame to himself.—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, ch. 23.

ALSO IN: F. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon I.*, v. 1, ch. 5-7.—*Memoirs of Napoleon dictated at St. Helena*, v. 4, ch. 1-4.

A. D. 1796-1797 (December—January).—Hoche's expedition to Ireland. See IRELAND: A. D. 1791-1798.

A. D. 1797 (February—October).—British naval victories of Cape St. Vincent and Camperdown. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1797.

A. D. 1797 (April—May).—The overthrow of Venice by Bonaparte.—When Napoleon, in March, entered upon his campaign against the Archduke Charles, "the animosity existing between France and Venice had . . . attained a height that threatened an open rupture between the two republics, and was, therefore, of some advantage to Austria. The Signoria saw plainly what its fate would be should the French prove victorious; but though they had 12,000 or 15,000 Slavonian troops ready at hand, and mostly assembled in the capital, they never ventured to use them till the moment for acting was past. On the Terra Firma, the citizens of Brescia and Bergamo had openly renounced the authority of St. Mark, and espoused the cause of France; the country people, on the other hand, were bitterly hostile to the new Republicans. Oppressed by requisitions, plundered and insulted by the troops, the peasants had slain straggling and marauding French soldiers; the comrades of the sufferers had retaliated, and an open revolt was more than once expected. General Battaglia, the Venetian providore, remonstrated against the open violence practised on the subjects of Venice; Buonaparte replied by accusing the government of partiality for Austria, and went so far as to employ General Andrieux to instigate the people to rise against the senate. The Directory, however, desired him to pause, and not to drive the Venetians to extremity, till the opportunity

should have arrived for carrying into effect the future projects entertained against that state.' Both parties were watching their time, but the craven watches in vain, for he is struck down long before his time to strike arrives." A month later, when Napoleon was believed to be involved in difficulties in Carinthia and the Tyrol, Venice "had thrown off the mask of neutrality; the tocsin had sounded through the communes of the Terra Firma, and a body of troops had joined the insurgents in the attack on the citadel of Verona. Not only were the French assailed wherever they were found in arms, but the very sick were inhumanly slain in the hospitals by the infuriated peasantry; the principal massacre took place at Verona on Easter Monday [April 17], and cast a deep stain on the Venetian cause and character." But even while these sinister events were in progress, Bonaparte had made peace with the humiliated Austrians, and had signed the preliminary treaty of Leoben, which promised to give Venice to them in exchange for the Netherlands. And now, with all his forces set free, he was prepared to crush the venerable Republic, and make it subservient to his ambitious schemes. He "refused to hear of any accommodation: and, unfortunately, the base massacre of Verona blackened the Venetian cause so much as almost to gloss over the unprincipled violence of their adversaries. 'If you could offer me the treasures of Peru,' said Napoleon to the terrified deputies who came to sue for pardon and offer reparation, 'if you could cover your whole dominions with gold, the atonement would be insufficient. French blood has been treacherously shed, and the Lion of St. Mark must bite the dust.' On the 3d of May he declared war against the republic, and French troops immediately advanced to the shores of the lagunes. Here, however, the waves of the Adriatic arrested their progress, for they had not a single boat at command, whereas the Venetians had a good fleet in the harbour, and an army of 10,000 or 15,000 soldiers in the capital: they only wanted the courage to use them. Instead of fighting, however, they deliberated; and tried to purchase safety by gold, instead of maintaining it by arms. Finding the enemy relentless, the Great Council proposed to modify their government,—to render it more democratic, in order to please the French commander,—to lay their very institutions at the feet of the conqueror; and, strange to say, only 21 patricians out of 690 dissented from this act of national degradation. The democratic party, supported by the intrigues of Vittelan, the French secretary of legation, exerted themselves to the utmost. The Slavonian troops were disbanded, or embarked for Dalmatia; the fleet was dismantled, and the Senate were rapidly divesting themselves of every privilege, when, on the 31st of May, a popular tumult broke out in the capital. The Great Council were in deliberation when shots were fired beneath the windows of the ducal palace. The trembling senators thought that the rising was directed against them, and that their lives were in danger, and hastened to divest themselves of every remnant of power and authority at the very moment when the populace were taking arms in their favour. 'Long live St. Mark, and down with foreign dominion!' was the cry of the insurgents, but nothing could communicate one spark of gallant fire to the Venetian aristocracy. In the midst of

the general confusion, while the adverse parties were firing on each other, and the disbanded Slavonians threatening to plunder the city, these unhappy legislators could only delegate their power to a hastily assembled provisional government, and then separate in shame and for ever. The democratic government commenced their career in a manner as dishonourable as that of the aristocracy had been closed." They "immediately despatched the flotilla to bring over the French troops. A brigade under Baraguai d'Hilliers soon landed [May 15] at the place of St. Mark; and Venice, which had braved the thunders of the Vatican, the power of the emperors, and the arms of the Othmans, . . . now sunk for ever, and without striking one manly blow or firing one single shot for honour and fame! Venice counted 1300 years of independence, centuries of power and renown, and many also of greatness and glory, but ended in a manner more dishonourable than any state of which history makes mention. The French went through the form of acknowledging the new democratic government, but retained the power in their own hands. Heavy contributions were levied, all the naval and military stores were taken possession of, and the fleet, having conveyed French troops to the Ionian islands, was sent to Toulon."—T. Mitchell, *Principal Campaigns in the Rise of Napoleon*, ch. 6 (*Fraser's Magazine*, April, 1846).

ALSO IN: E. Flagg, *Venice: The City of the Sea*, pt. 1, ch. 1-4 (v. 1).—*Memoirs of Napoleon dictated at St. Helena*, v. 4, ch. 5.

A. D. 1797 (May—October).—Napoleon's political work in Italy.—Creation of the Ligurian and Cisalpine Republics.—Dismemberment of the Graubunden.—The Peace of Campo-Formio.—Venice given over to Austria, and Lombardy and the Netherlands taken away.—"The revolution in Venice was soon followed by another in Genoa, also organised by the plots of the French minister there, Faypoult. The Genoese had in general shown themselves favourable to France; but there existed among the nobles an anti-French party; the Senate, like that of Venice, was too aristocratic to suit Bonaparte's or the Directory's notions; and it was considered that Genoa, under a democratic constitution, would be more subservient to French interests. An insurrection, prepared by Faypoult, of some 700 or 800 of the lowest class of Genoese, aided by Frenchmen and Lombards, broke out on May 22nd, but was put down by the great mass of the real Genoese people. Bonaparte, however, was determined to effect his object. He directed a force of 12,000 men on Genoa, and despatched Lavalette with a letter to the Doge. . . . Bonaparte's threats were attended by the same magical effects at Genoa as had followed them at Venice. The Senate immediately despatched three nobles to treat with him, and on June 6th was concluded the Treaty of Montebello. The Government of Genoa recognised by this treaty the sovereignty of the people, confided the legislative power to two Councils, one of 300, the other of 500 members, the executive power to a Senate of twelve, presided over by the Doge. Meanwhile a provisional government was to be established. By a secret article a contribution of four millions, disguised under the name of a loan, was imposed upon Genoa. Her obedience was recompensed with a

considerable augmentation of territory, and the incorporation of the districts known as the 'imperial fiefs.' Such was the origin of the Ligurian Republic. Austrian Lombardy, after its conquest, had also been formed into the 'Lombard Republic'; but the Directory had not recognised it, awaiting a final settlement of Italy through a peace with Austria. Bonaparte, after taking possession of the Duchy of Modena and the Legations, had, at first, thought of erecting them into an independent state under the name of the 'Cispadane Republic'; but he afterwards changed his mind and united these states with Lombardy under the title of the Cisalpine Republic. He declared, in the name of the Directory, the independence of this new republic, June 29th 1797; reserving, however, the right of nominating, for the first time, the members of the Government and of the legislative body. The districts of the Valteline, Chiavenna, and Bormio, subject to the Grison League, in which discontent and disturbance had been excited by French agents, were united in October to the new state; whose constitution was modelled on that of the French Republic. Bonaparte was commissioned by the Directory to negotiate a definitive peace with Austria, and conferences were opened for that purpose at Montebello, Bonaparte's residence near Milan. The negotiations were chiefly managed by himself, and on the part of Austria by the Marquis di Gallo, the Neapolitan ambassador at Vienna, and Count Meerfeld. . . . The negotiations were protracted six months, partly through Bonaparte's engagements in arranging the affairs of the new Italian republics, but more especially by divisions and feuds in the French Directory." The Peace of Campo Formio was concluded October 17. "It derived this name from its having been signed in a ruined castle situated in a small village of that name near Udine; a place selected on grounds of etiquette in preference to the residence of either of the negotiators. By this treaty the Emperor ceded the Austrian Netherlands to France; abandoned to the Cisalpine Republic, which he recognised, Bergamo, Brescia, Crema, Peschiera, the town and fortress of Mantua with their territories, and all that part of the former Venetian possessions to the south and west of a line which, commencing in the Tyrol, traversed the Lago di Garda, the left bank of the Adige, but including Porto Legnago on the right bank, and thence along the left bank of the Po to its mouth. France was to possess the Ionian Islands, and all the Venetian settlements in Albania below the Gulf of Lodrino; the French Republic agreeing on its side that the Emperor should have Istria, Dalmatia, the Venetian isles in the Adriatic, the mouths of the Cattaro, the city of Venice, the Lagoons, and all the former Venetian terra firma to the line before described. The Emperor ceded the Breisgau to the Duke of Modena, to be held on the same conditions as he had held the Modenese. A congress composed of the plenipotentiaries of the German Federation was to assemble immediately, to treat of a peace between France and the Empire. To this patent treaty was added another secret one, by the principal article of which the Emperor consented that France should have the frontier of the Rhine, except the Prussian possessions, and stipulated that the Imperial troops should enter Venice on the same day that the French

entered Mentz. He also promised to use his influence to obtain the accession of the Empire to this arrangement; and if that body withheld its consent, to give it no more assistance than his contingent. The navigation of the Rhine to be declared free. If, at the peace with the Empire, the French Republic should make any acquisitions in Germany, the Emperor was to obtain an equivalent there, and vice versâ. The Dutch Stadtholder to have a territorial indemnity. To the King of Prussia were to be restored his possessions on the left bank of the Rhine, and he was consequently to have no new acquisitions in Germany. Princes and States of the Empire, damaged by this treaty, to obtain a suitable indemnity. . . . By the Treaty of Campo Formio was terminated not only the Italian campaign, but also the first continental war of the Revolution. The establishment of Bonaparte's prestige and power by the former was a result still more momentous in its consequences for Europe than the fall of Venice and the revolutionising of Northern Italy."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 8 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev.* (Am. ed.), v. 4, pp. 214–225.—Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon Buonaparte*, ch. 28.—*Memoirs of Napoleon dictated at St. Helena*, ch. 6–8.

A. D. 1797 (September).—Conflict of the Directory and the two Councils.—The Revolutionary Coup d'État of the 18th of Fructidor.—Suppression of the Royalists and Moderates.—Practical overthrow of the Constitution.—"The inevitable dissension between the executive power and the electoral power had already displayed itself at the conclusion of the elections of the Year V. The elections were made for the most part under the influence of the reactionary party, which, whilst it refrained from conspiring for the overthrow of the new Constitution, saw with terror that the executive power was in the hands of men who had taken part in the excesses and crimes of the Convention. Pichegru, whose intrigues with the princes of the House of Bourbon were not yet known, was enthusiastically made President of the Council of Five Hundred, and Barbé-Marbois was made President of the Ancients. Le Tourneur having become, by lot, the retiring member of the Directory, Barthélemy, an upright and moderate man, was chosen in his place. He, as well as his colleague, Carnot, were opposed to violent measures; but they only formed in the Directorate a minority which was powerless against the Triumvirs Barras, Rewbel, and La Réveillère, who soon entered upon a struggle with the two Councils. . . . There were, doubtless, amongst [their opponents] in the two Councils, some Royalists, and ardent reactionists, who desired with all their hearts the restoration of the Bourbons; but, according to the very best testimony, the majority of the names which were drawn from the electoral urn since the promulgation of the Constitution of the Year III. were strangers to the Royalist party. 'They did not desire,' to use the words of an eminent and impartial historian of our own day [De Barante, *Life of Royer-Collard*], 'a counter-revolution, but the abolition of the revolutionary laws which were still in force. They wished for peace and true liberty, and the successive purification of a Directorate which was the direct heir of the Convention. . . . But the Directorate was as much opposed to the Moderates as to the Royalists.' It

pretended to regard these two parties as one, and falsely represented them as conspiring in common for the overthrow of the Republic and the re-establishment of monarchy. . . . If there were few Royalists in the two Councils, there were also few men determined to provoke on the part of the Directors a recourse to violence against their colleagues. But as a great number of their members had sat in the Convention, they naturally feared a too complete reaction, and, affecting a great zeal for the Constitution, they founded at the Hotel Salm, under the name of the Constitutional Club, an association which was widely opposed in its spirit and tendency to that of the Hotel Clichy, in which were assembled the most ardent members of the reactionary party [and hence called Clichyans]. . . . The Council of Five Hundred, on the motion of a member of the Clichy Club, energetically demanded that the Legislative power should have a share in determining questions of peace or war. No general had exercised, in this respect, a more arbitrary power than had Bonaparte, who had negotiated of his own mere authority several treaties, and the preliminaries of the peace of Campo Formio. He was offended at these pretensions on the part of the Council of Five Hundred, and entreated the Government to look to the army for support against the Councils and the reactionary press. He even sent to Paris, as a support to the policy of the Directors, General Augereau, one of the bravest men of his army, but by no means scrupulous as to the employment of violent means, and disposed to regard the sword as the supreme argument in politics, whether at home or abroad. The Directory gave him the command of the military division of Paris. . . . Henceforth a coup d'état appeared inevitable. The Directors now marched some regiments upon the capital, in defiance of a clause of the Constitution which prohibited the presence of troops within a distance of twelve leagues of Paris, unless in accordance with a special law passed in or near Paris itself. The Councils burst forth into reproaches and threats against the Directors, to which the latter replied by fiery addresses to the armies, and to the Councils themselves. It was in vain that the Directors Carnot and Barthélemy endeavoured to quell the rising storm; their three colleagues refused to listen to them, and fixed the 18th Fructidor [September 4] for the execution of their criminal projects. During the night preceding that day, Augereau marched 12,000 men into Paris, and in the morning these troops, under his own command, supported by 40 pieces of cannon, surrounded the Tuileries, in which the Councils held their sittings. The grenadiers of the Councils' guard joined Augereau, who arrested with his own hand the brave Ramel, who commanded that guard, and General Pichegru, the President of the Council of Five Hundred. . . . The Directors . . . published a letter written by Moreau, which revealed Pichegru's treason; and at the same time nominated a Committee for the purpose of watching over the public safety. . . . Forty-two members of the Council of Five Hundred, eleven members of that of the Ancients, and two of the Directors, Carnot [who escaped, however, into Switzerland] and Barthélemy, were condemned to be transported to the fatal district of Sinnamari. . . . The Directors also made the editors of 35 journals the victims of their resentment. They had the laws passed

in favour of the priests and emigrants reversed, and annulled the elections of 48 departments. Merlin de Douai and François de Neufchâteau were chosen as successors to Carnot and Barthélemy, who had been banished and proscribed by their colleagues. That which took place on the 18th Fructidor ruined the Constitutional and Moderate party, whilst it resuscitated that of the Revolution."—E. de Bonnechose, *Hist. of France, 4th period, bk. 2, ch. 4 (v. 2)*.—"During these two days, Paris continued perfectly quiet. The patriots of the faubourgs deemed the punishment of transportation too mild. . . . These groups, however, which were far from numerous, disturbed not in the least the peace of Paris. The sectionaries of Vendémiaire . . . had no longer sufficient energy to take up arms spontaneously. They suffered the stroke of policy to be carried into effect without opposition. For the rest, public opinion continued uncertain. The sincere republicans clearly perceived that the royalist faction had rendered an energetic measure inevitable, but they deplored the violation of the laws and the intervention of the military power. They almost doubted the culpability of the conspirators on seeing such a man as Carnot mingled in their ranks. They apprehended that hatred had too strongly influenced the determinations of the Directory. Lastly, even, though considering its determinations as necessary, they were sad, and not without reason; for it became evident that that constitution, on which they had placed all their hope, was not the termination of our troubles and our discord. The mass of the population submitted and detached itself much on that day from political events. . . . From that day, political zeal began to cool. Such were the consequences of the stroke of policy accomplished on the 18th of Fructidor. It has been asserted that it had become useless at the moment when it was executed; that the Directory, in frightening the royalist faction, had already succeeded in overawing it; that, by persisting in this stretch of power, it paved the way to military usurpation. . . . But . . . the royalist faction. . . . on the junction of the new third . . . would infallibly have overturned everything, and mastered the Directory. Civil war would then have ensued between it and the armies. The Directory, in foreseeing this movement and timely repressing it, prevented a civil war; and, if it placed itself under the protection of the military, it submitted to a melancholy but inevitable necessity."—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the French Rev. (Am. ed.)*, v. 4, pp. 205-206.

A. D. 1797-1798 (December-May).—Revolutionary intrigues in Rome.—French troops in possession of the city.—Formation of the Roman Republic.—Removal of the Pope.—"At Rome a permanent conspiracy was established at the French Embassy, where Joseph Bonaparte, as the ambassador of the Republic, was the centre of a knot of conspirators. On the 28th of December, 1797, came the first open attempt at insurrection. General Duphot, a hot-headed young man, one of the military attachés of the French Embassy, put himself at the head of a handful of the disaffected, and led them to the attack of one of the posts of the pontifical troops. In the ensuing skirmish a chance shot struck down the French general, and the rabble which followed him dispersed in all directions. It was just the opportunity for which the Directory had been waiting

in order to break the treaty of Tolentino and seize upon Rome. Joseph Bonaparte left the city the morning after the émeute, and a column of troops was immediately detached from his brother's army in the north of Italy and ordered to march on Rome. It consisted of General Berthier's division and 6,000 Poles under Dombrowski, and it received the ominous title of l'armée vengeresse—the avenging army. As they advanced through the Papal territory they met with no sympathy, no assistance, from the inhabitants, who looked upon them as invaders rather than deliverers. 'The army,' Berthier wrote to Bonaparte, 'has met with nothing but the most profound consternation in this country, without seeing one glimpse of the spirit of independence; only one single patriot came to me, and offered to set at liberty 2,000 convicts.' This liberal offer of a re-inforcement of 2,000 scoundrels the French general thought it better to decline. . . . At length, on the 10th of February, Berthier appeared before Rome. . . . Wishing to avoid a useless effusion of blood, Pius VI. ordered the gates to be thrown open, contenting himself with addressing, through the commandant of St. Angelo, a protest to the French general, in which he declared that he yielded only to overwhelming force. A few days after, a self-elected deputation of Romans waited upon Berthier, to request him to proclaim Rome a republic, under the protection of France. As Berthier had been one of the most active agents in getting up this deputation, he, of course, immediately yielded to their request. The French general then demanded of the Pope that he should formally resign his temporal power, and accept the new order of things. His reply was the same as that of every Pope of whom such a demand has been made: 'We cannot—we will not!' In the midst of a violent thunder-storm he was torn from his palace, forced into a carriage, and carried away to Viterbo, and thence to Siena, where he was kept a prisoner for three months. Rome was ruled by the iron hand of a military governor. . . . Meanwhile, alarmed at the rising in Italy, the Directory were conveying the Pope to a French prison. . . . After a short stay at Grenoble he was transferred to the fortress of Valence, where, broken down by the fatigues of his journey, he died on August 19th, 1799, praying for his enemies with his last breath."—Chevalier O'Clery, *Hist. of the Italian Revolution*, ch. 2, sect. 1.

ALSO IN: C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 1, ch. 4.—J. Miley, *Hist. of the Papal States*, bk. 8, ch. 3 (v. 3).—J. E. Darras, *Hist. of the Catholic Church*, 8th period, ch. 6 (v. 4).—T. Roscoe, *Memoirs of Scipio de Ricci*, v. 2, ch. 4.

A. D. 1797-1798 (December-September).—Invasion and subjugation of Switzerland.—Creation of the Helvetic Republic. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1792-1798.

A. D. 1797-1799.—Hostile attitude toward the United States.—The X, Y, Z correspondence.—Nearness of war. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1797-1799.

A. D. 1798 (May-August).—Bonaparte's expedition to Egypt.—His seizure of Malta.—Pursuit by the English fleet under Nelson.—The Battle of the Nile.—"The treaty of Campo Formio, by which Austria obtained terms highly advantageous to her interests, dissolved the offensive and defensive alliance of the con-

tinental powers, and left England alone in arms. The humiliation of this country was to be the last and the greatest achievement of French ambition. . . . During the autumn and winter of this year [1797-8], preparations for a great armament were proceeding at Toulon, and other harbours in possession of the French. The army of Italy, clamorous for a promised donation of 1,000,000,000 francs, which the Directory were unable to pay, had been flattered by the title of the army of England, and appeased by the prospect of the plunder of this country. But whatever might be the view of the Directory, or the expectation of the army, Bonaparte had no intention of undertaking an enterprise so rash as a descent upon the coast of England, while the fleets of England kept possession of the seas. There was another quarter from which the British Empire might be menaced with a better chance of success. India could never be secure while Egypt and the great eastern port of the Mediterranean were in the possession of one of the great maritime powers. Egypt had been an object of French ambition since the time of Louis XIV. . . . It was for Egypt, therefore, that the great armament of Toulon was destined. The project was not indeed considered a very hopeful one at Paris; but such was the dread and hatred of the ruling faction for the great military genius which had sprung out of the anarchy of France, and of the 30,000 creditors whom they were unable to satisfy, that the issue of the expedition which they most desired was, that it might never return from the banks of the Nile. . . . The fleet, consisting of thirteen ships of the line, with several frigates, smaller vessels, and transports conveying 28,000 picked troops, with the full equipment for every kind of military service, set sail on the 14th of May. Attached to this singular expedition, destined for the invasion of a friendly country, and the destruction of an unoffending people, was a staff of professors, furnished with books, maps, and philosophical instruments for prosecuting scientific researches in a land which, to a Christian and a philosopher, was the most interesting portion of the globe. The great armament commenced its career of rapine by seizing on the important island of Malta. Under the shallow pretence of taking in water for a squadron which had left its anchorage only two days, a portion of the troops were landed, and, after a show of resistance, the degenerate knights, who had already been corrupted, surrendered Malta, Gozo, and Cumino, to the French Republic. A great amount of treasure and of munitions of war, besides the possession of the strongest place in the Mediterranean, were thus acquired without loss or delay. A conquest of such importance would have amply repaid and justified the expedition, if no ulterior object had been pursued. But Bonaparte suffered himself to be detained no more than twenty-four hours by this achievement; and having left a garrison of 4,000 men in the island, and established a form of civil government, after the French pattern, he shaped his course direct for Alexandria. On the 1st of July, the first division of the French troops were landed at Marabou, a few miles from the city. Aboukir and Rosetta, which commanded the mouths of the Nile, were occupied without difficulty. Alexandria itself was incapable of any effectual defence, and, after a few skirmishes with the hand-

ful of Janissaries which constituted the garrison, the French entered the place; and for several hours the inhabitants were given up to an indiscriminate massacre. Bonaparte pushed forward with his usual rapidity, undeterred by the horrors of the sandy desert, and the sufferings of his troops. After two victories over the Mamelukes, one of which was obtained within sight of the Pyramids [and called the Battle of the Pyramids], the French advanced to Cairo; and such was the terror which they had inspired, that the capital of Egypt was surrendered without a blow. Thus in three weeks the country had been overrun. The invaders had nothing to fear from the hostility of the people; a rich and fertile country, the frontier of Asia, was in their possession; but, in order to hold the possession secure, it was necessary to retain the command of the sea. The English Government, on their side, considered the capture of the Toulon armament an object of paramount importance; and Earl St. Vincent, who was still blockading the Spanish ports, was ordered to leave Cadiz, if necessary, with his whole fleet, in search of the French; but at all events, to detach a squadron, under Sir Horatio Nelson, on that service. . . . Nelson left Gibraltar on the 8th of May, with three ships of the line, four frigates, and a sloop. . . . He was reinforced, on the 5th of June, with ten sail of the line. His frigates had parted company with him on the 20th of May, and never returned." Suspecting that Egypt was Bonaparte's destination, he made sail for Alexandria, but passed the French expedition, at night, on the way, arrived in advance of it, and, thinking his surmise mistaken, steered away for the Morea and thence to Naples. It was not until the 1st of August that he reached the Egyptian coast a second time, and found the French fleet, of sixteen sail, "at anchor in line of battle, in the Bay of 'Aboukir. Nelson, having determined to fight whenever he came up with the enemy, whether by day or by night, immediately made the signal for action. Although the French fleet lay in an open roadstead, they had taken up a position so strong as to justify their belief that they could not be successfully attacked by a force less than double their own. They lay close in shore, with a large shoal in their rear; in the advance of their line was an island, on which a formidable battery had been erected; and their flanks were covered by numerous gun-boats. . . . The general action commenced at sunset, and continued throughout the night until six o'clock the following morning, a period of nearly twelve hours. But in less than two hours, five of the enemy's ships had struck; and, soon after nine o'clock, the sea and shore, for miles around, were illuminated by a fire which burst from the decks of the 'Orient,' the French flag-ship, of 120 guns. In about half an hour she blew up, with an explosion so appalling that for some minutes the action was suspended, as if by tacit consent. At this time the French Admiral Brueys was dead, . . . killed by a chain-shot before the ship took fire. Nelson also had been carried below, with a wound which was, at first, supposed to be mortal. He had been struck in the head with a fragment of lan- gridge shot, which tore away a part of the scalp. . . . At three o'clock in the morning four more of the French ships were destroyed or taken. There was then an interval of two hours, during which hardly a shot was fired on either side. At

ten minutes to seven another ship of the line, after a feeble attempt at resistance, hauled down her colours. The action was now over. Of the thirteen French ships of the line, nine had been taken, and two had been burnt." Two ships of the line and two frigates escaped. "The British killed and wounded were 895. The loss of the French, including prisoners, was 5,225. Such was the great battle of the Nile."—W. Massey, *Hist. of Eng. during the Reign of George III.*, ch. 39 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: E. J. De La Gravière, *Sketches of the Last Naval War*, v. 1, pt. 3.—R. Southey, *Life of Nelson*, ch. 5.—*Despatches and Letters of Lord Nelson*, v. 3.—Bonaparte, *Memoirs Dictated at St. Helena*, v. 2.—A. T. Mahan, *Influence of Sea Power upon the French Revolution and Empire*, ch. 9 (v. 1).

A. D. 1798-1799 (August—April).—Arming against the Second European Coalition.—The conscription.—Overthrow of the Neapolitan kingdom.—Seizure of Piedmont.—Campaigns in Switzerland, Italy, and on the upper Danube.—Early successes and final reverses.—"The Porte declared war against the French, and entered into an alliance with Russia and England (12th August). A Russian fleet sailed from Sebastopol, and blockaded the Ionian Islands; the English vessels found every Turkish port open to them, and gained possession of the Levant trade, to the detriment of France. Thus the failure of the Egyptian expedition delivered the Ottoman Empire into the hands of two Powers, the one intent upon its dismemberment, the other eager to make itself master of its commerce; it gave England the supremacy in the Mediterranean; it inaugurated the appearance of Russia in southern Europe; it was the signal for a second coalition." Russia, "under Catherine, had but taken a nominal part in the first coalition, being too much occupied with the annihilation of Poland. . . . But now Catherine was dead, Paul I., her son and successor, took the émigrés in his pay, offered the Pretender an asylum at Mittau, promised his protection to the Congress at Rastadt, and fitted out 100,000 troops. Naples had been in a great ferment since the creation of the Roman Republic. The nobles and middle classes, imbued with French ideas, detested a Court sold to the English, and presided over by the imbecile Ferdinand, who left the cares of his government to his dissolute Queen. She hated the French, and now solicited Tuscany and Piedmont to unite with her to deliver Italy from the sway of these Republicans. The Austrian Court, of which Bonaparte had been the conscious or unconscious dupe, instead of disarming after the Treaty of Campo-Formio, continued its armaments with redoubled vigour, and now demanded indemnities, on the pretext that it had suffered from the Republican system which the French introduced into Switzerland and Italy. The Directory very naturally refused to accede to this; and thereupon Austria prepared for war, and endeavoured to drag Prussia and the German Empire into it. . . . But Frederick William's successor and the princess of the empire declined to recommence hostilities with France, of which they had reason to fear the enmity, though at present she was scarcely able to resist a second coalition. The French nation, in fact, was sincerely eager for peace. . . . Nevertheless, and though there was little unity amongst them, the Councils and the Directory

prepared their measures of defence; they increased the revenue, by creating a tax on doors and windows; they authorised the sale of national property to the amount of 125,000,000 francs; and finally, on the report of Jourdan, they passed the famous law of conscription (5th September), which compelled every Frenchman to serve in the army from the age of 20 to that of 25, the first immediate levy to consist of 200,000 troops. When the victory of the Nile became known at Naples the court was a prey to frenzied excitement. Taxes had already been doubled, a fifth of the population called to arms, the nobles and middle classes were tortured into submission. And when the report spread that the Russians were marching through Poland, it was resolved to commence hostilities by attacking the Roman Republic, and to rouse Piedmont and Tuscany to rebellion. Forty thousand Neapolitans, scarcely provided with arms, headed by the Austrian general Mack, made their way into the Roman states, guarded only by 18,000 French troops, dispersed between the two seas (12th November). Championnet, their commander, abandoned Rome, took up a position on the Tiber, near Civita-Castellana, and concentrated all his forces on that point. The King of Naples entered Rome, while Mack went to encounter Championnet. The latter beat him, routed or captured the best of his troops, and compelled him to retire in disorder to the Neapolitan territory. Championnet, now at the head of 25,000 men, returned to Rome, previous to marching on Naples, where the greatest disorder prevailed. At the news of his approach the Court armed the lazzaroni, and fled with its treasures to the English fleet, abandoning the town to pillage and anarchy (20th Dec., 1798). Mack, seeing his army deserting him, and his officers making common cause with the Republicans, concluded an armistice with Championnet, but his soldiers revolted and compelled him to seek safety in the French camp. On Championnet's appearance before Naples, which the lazzaroni defended with fury, a violent battle ensued, lasting for three days; however, some of the citizens delivered the fort of St. Elmo to the French, and then the mob laid down its arms (23rd January, 1799). The Parthenopean Republic [so called from one of the ancient names of the city of Naples] was immediately proclaimed, a provisional government organised, the citizens formed themselves into a National Guard, and the kingdom accepted the Revolution. The demand of Championnet for a war contribution of 27,000,000 francs roused the Calabrians to revolt; anarchy prevailed everywhere; commissioners were sent by the Directory to re-establish order. The French general had them arrested, but he was deposed and succeeded by Macdonald. In commencing its aggression the court of Naples had counted on the aid of the King of Sardinia and the Grand Duke of Tuscany. But Piedmont, placed between three republics, was herself sharing the Revolutionary ferment; the King, who had concluded an alliance with Austria, proscribed the democrats, who, in their turn, declared war against him by means of the Ligurian Republic, whither they had fled. When Championnet was compelled to evacuate Rome, the Directory, afraid that Sardinia would harass the French rear, had ordered Joubert, commanding the army of Italy, to occupy Piedmont. The Piedmontese troops opened every place to the French, entered into their ranks, and the King

[December 8, 1798] was forced to give up all claims to Piedmont, and to take refuge in Sardinia . . . [retaining the latter, but abdicating the sovereignty of Piedmont]. Tuscany being also occupied by the Republican troops, the moment war was declared against Austria, Italy was virtually under French dominion. These events but increased the enmity of the Coalition, which hurried its preparations, while the Directory, cheered by its successes, resolved to take the offensive on all points. . . . In the present struggle, however, the conditions of warfare were changed. The lines of invasion were no longer, as formerly, short and isolated, but stretched from the Zuyder Zee to the Gulf of Tarentum, open to be attacked in Holland from the rear, and at Naples by the English fleet. . . . Seventy thousand troops, under the Archduke Charles, occupied Bavaria; General Hotze occupied the Vorarlberg with 25,000 men; Bellegarde was with 45,000 in the Tyrol; and 70,000 guarded the line of the Adige, headed by Marshal Kray. Eighty thousand Russians, in two equal divisions, were on their way to join the Austrians. The division under Suwarroff was to operate with Kray, that one under Korsakoff with the Archduke. Finally, 40,000 English and Russians were to land in Holland, and 20,000 English and Sicilians in Naples. The Directory, instead of concentrating its forces on the Adige and near the sources of the Danube, divided them. Fifteen thousand troops were posted in Holland, under Brune; 8,000 at Mayence, under Bernadotte; 40,000 from Strasburg to Bâle, under Jourdan; 30,000 in Switzerland, under Masséna; 50,000 on the Adige, under Schérer; 30,000 at Naples, under Macdonald. These various divisions were in reality meant to form but one army, of which Masséna was the centre, Jourdan and Schérer the wings, Brune and Macdonald the extremities. To Masséna was confided the principal operation, namely, to possess himself of the central Alps, in order to isolate the two imperial armies of the Adige and Danube and to neutralise their efforts. The Coalition having hit upon the same plan as the Directory, ordered the Austrians under Bellegarde to invade the Grisons, while on the other side a division was to descend into the Valteline. Masséna's right wing, under Lecourbe, defeated Bellegarde, crossed the upper Rhine and made its way to the Inn. Schérer also advanced by the Valteline to the upper Adige and joined operations with Lecourbe. "While these two generals were spreading terror in the Tyrol, Masséna made himself master of the Rhine from its sources to the lake of Constance, receiving but one check in the fruitless siege of Feldkirch, a position he coveted in order to be able to support with his right wing the army of the Danube, or with his left that of Italy. This check compelled Lecourbe and Dessoles to slacken their progress, and the various events on the Danube and the Po necessitated their recall in a short time. Jourdan had crossed the Rhine at Kehl, Bâle, and Schaffhausen (1st March), penetrated into the defile of the upper Danube, and reached the village of Ostrach, where he was confronted by the Archduke Charles, who had passed the Iller, and who, after a sanguinary battle [March 21], compelled him to retreat upon Tuttlingen. The tidings of Masséna's success having reached Jourdan, he wished to support it by marching to Stockach, the key to the roads of Switzerland and Germany; but he was once more defeated (25th

March), and retreated, not into Switzerland, whence he could have joined Masséna, but to the Rhine, which he imagined to be threatened. . . . In Italy the Directory had given orders to Schérer to force the Adige, and to drive the Austrians over the Piave and the Brenta." He attacked and carried the Austrian camp of Pastrengo, near Rivoli, on the 25th of March, 1799, inflicting a loss of 8,000 on the enemy; but on the 5th of April, when moving to force the lower Adige, he was defeated by Kray at Magnano. "Schérer lost his head, fled precipitately, and did not stop until he had put a safe distance between himself and the enemy. . . . The army of Switzerland, under Masséna, dispersed in the mountains, with both its flanks threatened, had no other means of salvation than to fall back behind the Rhine."—H. Van Laun, *The French Revolutionary Epoch*, bk. 3, ch. 1, sect. 2 (v. 1).

Also in: R. Southey, *Life of Nelson*, ch. 6 (v. 2). —A. Griffiths, *French Revolutionary Generals*, ch. 18.—A. Gallenga, *Hist. of Piedmont*, v. 3, ch. 5. —P. Colletta, *Hist. of the Kingdom of Naples*, bk. 3, ch. 2; bk. 4, ch. 1 (v. 1).

A. D. 1798-1799 (August—August).—Bonaparte's organization of government in Egypt. —His advance into Syria and repulse at Acre. —His victory at Aboukir and return to France. —"On hearing of the battle of Aboukir [better known as 'the battle of the Nile'], a solitary sigh escaped from Napoleon. 'To France,' said he, 'the fates have decreed the empire of the land—to England that of the sea.' He endured this great calamity with the equanimity of a masculine spirit. He gave orders that the seamen landed at Alexandria should be formed into a marine brigade, and thus gained a valuable addition to his army; and proceeded himself to organise a system of government, under which the great natural resources of the country might be turned to the best advantage. . . . He was careful to advance no claim to the sovereignty of Egypt, but asserted, that having rescued it from the Mameluke usurpation, it remained for him to administer law and justice, until the time should come for restoring the province to the dominion of the Grand Seigneur. He then established two councils, consisting of natives, principally of Arab chiefs and Moslem of the church and the law, by whose advice all measures were, nominally, to be regulated. They formed of course a very subservient senate. . . . The virtuosi and artists in his train, meanwhile, pursued with indefatigable energy their scientific researches; they ransacked the monuments of Egypt, and laid the foundation, at least, of all the wonderful discoveries which have since been made concerning the knowledge, arts, polity (and even language), of the ancient nation. Nor were their objects merely those of curiosity. They, under the General's direction, examined into the long-smothered traces of many an ancient device for improving the agriculture of the country. Canals that had been shut up for centuries were reopened; the waters of the Nile flowed once more where they had been guided by the skill of the Pharaohs or the Ptolemies. Cultivation was extended; property secured; and it cannot be doubted that the signal improvements since introduced in Egypt, are attributable mainly to the wise example of the French administration. . . . In such labours Napoleon passed the autumn of 1798. . . . General Dessaix, meanwhile, had pur-

sued Mourad Bey into Upper Egypt, where the Mamelukes hardly made a single stand against him, but contrived by the excellence of their horses, and their familiarity with the deserts, to avoid any total disruption of their forces. . . . The General, during this interval of repose, received no communication from the French Government; but rumours now began to reach his quarters which might well give him new anxieties. The report of another rupture with Austria gradually met with more credence; and it was before long placed beyond a doubt, that the Ottoman Porte, instead of being tempted into any recognition of the French establishment in Egypt, had declared war against the Republic, and summoned all the strength of her empire to pour in overwhelming numbers on the isolated army of Bonaparte. . . . The General despatched a trusty messenger into India, inviting Tippoo Saib to inform him exactly of the condition of the English army in that region, and signifying that Egypt was only the first post in a march destined to surpass that of Alexander! 'He spent whole days,' writes his secretary, 'in lying flat on the ground stretched upon maps of Asia.' At length the time for action came. Leaving 15,000 in and about Cairo, the division of Dessaix in Upper Egypt, and garrisons in the chief towns,—Bonaparte on the 11th of February 1799 marched for Syria at the head of 10,000 picked men, with the intention of crushing the Turkish armament in that quarter, before their chief force (which he now knew was assembling at Rhodes) should have time to reach Egypt by sea. Traversing the desert which divides Africa from Asia, he took possession of the fortress El-Arish (Feb. 15), whose garrison, after a vigorous assault, capitulated on condition that they should be permitted to retreat into Syria, pledging their parole not to serve again during the war. Pursuing his march, he took Gazah (that ancient city of the Philistines) without opposition; but at Jaffa (the Joppa of holy writ), the Moslem made a resolute defence. The walls were carried by storm, 3,000 Turks died with arms in their hands, and the town was given up during three hours to the fury of the French soldiery—who never, as Napoleon confessed, availed themselves of the license of war more savagely than on this occasion. A party of the garrison—amounting, according to Bonaparte, to 1,200 men, but stated by others as nearly 3,000 in number—held out for some hours longer in the mosques and citadel; but at length, seeing no chance of rescue, grounded their arms on the 7th of March. . . . On the 10th—three days after their surrender—the prisoners were marched out of Jaffa, in the centre of a battalion under General Bon. When they had reached the sand-hills, at some distance from the town, they were divided into small parties, and shot or bayoneted to a man. They, like true fatalists, submitted in silence; and their bodies were gathered together into a pyramid, where, after the lapse of thirty years, their bones are still visible whitening the sand. Such was the massacre of Jaffa, which will ever form one of the darkest stains on the name of Napoleon. He admitted the fact himself;—and justified it on the double plea, that he could not afford soldiers to guard so many prisoners, and that he could not grant them the benefit of their parole, because they were the very men who had already been set free on such

terms at El-Arish. . . . Buonaparte had now ascertained that the Pacha of Syria, Achmet-Djezzar, was at St. Jean D'Acre (so renowned in the history of the crusades), and determined to defend that place to extremity, with the forces which had already been assembled for the invasion of Egypt. He in vain endeavoured to seduce this ferocious chief from his allegiance to the Porte, by holding out the hope of a separate independent government, under the protection of France. The first of Napoleon's messengers returned without an answer; the second was put to death; and the army moved on Acre in all the zeal of revenge, while the necessary apparatus of a siege was ordered to be sent round by sea from Alexandria. Sir Sidney Smith was then cruising in the Levant with two British ships of the line, the *Tigre* and the *Theseus*; and, being informed by the Pacha of the approaching storm, hastened to support him in the defence of Acre. Napoleon's vessels, conveying guns and stores from Egypt, fell into his hands, and he appeared off the town two days before the French army came in view of it. He had on board his ship Colonel Philippeaux, a French royalist of great talents (formerly Buonaparte's school-fellow at Brienne); and the Pacha willingly permitted the English commodore and this skilful ally to regulate for him, as far as was possible, the plan of his defence. The loss of his own heavy artillery, and the presence of two English ships, were inauspicious omens; yet Buonaparte doubted not that the Turkish garrison would shrink before his onset, and he instantly commenced the siege. He opened his trenches on the 18th of March. 'On that little town' said he to one of his generals, as they were standing together on an eminence, which still bears the name of Richard Cœur de-Lion—'on yonder little town depends the fate of the East. Behold the Key of Constantinople, or of India.' . . . Meanwhile a vast Mussulman army had been gathered among the mountains of Samaria, and was preparing to descend upon Acre, and attack the besiegers in concert with the garrison of Djezzar. Junot, with his division, marched to encounter them, and would have been overwhelmed by their numbers, had not Napoleon himself followed and rescued him (April 8) at Nazareth, where the splendid cavalry of the Orientals were, as usual, unable to resist the solid squares and well-directed musketry of the French. Kleber with another division, was in like manner endangered, and in like manner rescued by the general-in-chief at Mount Tabor (April 15). The Mussulmans dispersed on all hands; and Napoleon, returning to his siege, pressed it on with desperate assaults, day after day, in which his best soldiers were thinned, before the united efforts of Djezzar's gallantry, and the skill of his allies." On the 21st of May, when the siege had been prosecuted for more than two months, Napoleon commanded a final assault. "The plague had some time before this appeared in the camp; every day the ranks of his legions were thinned by this pestilence, as well as by the weapons of the defenders of Acre. The hearts of all men were quickly sinking. The Turkish fleet was at hand to reinforce Djezzar; and upon the utter failure of the attack of the 21st of May, Napoleon yielded to stern necessity, and began his retreat upon Jaffa. . . . The name of Jaffa was already sufficiently stained; but fame speedily represented Napoleon as having now made it

the scene of another atrocity, not less shocking than that of the massacre of the Turkish prisoners. The accusation, which for many years made so much noise throughout Europe, amounts to this: that on the 27th of May, when it was necessary for Napoleon to pursue his march from Jaffa for Egypt, a certain number of the plague-patients in the hospital were found to be in a state that held out no hope whatever of their recovery; that the general, being unwilling to leave them to the tender mercies of the Turks, conceived the notion of administering opium, and so procuring for them at least a speedy and an easy death; and that a number of men were accordingly taken off in this method by his command. . . . Whether the opium was really administered or not—that the audacious proposal to that effect was made by Napoleon, we have his own admission; and every reader must form his opinion—as to the degree of guilt which attaches to the fact of having meditated and designed the deed. . . . The march onwards was a continued scene of misery; for the wounded and the sick were many, the heat oppressive, the thirst intolerable; and the ferocious Djezzar was hard behind, and the wild Arabs of the desert hovered round them on every side, so that he who fell behind his company was sure to be slain. . . . Having at length accomplished this perilous journey [June 14], Buonaparte repaired to his old head-quarters at Cairo, and re-entered on his great functions as the establisher of a new government in the state of Egypt. But he had not long occupied himself thus, ere new rumours concerning the beys on the Upper Nile, who seemed to have some strong and urgent motive for endeavouring to force a passage downwards, began to be mingled with, and by degrees explained by, tidings daily repeated of some grand disembarkation of the Ottomans, designed to have place in the neighbourhood of Alexandria. Leaving Dessaix, therefore, once more in command at Cairo, he himself descended the Nile, and travelled with all speed to Alexandria, where he found his presence most necessary. For, in effect, the great Turkish fleet had already run into the bay of Aboukir; and an army of 18,000, having gained the fortress, were there strengthening themselves, with the view of awaiting the promised descent and junction of the Mamelukes, and then, with overwhelming superiority of numbers, advancing to Alexandria, and completing the ruin of the French invaders. Buonaparte, reaching Alexandria on the evening of the 24th of July, found his army already posted in the neighbourhood of Aboukir, and prepared to anticipate the attack of the Turks on the morrow. . . . The Turkish outposts were assaulted early next morning, and driven in with great slaughter; but the French, when they advanced, came within the range of the batteries and also of the shipping that lay close by the shore, and were checked. Their retreat might have ended in a rout, but for the undisciplined eagerness with which the Turks engaged in the task of spoiling and maiming those that fell before them—thus giving to Murat the opportunity of charging their main body in flank with his cavalry, at the moment when the French infantry, profiting by their disordered and scattered condition, and rallying under the eye of Napoleon, forced a passage to the entrenchments. From that moment the battle was a massacre. . . . Six thousand surrendered at discretion:

12,000 perished on the field or in the sea. . . . Napoleon once more returned to Cairo on the 9th of August; but it was only to make some parting arrangements as to the administration, civil and military; for, from the moment of his victory at Aboukir, he had resolved to entrust Egypt to other hands, and Admiral Gantheaume was already preparing in secret the means of his removal to France."—J. G. Lockhart, *Life of Napoleon Buonaparte*, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: Duke of Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 9-11.—*Memoirs of Napoleon dictated at St. Helena*, v. 2.—*Letters from the army of Bonaparte in Egypt*.—M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 1, ch. 15-23.

A. D. 1799 (April—September).—Murder of the French envoys at Rastadt.—Disasters in North Italy.—Suwarroff's victories.—Anglo-Russian invasion of Holland and capture of the Dutch fleet.—"While the French armies were thus humiliated in the field, the representatives of the republic at the congress of Rastadt [where peace negotiations with the states of the empire had been in progress for months] became the victims of a sanguinary tragedy. As France had declared war against the emperor [as sovereign of Austria], and not against the empire, the congress had not necessarily been broken off; but the representatives of the German states were withdrawn one after another, until the successes of the Austrians rendered the position of the French ministers no longer secure. At length they received notice, from the nearest Austrian commander, to depart within twenty-four hours; and the French ministers—Jean Debry, Bonnier, and Roberjeot—left Rastadt with their families and attendants late in the evening of the 8th of Floréal (the 28th of April). The night was very dark, and they appear to have been apprehensive of danger. At a very short distance from Rastadt they were surrounded by a troop of Austrian hussars, who stopped the carriages, dragged the three ministers out, and massacred them in the presence of their wives and children. The hussars then plundered the carriages, and took away, especially, all the papers. Fortunately for Jean Debry, he had been stunned, but not mortally wounded; and after the murderers were gone the cold air of the night restored him to life. This crime was supposed to have been perpetrated at the instigation of the imperial court, for reasons which have not been very clearly explained; but the representatives of the German states proclaimed loudly their indignation. The reverses of the republican arms, and the tragedy of Rastadt, were eagerly embraced by the opposition in France as occasions for raising a violent outcry against the directory. . . . It was in the midst of this general unpopularity of the directors that the elections of the year VII. of the republic took place, and a great majority of the patriots obtained admission to the councils, and thus increased the numerical force of the opposition. . . . The directory had made great efforts to repair the reverses which had marked the opening of the campaign. Jourdain had been deprived of the command of the army of the Danube, which had been placed, along with that of Switzerland, under the orders of Masséna. The command of the army of Italy had been transferred from Scherer to Moreau; and Macdonald had received orders to withdraw his forces from Naples and the papal states, in order to

unite them with the army in Upper Italy. The Russians under Suwarroff had now joined the Austrian army in Italy; and this chief, who was in the height of his reputation as a military leader, was made commander-in-chief of the combined Austro-Russian forces, Melas commanding the Austrians under him. Suwarroff advanced rapidly upon the Adda, which protected the French lines; and, on the 8th of Floréal (the 27th of April), forced the passage of that river in two places, at Brivio and Trezzo, above and below the position occupied by the division of Serrurier, which formed the French left, and which was thus cut off from the rest of the army. Moreau, who took the command of the French forces on the evening of the same day, made a vain attempt to drive the enemy back over the Adda at Trezzo, and thus recover his communication with Serrurier; and that division was surrounded, and, after a desperate resistance, obliged to lay down its arms, with the exception of a small number of men who made their way across the mountains into Piedmont. Victor's division effected its retreat without much loss, and Moreau concentrated his forces in the neighbourhood of Milan. This disastrous engagement, which took place on the 9th of Floréal, was known as the battle of Cassano. Moreau remained at Milan two days to give the members of the government of the Cisalpine republic, and all the Milanese families who were politically compromised, time to make their escape in his rear; after which he continued his retreat. . . . He was allowed to make this retreat without any serious interruption; for Suwarroff, instead of pursuing him actively, lost his time at Milan in celebrating the triumph of the anti-revolutionary party." Moreau first "established his army in a strong position at the confluence of the Tanaro and the Po, covered by both rivers, and commanding all the roads to Genoa; so that he could there, without great danger, wait the arrival of Macdonald." But soon, finding his position made critical by a general insurrection in Piedmont, he retired towards the mountains of Genoa. "On the 6th of Prairial (the 25th of May), Macdonald was at Florence; but he lost much time there; and it was only towards the end of the republican month (the middle of June), that he at length advanced into the plains of Piacenza to form his junction with Moreau." On the Trebbia he encountered Suwarroff's advance, under General Ott, and rashly attacked it. Having forced back Ott's advanced guard, the French suddenly found themselves confronted by Suwarroff himself and the main body of his army. "Macdonald now resolved to unite all his forces behind the Trebbia, and there risk a battle; but he was anticipated by Suwarroff, who attacked him next morning, and, after a very severe and sanguinary engagement, the French were driven over the Trebbia. The combat was continued next day, and ended again to the disadvantage of the French; and their position had become so critical, that Macdonald found it necessary to retreat upon the river Nura, and to make his way round the Apennines to Genoa. The French, closely pursued, experienced considerable loss in their retreat, until Suwarroff, hearing Moreau's cannon in his rear, discontinued the pursuit, in order to meet him." Moreau routed Bellegarde, in Suwarroff's rear, and took 3,000 prisoners; but no further collision of importance occurred dur-

ing the next two months of the summer. "Suwarrow had been prevented by the orders of the Aulic Council from following up with vigour his victory on the Trebbia, and had been obliged to occupy himself with sieges which employed with little advantage valuable time. Recruits were reaching the French armies in Italy, and they were restored to a state of greater efficiency. It was already the month of Thermidor (the middle of July), and Moreau saw the necessity of assuming the offensive and attacking the Austro-Russians while they were occupied with the sieges; but he was restrained by the orders of the directory to wait the arrival of Joubert. The latter, who had just contracted an advantageous marriage, by which the moderate party had hoped to attach him to their cause, lost an entire month in the celebration of his nuptial festivities, and only reached the army of Italy in the middle of Thermidor (the beginning of August), where he immediately succeeded Moreau in the command; but he prevailed upon that able general to remain with him, at least until after his first battle. The French army had taken a good position in advance of Novi, and were preparing to act against the enemy while he was still occupied in the sieges, when news arrived that Alessandria and Mantua had surrendered, and that Suwarrow was preparing to unite against them the whole strength of his forces. Joubert immediately resolved to fall back upon the Apennines, and there act upon the defensive; but it was already too late, for Suwarrow had advanced with such rapidity that he was forced to accept battle in the position he occupied, which was a very strong one. The battle began early in the morning of the 28th of Thermidor (the 15th of August); and very early in the action Joubert received a mortal wound from a ball which struck him near the heart. The engagement continued with great fury during the greater part of the day, but ended in the entire defeat of the French, who retreated from the field of battle in great confusion. The French lost about 10,000 men in killed and wounded, and a great number of prisoners. The news of this reverse was soon followed by disastrous intelligence from another quarter. The English had prepared an expedition against Holland, which was to be assisted by a detachment of Russian troops. The English forces, under Abercromby, landed near the mouth of the Helder in North Holland, on the 10th of Fructidor (the 27th of August), and defeated the French and Dutch republican army, commanded by Brune, in a decisive engagement [at the English camp, established on a well-drained morass, called the Zyp] on the 22nd of Fructidor (the 8th of September). Brune retreated upon Amsterdam; and the Russian contingent was thus enabled to effect its junction with the English without opposition. As one of the first consequences of this invasion, the English obtained possession of the whole Dutch fleet, upon the assistance of which the French government had counted in its designs against England. This succession of ill news excited the revolutionary party to a most unusual degree of violence."—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, bk. 6, ch. 22-23 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: H. Spalding, *Suwaroff*, ch. 7-8.—L. M. P. de Laverne, *Life of Field-Marshal Suwaroff*, ch. 6.—E. Vehse, *Memoirs of the Court of Austria*, ch. 15, sect. 2 (v. 2).—J. Adolphus, *Hist.*

of Eng.: Reign of Geo. III., ch. 108 (v. 7).—Gen. Sir H. Bunbury, *Narratives of the Great War with France*, pp. 1-58.

A. D. 1799 (August—December).—Campaign in Switzerland.—Battle of Zurich.—Defeat of the Russians.—Suwaroff's retreat across the Alps.—Reverses in Italy, and on the Rhine.—Fall of the Parthenopean and Roman Republics.—Since the retreat of Masséna in June, the Archduke Charles had been watching the French on the Limmat and expecting the arrival of Russian reinforcements under Korsakoff; "but the Aulic Council, with unaccountable infatuation, ordered him at this important juncture to repair with the bulk of his army to the Rhine, leaving Switzerland to Korsakoff and the Russians. Before these injudicious orders, however, could be carried into effect, Masséna had boldly assumed the offensive (Aug. 14) by a false attack on Zurich, intended to mask the operations of his right wing, which meanwhile, under Lecourbe, was directed against the St. Gothard, in order to cut off the communication between the allied forces in Switzerland and in Italy. These attacks proved completely successful, . . . a French detachment . . . seizing the St. Gothard, and establishing itself at Airolo, on the southern declivity. Lecourbe's left had meanwhile cleared the banks of the lake of Zurich of the enemy, who were driven back into Glarus. To obtain these brilliant successes on the right, Masséna had been obliged to weaken his left wing; and the Archduke, now reinforced by 20,000 Russians, attempted to avail himself of this circumstance to force the passage of the Limmat, below Zurich (Aug. 16 and 17); but this enterprise, the success of which might have altered the fate of the war, failed from the defective construction of the pontoons; and the positive orders of the Aulic Council forbade his remaining longer in Switzerland. Accordingly, leaving 25,000 men under Hotze to support Korsakoff, he marched for the Upper Rhine, where the French, at his approach, abandoned the siege of Philipsburg, and retired to Mannheim; but this important post, the defences of which were imperfectly restored, was carried by a coup-de-main (Sept. 18), and the French driven with severe loss over the Rhine. But this success was dearly bought by the disasters in Switzerland, which followed the Archduke's departure. It had been arranged that Suwaroff was to move from Bellinzona (Sept. 21), and after retaking the St. Gothard combine with Korsakoff in a front attack on Masséna, while Hotze assailed him in flank. But Masséna, who was now the superior in numbers, determined to anticipate the arrival of Suwaroff by striking a blow, for which the presumptuous confidence of Korsakoff gave him increased facility. On the evening of 24th September, the passage of the river was surprised below Zurich, and the heights of Closter-Fahr carried by storm; and, in the course of the next day, Korsakoff, with his main army, was completely hemmed in at Zurich by the superior generalship of the French commander, who summoned the Russians to surrender. But the bravery shown by Korsakoff in these desperate circumstances equalled his former arrogance: on the 28th the Russian columns, issuing from the town, forced their way with the courage of despair through the surrounding masses of French, while a slender rear-guard defended the ramparts of Zurich till the

remainder had extricated themselves. The town was at length entered, and a frightful carnage ensued in the streets, in the midst of which the illustrious Lavater was barbarously shot by a French soldier: while Korsakoff, after losing 8,000 killed and wounded, 5,000 prisoners, 100 pieces of cannon, and all his ammunition, stores, and military chest, succeeded in reaching Schaffhausen. The attack of Soult above the lake (Sept. 25) was equally triumphant. The gallant Hotze, who commanded in that quarter, was killed in the first encounter; and the Austrians, giving way in consternation, were driven over the Thur, and at length over the Rhine, with the loss of 20 guns and 3,000 prisoners. Suwarroff in the meantime was gallantly performing his part of the plan. On the 23d of September, the French posts at Airolo and St. Gothard were carried, after a desperate resistance, by the Russian main force, while their flank was turned by Rosenberg; and Lecourbe, hastily retreating, broke down the Devil's Bridge to check the advance of the enemy. A scene of useless butchery followed, the two parties firing on each other from the opposite brinks of the impassable abyss; but the flank of the French was at length turned, the bridge repaired, and the Russians, pressing on in triumph, joined the Austrian division of Auffenberg, at Wasen, and repulsed the French beyond Altdorf. But this was the limit of the old marshal's success. After effecting with severe loss the passage of the tremendous defiles and ridges of the Schachenthal, between Altdorf and Mutten, he found that Llnken and Jellachich, who were to have moved from Coire to co-operate with him, had again retreated on learning the disaster at Zurich; and Suwarroff found himself in the midst of the enemy, with Massena on one side and Molitor on the other. With the utmost difficulty the veteran conqueror was prevailed upon, for the first time in his life, to order a retreat, which had become indispensable, and the heads of his columns were turned towards Glarus and the Grisons. But though the attack of Massena on their rear in the Muttenthal was repulsed with the loss of 2,000 men, their onward route was barred at Naefels by Molitor, who defied all the efforts of Prince Bagrathion to dislodge him; and in the midst of a heavy fall of snow, which obliterated the mountain paths, the Russian army wound its way (Oct. 5) in single file over the rugged and sterile peaks of the Alps of Glarus. Numbers perished of cold, or fell over the precipices; but nothing could overcome the unconquerable spirit of the soldiers: without fire or stores, and compelled to bivouac on the snow, they still struggled on through incredible hardships, till the dreadful march terminated (Oct. 10) at Ilantz. Such was the famous passage of the Alps by Suwarroff. Korsakoff in the meanwhile (Oct. 1-7) had maintained a desperate conflict near Constance, till the return of the Archduke checked the efforts of the French; and the Allies, abandoning the St. Gothard, and all the other posts they still held in Switzerland, concentrated their forces on the Rhine, which became the boundary of the two armies. . . . In Italy, after the disastrous battle of Novi, the Directory had given the leadership of the armies, both of Italy and Savoy, to the gallant Championnet, but he could muster only 54,000 troops and 6,000 raw conscripts to oppose Melas, who

had succeeded Suwarroff in the command, and who had 68,000, besides his garrisons and detachments. The proposition of Championnet had been to fall back, with his army still entire, to the other side of the Alps: but his orders were positive to attempt the relief of Coni, then besieged by the Austrians; and after a desultory warfare for several weeks, he commenced a decisive movement for that purpose at the end of October, with 35,000 men. But before the different French columns could effect a junction, they were separately assailed by Melas: the divisions of Grenier and Victor were overwhelmed at Genola (Nov. 4), and defeated with the loss of 7,000 men; and though St. Cyr repulsed the Imperialists (Nov. 10) on the plateau of Novi, Coni was left to its fate, and surrendered with all its garrison (Dec. 4). An epidemic disorder broke out in the French army, to which Championnet himself, and numerous soldiers, fell victims: the troops giving way to despair, abandoned their standards by hundreds and returned to France; and it was with difficulty that the eloquent exhortations of St. Cyr succeeded in keeping together a sufficient number to defend the Bochetta pass, in front of Genoa, the loss of which would have entailed destruction on the whole army. The discomfited Republicans were driven back on their own frontiers; and, excepting Genoa, the tricolor flag was everywhere expelled from Italy. At the same time the campaign on the Rhine was drawing to a close. The army of Massena was not strong enough to follow up the brilliant success at Zurich, and the jealousies of the Austrians and Russians, who mutually laid on each other the blame of the late disasters, prevented their acting cordially in concert against him. Suwarroff at length, in a fit of exasperation, drew off his troops to winter quarters in Bavaria, and took no further share in the war; and a fruitless attempt in November against Philipsburg, by Lecourbe, who had been transferred to the command on the lower Rhine, closed the operations in that quarter."—*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe*, sects. 245-251 (ch. 28, v. 7 of complete work).—Meantime, the French had been entirely expelled from southern Italy. On the withdrawal of Macdonald, with most of his army, from Naples, "Cardinal Ruffo, a soldier, churchman, and politician, put himself at the head of a numerous body of insurgents, and commenced war against such French troops as had been left in the south and in the middle of Italy. This movement was actively supported by the British fleet. Lord Nelson recovered Naples; Rome surrendered to Commodore Trowbridge. Thus the Parthenopean and Roman republics were extinguished forever. The royal family returned to Naples, and that fine city and country were once more a kingdom. Rome, the capital of the world, was occupied by Neapolitan troops."—Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 38.

ALSO IN: L. M. P. de Laverne, *Life of Suwarroff*, ch. 6.—H. Spalding, *Suwarroff*.—P. Colletta, *Hist. of the Kingdom of Naples*, bk. 4, ch. 2 and bk. 5, ch. 1-2 (v. 1).—T. J. Pettigrew, *Memoirs of Lord Nelson*, v. 1, ch. 8-9.

A. D. 1799 (September—October).—Disastrous ending of the Anglo-Russian invasion of Holland.—Capitulation of the Duke of York.—Dissolution of the Dutch East India Company.—"It is very obvious that the Duke of York was selected in an unlucky hour to be the

commander-in-chief of this Anglo-Russian expedition, when we compare the time in which Abercrombie was alone on the marshy promontory of the Helder . . . with the subsequent period. On the 10th of September Abercrombie successfully repulsed the attack of General Brune, who had come for the purpose from Haarlem to Alkmar; on the 19th the Duke of York landed, and soon ruined everything. The first division of the Russians had at length arrived on the 15th, under the command of General Herrmann, for whom it was originally destined, although unhappily it afterwards came into the hands of General Korsakoff. The duke therefore thought he might venture on a general attack on the 19th. In this attack Herrmann led the right wing, which was formed by the Russians, and Abercrombie, with whom was the Prince of Orange, the left, whilst the centre was left to the Duke of York, the commander-in-chief. This decisive battle was fought at Bergen, a place situated to the north of Alkmar. The combined army was victorious on both wings, and Horn, on the Zuyder Zee, was occupied; the Duke of York, who was only a general for parades and reviews, merely indulged the centre with a few manœuvres hither and thither. . . . The Russians, therefore, who were left alone in impassible marshes, traversed by ditches, and unknown to their officers, lost many men, and were at length surrounded, and even their general taken prisoner. The duke concerned himself very little about the Russians, and had long before prudently retired into his trenches; and, as the Russians were lost, Abercrombie and the Crown Prince were obliged to relinquish Horn." The incapacity of the commander-in-chief held the army paralyzed during the fortnight following, suffering from sickness and want, while it would still have been practicable to push forward to South Holland. "A series of bloody engagements took place from the 2nd till the 6th of October, and the object of the attack upon the whole line of the French and Batavian army would have been attained had Abercrombie alone commanded. The English and Russians, who call this the battle of Alkmar, were indisputably victorious in the engagements of the 2nd and 3rd of October. They even drove the enemy before them to the neighbourhood of Haarlem, after having taken possession of Alkmar; but on the 6th, Brune, who owes his otherwise very moderate military renown to this engagement alone, having received a reinforcement of some thousands on the 4th and 5th, renewed the battle. The fighting on this day took place at Castricum, on a narrow strip of land between the sea and the lake of Haarlem, a position favourable to the French. The French report is, as usual, full of the boasts of a splendid victory; the English, however, remained in possession of the field, and did not retire to their trenches behind Alkmar and to the marshes of Zyp till the 7th. . . . In not more than eight days afterwards, the want in the army and the anxiety of its incapable commander-in-chief became so great, the number of the sick increased so rapidly, and the fear of the difficulties of embarkation in winter so grew and spread, that the duke accepted the most shameful capitulation that had ever been offered to an English general, except at Saratoga. This capitulation, concluded on the 19th of October, was only granted because the

English, by destroying the dykes, had it in their power to ruin the country."—F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the Eighteenth Century*, v. 7, pp. 149–151. —"For the failure in accomplishing the great objects of emancipating Holland and restoring its legitimate ruler; for the clamorous joy with which her enemies, foreign and domestic, hailed the event; the government of Great Britain had many consolations. . . . The Dutch fleet, which, in the hands of an enterprising enemy, might have been so injuriously employed, was a capture of immense importance: if Holland was ever to become a friend and ally, we had abundant means of promoting her prosperity and re-establishing her greatness; if an enemy, her means of injury and hopes of rivalry were effectually suppressed. Her East-India Company, . . . long the rival of our own in power and prosperity, whose dividends in some years had risen to the amount of 40 per cent., now finally closed its career, making a paltry final payment in part of the arrears of dividends for the present and three preceding years."—J. Adolphus, *Hist. of Eng. : Reign of George III.*, ch. 109 (v. 7).

ALSO IN: G. R. Gleig, *Life of Gen. Sir R. Abercromby (Eminent British Military Commanders, v. 3)*.

A. D. 1799 (November).—Return of Bonaparte from Egypt.—The first Napoleonic Coup d'État.—Revolution of the 18th Brumaire.—End of the First Republic.—Creation of the Consulate.—"When Bonaparte, by means of the bundle of papers which Sidney Smith caused to find their way through the French lines, learned the condition of affairs in Europe, there was but one course consistent with his character for him to pursue. There was nothing more to be done in Egypt; there was everything to be done in France. If he were to lead his army back, even in case he should, by some miracle, elude the eager eyes of Lord Nelson, the act would be generally regarded as a confession of disaster. If he were to remain with the army, he could, at best, do nothing but pursue a purely defensive policy; and if the army were to be overwhelmed, it was no part of Napoleonism to be involved in the disaster. . . . It would be far shrewder to throw the responsibility of the future of Egypt on another, and to transfer himself to the field that was fast ripening for the coveted harvest. Of course Bonaparte, under such circumstances, did not hesitate as to which course to pursue. Robbing the army of such good officers as survived, he left it in command of the only one who had dared to raise his voice in opposition to the work of the 18th Fructidor . . . the heroic but indignant Kléber. Was there ever a more exquisite revenge? . . . On the arrival of Bonaparte in Paris everything seemed ready to his hand. . . . The policy which, in the seizure of Switzerland and the Papal States, he had taken pains to inaugurate before his departure for Egypt had borne its natural fruit. As never before in the history of Europe, England, Holland, Russia, Austria, Naples, and even Turkey had joined hands in a common cause, and as a natural consequence the Directory had been defeated at every point. Nor was it unnatural for the people to attribute all these disasters to the inefficiency of the government. The Directory had really fallen into general contempt, and at the new election on the 30th Prairial it had been practically overthrown. Rewbell, who by his

influence had stood at the head of affairs, had been obliged to give way," and Sieyès had been put in his place. "By the side of this fantastic statesman . . . Barras had been retained, probably for no other reason than that he was sure to be found with the majority, while the other members, Gohier, Moulins, and Roger-Ducos were men from whose supposed mediocrity no very decided opposition could be anticipated. Thus the popular party was not only revenged for the outrages of Fructidor, but it had also made up the new Directory of men who seemed likely to be nothing but clay in the hands of Bonaparte.

. . . The manner in which the General was received can have left no possible doubt remaining in his mind as to the strength of his hold on the hearts of the people. It must have been apparent to all that he needed but to declare himself, in order to secure a well-nigh unanimous support and following of the masses. But with the political leaders the case, for obvious reasons, was far different.

. . . His popularity was so overwhelming, that in his enmity the leaders could anticipate nothing but annihilation, in his friendship nothing but insignificance. . . . The member of the government who, at the time, wielded most influence, was Sieyès, a man to whom personally the General had so unconquerable an aversion, that Josephine was accustomed to refer to him as her husband's *bête noir*. It was evident that Sieyès was the most formidable obstacle to the General's advance." As a first movement, Bonaparte endeavored to bring about the removal of Sieyès from the Directory and his own election to the place. Failing this, his party attempted the immediate creation of a dictatorship. When that, too, was found impracticable, Sieyès was persuaded to a reconciliation and alliance with the ambitious soldier, and the two, at a meeting, planned the proceedings "which led to that dark day in French history known as the 18th Brumaire [November 9, 1799]. It remained only to get absolute control of the military forces, a task at that time in no way difficult. The officers who had returned with Bonaparte from Egypt were impatient to follow wherever their master might lead. Moreau, who, since the death of Hoche, was regarded as standing next to Bonaparte in military ability, was not reluctant to cast in his lot with the others, and Macdonald as well as Serurier soon followed his example. Bernadotte alone would yield to neither flattery nor intimidation. . . . While Bonaparte was thus marshalling his forces in the Rue de la Victoire, the way was opening in the Councils. A commission of the Ancients, made up of the leading conspirators, had worked all night drawing up the proposed articles, in order that in the morning the Council might have nothing to do but to vote them. The meeting was called for seven o'clock, and care was taken not to notify those members whose opposition there was reason to fear. . . . The articles were adopted without discussion. Those present voted, first, to remove the sessions of the Councils from Paris to Saint Cloud (a privilege which the constitution conferred upon the Ancients alone), thus putting them at once beyond the power of influencing the populace and of standing in the way of Bonaparte. They then passed a decree giving to Bonaparte the command of the military forces, at the same time inviting him to come to the Assembly for the purpose of taking the oath of allegiance to the

Constitution." Bonaparte appeared, accordingly, before the Council; but instead of taking an oath of allegiance to the constitution, he made a speech which he closed by declaring: "We want a Republic founded on true liberty and national representation. We will have it, I swear; I swear it in my own name and that of my companions in arms." "Thus the mockery of the oath-taking in the Council of Ancients was accomplished. The General had now a more difficult part to perform in the Council of Five Hundred. As the meeting of the Assembly was not to occur until twelve o'clock of the following day, Bonaparte made use of the intervening time in posting his forces and in disposing of the Directory. . . . There was one locality in the city where it was probable aggressive force would be required. The Luxembourg was the seat of the Directory, and the Directory must at all hazards be crushed. . . . Bonaparte knew well how to turn all such ignominious service to account. In close imitation of that policy which had left Kléber in Egypt, he placed the Luxembourg in charge of the only man in the nation who could now be regarded as his rival for popular favor. Moreau fell into the snare, and by so doing lost a popularity which he was never afterwards able to regain. Having thus placed his military forces, Bonaparte turned his attention to the Directors. The resignations of Sieyès and of Roger-Ducos he already had upon his table. It remained only to procure the others. Barras, without warning, was confronted by Talleyrand and Bruix, who asked him without circumlocution to resign his office," which he did, after slight hesitation. Gohier and Moulins were addressed by Bonaparte in person, but firmly resisted his importunities and his threats. They were then made prisoners by Moreau. "The night of the 18th passed in comparative tranquillity. The fact that there was no organized resistance is accounted for by Lanfrey with a single mournful statement, that 'nothing of the kind could be expected of a nation that had been decapitated. All the men of rank in France for the previous ten years, either by character or genius or virtue, had been mown down, first by the scaffolds and proscriptions, next by war.'" On the morrow, the 19th of Brumaire (November 10) the sitting of the two councils began at two o'clock. In the Council of Five Hundred the partisans of Bonaparte were less numerous than in that of the Ancients, and a powerful indignation at the doings of the previous day began quickly to show itself. In the midst of a warm debate upon the resignation of Barras, which had just been received, "the door was opened, and Bonaparte, surrounded by his grenadiers, entered the hall. A burst of indignation at once arose. Every member sprang to his feet. 'What is this?' they cried, 'swords here! armed men! Away! we will have no dictator here.' Then some of the deputies, bolder than the others, surrounded Bonaparte and overwhelmed him with invectives. 'You are violating the sanctity of the laws; what are you doing, rash man?' exclaimed Bigonnet. 'Is it for this that you have conquered?' demanded Destrem, advancing towards him. Others seized him by the collar of his coat, and, shaking him violently, reproached him with treason. This reception, though the General had come with the purpose of intimidating the Assembly, fairly overwhelmed him. Eye-

witnesses declare that he turned pale, and fell fainting into the arms of his soldiers, who drew him out of the hall." His brother Lucien, who was President of the Council, showed better nerve. By refusing to put motions that were made to vote, and finally by resigning his office and quitting the chair, he threw the Council into confusion. Then, appearing to the troops outside, who supposed him to be still President of the Council, he harangued them and summoned them to clear the chamber. "The grenadiers poured into the hall. A last cry of 'Vive la République' was raised, and a moment later the hall was empty. Thus the crime of the conspirators was consummated, and the First French Republic was at an end. After this action it remained only to put into the hands of Bonaparte the semblance of regular authority. . . . A phantom of the Council of Five Hundred—Cornet, one of them, says 30 members—met in the evening and voted the measures which had been previously agreed upon by the conspirators. Bonaparte, Siéyès, and Roger-Ducos were appointed provisional consuls; 57 members of the Council who had been most prominent in their opposition were excluded from their seats; a list of proscriptions was prepared; two commissioners chosen from the assemblies were appointed to assist the consuls in their work of organization; and, finally, . . . they adjourned the legislative body until the 20th of February."—C. K. Adams, *Democracy and Monarchy in France*, ch. 4.

Also in: P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon I.—A. Thiers, Hist. of the French Rev. (Am. ed.), v. 4, pp. 407–430.—M. de Bourrienne, Private Memoirs of Napoleon, v. 1, ch. 24–27.—Count Miot de Melito, Memoirs, ch. 9.*

A. D. 1799 (November–December).—The constitution of the consulate.—Bonaparte as First Consul.—"During the three months which followed the 18th Brumaire, approbation and expectation were general. A provisional government had been appointed, composed of three consuls, Bonaparte, Siéyès, and Roger-Ducos, with two legislative commissioners, entrusted to prepare the constitution and a definitive order of things. The consuls and the two commissioners were installed on the 21st Brumaire. This provisional government abolished the law respecting hostages and compulsory loans; it permitted the return of the priests proscribed since the 18th Fructidor; it released from prison and sent out of the republic the emigrants who had been shipwrecked on the coast of Calais, and who for four years were captives in France, and were exposed to the heavy punishment of the emigrant army. All these measures were very favourably received. But public opinion revolted at a proscription put in force against the extreme republicans. Thirty-six of them were sentenced to transportation to Guiana, and twenty-one were put under surveillance in the department of Charante-Inférieure, merely by a decree of the consuls on the report of Fouché, minister of police. The public viewed unfavourably all who attacked the government, but at the same time it exclaimed against an act so arbitrary and unjust. The consuls, accordingly, recoiled before their own act; they first commuted transportation into surveillance, and soon withdrew surveillance itself. It was not long before a rupture broke out between the authors of the 18th

Brumaire. During their provisional authority it did not create much noise, because it took place in the legislative commissions. The new constitution was the cause of it. Siéyès and Bonaparte could not agree on this subject: the former wished to institute France, the latter to govern it as a master. . . . Bonaparte took part in the deliberations of the constituent committee, with his instinct of power, he seized upon everything in the ideas of Siéyès which was calculated to serve his projects, and caused the rest to be rejected. . . . On the 24th of December, 1799 (Nivose, year VIII.), forty-five days after the 18th Brumaire, was published the constitution of the year VIII.; it was composed of the wrecks of that of Siéyès, now become a constitution of servitude."—F. A. Mignet, *Hist. of the French Rev., ch. 14.*—"The new constitution was still republic in name and appearance, but monarchical in fact, the latter concealed, by the government being committed, not to the hand of one individual, but of three. The three persons so fixed upon were denominated consuls, and appointed for ten years;—one of them, however, was really ruler, although he only obtained the modest name of First Consul. The rights which Bonaparte caused to be given to himself made all the rest nothing more than mere deception. The First Consul was to invite the others merely to consultation on affairs of state, whilst he himself, either immediately or through the senate, was to appoint to all places of trust and authority, to decide absolutely upon questions of peace or war, and to be assisted by a council of state. . . . In order to cover and conceal the power of the First Consul, especially in reference to the appointment of persons to offices of trust and authority, a senate was created, which neither belonged to the people nor to the government, but immediately from the very beginning was an assembly of courtiers and placemen, and at a later period became the mere tool of every kind of despotism, by rendering it easy to dispense with the legislative body. The senate consisted of eighty members, a part of whom were to be immediately nominated from the lists of notability, and the senate to fill up its own body from persons submitted to them by the First Consul, the tribunate, and the legislative body. Each senator was to have a salary of 25,000 f.; their meetings were not public, and their business very small. From the national lists the senate was also to select consuls, legislators, tribunes, and judges of the Court of Cassation. Large lists were first presented to the communes, on which, according to Roederer, there stood some 500,000 names, out of which the communes selected 50,000 for the departmental lists, from which again 5,000 were to be chosen for the national list. From these 5,000 names, selected from the departmental list, or from what was termed the national list, the senate was afterwards to elect the members of the legislature and the high officers of government. The legislature was to consist of two chambers, the tribunate and the legislative body—the former composed of 100, and the latter of 300 members. The chambers had no power of taking the initiative, that is, they were obliged to wait till bills were submitted to them, and could of themselves originate nothing: they were, however, permitted to express wishes of all kinds to the government. Each bill (*projet de loi*) was introduced into the

tribunate by three members of the council of state, and there defended by them, because the tribunate alone had the right of discussion, whilst the mere power of saying Yea or Nay was conferred upon the members of the legislative body. The tribunate, having accepted the bill, sent three of its members, accompanied by the members from the council of state, to defend the measure in the assembly of the legislative body. Every year one-fifth of the members of the legislative body was to retire from office, being, however, always re-eligible as long as their names remained on the national list. The sittings of the legislative body alone were public, because they were only permitted to be silent listeners to the addresses of the tribunes or councillors of state, and to assent to, or dissent from, the proposed law. Not above 100 persons were, however, allowed to be present as auditors; the sittings were not allowed to continue longer than four months; both chambers, however, might be summoned to an extraordinary sitting. . . . When the constitution was ready to be brought into operation, Sieyes terminated merely as he had begun, and Bonaparte saw with pleasure that he showed himself both contemptible and venal. He became a dumb senator, with a yearly income of 25,000 f.; and obtained 800,000 f. from the directorial treasury, whilst Roger Ducos was obliged to go away contented with a *douceur* of 120,000 f.; and, last of all, Sieyes condescended to accept from Bonaparte a present of the national domain of Crosne, which he afterwards exchanged for another estate. For colleagues in his new dignity Bonaparte selected very able and skilful men, but wholly destitute of all nobility of mind, and to whom it never once occurred to offer him any opposition; these were Cambacérès and Lebrun. The former, a celebrated lawyer, although formerly a vehement Jacobin, impatiently waited till Bonaparte brought forth again all the old plunder; and then, covered with orders, he strutted up and down the Palais Royal like a peacock, and exhibited himself as a show. Lebrun, who was afterwards created a duke, at a later period distinguished himself by being the first to revive the use of hair powder; in fact, he was completely a child and partisan of the olden times, although for a time he had played the part of a Girondist. . . . As early as the 25th and 26th of December the First Consul took up his abode in the Tuileries. There the name of citizen altogether disappeared, for the consul's wife caused herself again to be addressed as Madame. Everything which concerned the government now began to assume full activity, and the adjourned legislative councils were summoned for the 1st of January, in order that they might be dissolved."—F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the Eighteenth Century*, v. 7, pp. 189-192.

ALSO IN: P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon I.*, v. 1, ch. 13-14.—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and Empire*, bk. 1-2 (v. 1).—H. C. Lockwood, *Const. Hist. of France*, ch. 2 and app. 4.

A. D. 1800.—Convention with the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1800.

A. D. 1800 (January—June).—Affairs in Egypt.—The repudiated Treaty of El Arish.—Kléber's victory at Heliopolis.—His assassination.—"Affairs in Egypt had been on the whole unfavourable to the French, since that

army had lost the presence of the commander-in-chief. Kléber, on whom the command devolved, was discontented both at the unceremonious and sudden manner in which the duty had been imposed upon him, and with the scarcity of means left to support his defence. Perceiving himself threatened by a large Turkish force, which was collecting for the purpose of avenging the defeat of the vizier at Aboukir, he became desirous of giving up a settlement which he despaired of maintaining. He signed accordingly a convention with the Turkish plenipotentiaries, and Sir Sidney Smith on the part of the British [at El Arish, January 28, 1800], by which it was provided that the French should evacuate Egypt, and that Kléber and his army should be transported to France in safety, without being molested by the British fleet. When the British government received advice of this convention they refused to ratify it, on the ground that Sir Sidney Smith had exceeded his powers in entering into it. The Earl of Elgin having been sent out as plenipotentiary to the Porte, it was asserted that Sir Sidney's ministerial powers were superseded by his appointment. . . . The truth was that the arrival of Kléber and his army in the south of France, at the very moment when the successes of Suwarrow gave strong hopes of making some impression on her frontier, might have had a most material effect upon the events of the war. . . . The treaty of El Arish was in consequence broken off. Kléber, disappointed of this mode of extricating himself, had recourse to arms. The Vizier Jousseff Pacha, having crossed the Desert and entered Egypt, received a bloody and decisive defeat from the French general, near the ruins of the ancient city of Heliopolis, on the 20th of March, 1800 [following which Kléber crushed with great slaughter a revolt that had broken out in Cairo]. The measures which Kléber adopted after this victory were well calculated to maintain the possession of the country, and reconcile the inhabitants to the French government. . . . While busied in these measures, he was cut short by the blow of an assassin. A fanatic Turk, called Soliman Haleby, a native of Aleppo, imagined he was inspired by Heaven to slay the enemy of the Prophet and the Grand Signior. He concealed himself in a cistern, and springing out on Kléber when there was only one man in company with him, stabbed him dead [June 14]. . . . The Baron Menou, on whom the command now devolved, was an inferior person to Kléber. . . . Menou altered for the worse several of the regulations of Kléber, and, carrying into literal execution what Buonaparte had only written and spoken of, he became an actual Mahommedan."—Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon Buonaparte*, ch. 40.

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and Empire*, bk. 5 (v. 1).

A. D. 1800-1801 (May—February).—Bonaparte's second Italian campaign.—The crossing of the Alps.—The Battle of Marengo.—Moreau in Germany.—Hohenlinden.—Austrian siege of Genoa.—"Preparations for the new campaign in spring were completed. Moreau was made commander-in-chief of the army of the Rhine, 150,000 strong. The plan of the campaign was concerted between the First Consul and Carnot, who had superseded Berthier as Minister at War. The operations were conducted with the

utmost secrecy. Napoleon had determined to strike the decisive blow against Austria in Italy, and to command there in person. By an article in the Constitution the First Consul was forbidden to take command of an army. To this interdiction he cheerfully assented; but he evaded it, as soon as the occasion was ripe, by giving the nominal command of the army of Italy to Berthier. He began to collect troops at Dijon, which were, he publicly announced, intended to advance upon Italy. They consisted chiefly of conscripts and invalids, with a numerous staff, and were called 'the army of reserve.' Meantime, while caricatures of some ancient men with wooden legs and little boys of twelve years old, entitled 'Bonaparte's Army of Reserve,' were amusing the Austrian public, the real army of Italy was formed in the heart of France, and was marching by various roads towards Switzerland. . . . The artillery was sent piecemeal from different arsenals; the provisions necessary to an army about to cross barren mountains were forwarded to Geneva, embarked on the lake, and landed at Villeneuve, near the entrance to the valley of the Simplon. The situation of the French army in Italy had become critical. Masséna had thrown himself into Genoa with 12,000 men, and was enduring all the rigours of a siege, pressed by 30,000 Austrians under General Ott, seconded by the British fleet. Suchet, with the remainder of the French army, about 10,000 strong, completely cut off from communication with Masséna, had concentrated his forces on the Var, was maintaining an unequal contest with Melas, the Austrian commander-in-chief, and strenuously defending the French frontier. Napoleon's plan was to transport his army across the Alps, plant himself in the rear of the Austrians, intercept their communications, then manœuvre so as to place his own army and that of Masséna on the Austrian right and left flanks respectively, cut off their retreat, and finally give them battle at the decisive moment. While all Europe imagined that the multifarious concerns of the Government held the First Consul at Paris, he was travelling at a rapid rate towards Geneva, accompanied only by his secretary. He left Paris on the 6th of May, at two in the morning, leaving Cambacérès to preside until his return, and ordering Fouché to announce that he was about to review the army at Dijon, and might possibly go as far as Geneva, but would return in a fortnight. 'Should anything happen,' he significantly added, 'I shall be back like a thunderbolt.' . . . On the 13th the First Consul reviewed the vanguard of his army, commanded by General Lannes, at Lausanne. The whole army consisted of nearly 70,000 men. Two columns, each of about 6,000 men, were put in motion, one under Turreau, the other under Chabran, to take the routes of Mont Cenis and the Little St. Bernard. A division consisting of 15,000 men, under Moncey, detached from the army of the Rhine, was to march by St. Gothard. Moreau kept the Austrian army of the Rhine, under General Kray, on the defensive before Ulm [to which he had forced his way in a series of important engagements, at Engen, May 2, at Moeskirch, May 4, at Biberach, May 9, and at Hochstadt, June 19], and held himself in readiness to cover the operations of the First Consul in Italy. The main body of the French army, in numbers about 40,000, nominally commanded by Berthier, but in fact by the

First Consul himself, marched on the 15th from Lausanne to the village of St. Pierre, at the foot of the Great St. Bernard, at which all trace of a practicable road entirely ceased. General Marescot, the engineer who had been sent forward from Geneva to reconnoitre, reported the paths to be 'barely passable.' 'Set forward immediately!' wrote Napoleon. Field forges were established at St. Pierre to dismount the guns, the carriages and wheels were slung on poles, and the ammunition-boxes carried by mules. A number of trees were felled, then hollowed out, and the pieces, being jammed into these rough cases, 100 soldiers were attached to each and ordered to drag them up the steep. . . . The whole army effected the passage of the Great St. Bernard in three days."—R. H. Horne, *Hist. of Napoleon Bonaparte*, ch. 18.—"From May 16 to May 19, the solitudes of the vast mountain track echoed to the din and tumult of war, as the French soldiery swept over its heights to reach the valley of the Po and the plains of Lombardy. A hill fort, for a time, stopped the daring invaders, but the obstacle was passed by an ingenious stratagem; and before long Bonaparte, exulting in hope, was marching from the verge of Piedmont on Milan, having made a demonstration against Turin, in order to hide his real purpose. By June 2 the whole French army, joined by the reinforcement sent by Moreau, was in possession of the Lombard capital, and threatened the line of its enemy's retreat, having successfully accomplished the first part of the brilliant design of its great leader. While Bonaparte was thus descending from the Alps, the Austrian commander had been pressing forward the siege of Genoa and his operations on the Var. Masséna, however, stubbornly held out in Genoa; and Suchet had defended the defiles of Provence with a weak force with such marked skill that his adversary had made little progress. When first informed of the terrible apparition of a hostile army gathering upon his rear, Melas disbelieved what he thought impossible; and when he could no longer discredit what he heard, the movements by Mont Cenis and against Turin, intended to perplex him, had made him hesitate. As soon, however, as the real design of the First Consul was fully revealed, the brave Austrian chief resolved to force his way to the Adige at any cost; and, directing Ott to raise the siege of Genoa, and leaving a subordinate to hold Suchet in check, he began to draw his divided army together, in order to make a desperate attack on the audacious foe upon his line of retreat. Ott, however, delayed some days to receive the keys of Genoa, which fell [June 4] after a defence memorable in the annals of war; and, as the Austrian forces had been widely scattered, it was June 12 [after a severe defeat at Montebello, on the 9th, by Lannes] before 50,000 men were assembled for an offensive movement round the well-known fortresses of Alessandria. Meanwhile, the First Consul had broken up from Milan; and, whether ill-informed of his enemy's operations, or apprehensive that, after the fall of Genoa, Melas would escape by a march southwards, he had advanced from a strong position he had taken between the Ticino, the Adda, and the Po, and had crossed the Scrivia into the plains of Marengo, with forces disseminated far too widely. Melas boldly seized the opportunity to escape from the weakened meshes of the net thrown round him; and attacked Bonaparte on

the morning of June 14 with a vigor and energy which did him honor. The battle raged confusedly for several hours; but the French had begun to give way and fly, when the arrival of an isolated division on the field [that of Desaix, who had been sent southward by Bonaparte, and who turned back, on his own responsibility, when he heard the sounds of battle] and the unexpected charge of a small body of horsemen, suddenly changed defeat into a brilliant victory. The importance was then seen of the commanding position of Bonaparte on the rear of his foe; the Austrian army, its retreat cut off, was obliged to come to terms after a single reverse; and within a few days an armistice was signed by which Italy to the Mincio was restored to the French, and the disasters of 1799 were effaced. . . . While Italy had been regained at one stroke, the campaign in Germany had progressed slowly; and though Moreau was largely superior in force, he had met more than one check near Ulm, on the Danube. The stand, however, made ably by Kray, could not lessen the effects of Marengo; and Austria, after that terrible reverse, endeavored to negotiate with the dreaded conqueror. Bonaparte, however, following out a purpose which he had already made a maxim of policy, and resolved if possible to divide the Coalition, refused to treat with Austria jointly with England, except on conditions known to be futile; and after a pause of a few weeks hostilities were resumed with increased energy. By this time, however, the French armies had acquired largely preponderating strength; and while Brune advanced victoriously to the Adige—the First Consul had returned to the seat of government—Moreau in Bavaria marched on the rivers which, descending from the Alps to the Danube, form one of the bulwarks of the Austrian Monarchy. He was attacked incautiously by the Archduke John—the Archduke Charles, who ought to have been in command, was in temporary disgrace at the Court—and soon afterwards [December 3] he won a great battle at Hohenlinden, between the Isar and the Inn, the success of the French being complete and decisive, though the conduct of their chief has not escaped criticism. This last disaster proved overwhelming, and Austria and the States of the Empire were forced to submit to the terms of Bonaparte. After a brief delay peace was made at Luneville in February 1801.”—W. O’C. Morris, *The French Rev. and First Empire*, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: C. Botta, *Italy during the Consulate and Empire of Napoleon*, ch. 1-2.—Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 6 (v. 1).—C. Adams, *Great Campaigns in Europe from 1796 to 1870*, ch. 2.—Duke de Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 19-20.

A. D. 1800-1801 (June—February).—The King of Naples spared at the intercession of the Russian Czar.—The Czar won away from the Coalition.—The Pope befriended.—“Replaced in his richest territories by the allies, the King of Naples was bound by every tie to assist them in the campaign of 1800. He accordingly sent an army into the march of Ancona, under the command of Count Roger de Damas. . . . Undeterred by the battle of Marengo, the Count de Damas marched against the French general Miollis, who commanded in Tuscany, and sustained a defeat by him near Sienna. Retreat became now necessary, the more especially as the armistice which was entered into by Gen-

eral Melas deprived the Neapolitans of any assistance from the Austrians, and rendered their whole expedition utterly hopeless. They were not even included by name in the armistice, and were thus left exposed to the whole vengeance of the French. . . . At this desperate crisis, the Queen of the Two Sicilies took a resolution which seemed almost as desperate, and could only have been adopted by a woman of a bold and decisive character. She resolved, notwithstanding the severity of the season, to repair in person to the court of the Emperor Paul, and implore his intercession with the First Consul, in behalf of her husband and his territories.” The Russian autocrat was more than ready to accede to her request. Disgusted and enraged at the discomfiture of Suwarow in Switzerland, dissatisfied with the conduct of Austria in that unfortunate campaign, and equally dissatisfied with England in the joint invasion of the Batavian republic, he made prompt preparations to quit the coalition and to ally himself with the First Consul of France. Bonaparte welcomed his overtures and gave them every flattering encouragement, conceding instantly the grace which he asked on behalf of the King and Queen of Naples. “The respect paid by the First Consul to the wishes of Paul saved for the present the royal family of Naples; but Murat [who commanded the army sent to central and southern Italy], nevertheless, made them experience a full portion of the bitter cup which the vanquished are generally doomed to swallow. General Damas was commanded in the deughtiest terms to evacuate the Roman States, and not to presume to claim any benefit from the armistice which had been extended to the Austrians. At the same time, while the Neapolitans were thus compelled hastily to evacuate the Roman territories, general surprise was exhibited when, instead of marching to Rome, and re-establishing the authority of the Roman Republic, Murat, according to the orders which he had received from the First Consul, carefully respected the territory of the Church, and reinstalled the officers of the Pope in what had been long termed the patrimony of St. Peter’s. This unexpected turn of circumstances originated in high policy on the part of Buonaparte. . . . Besides evacuating the Ecclesiastical States, the Neapolitans were compelled by Murat to restore various paintings, statues, and other objects of art, which they had, in imitation of Buonaparte, taken forcibly from the Romans,—so captivating is the influence of bad example. A French army of about 18,000 men was to be quartered in Calabria. . . . The harbours of the Neapolitan dominions were of course to be closed against the English. A cession of part of the isle of Elba, and the relinquishment of all pretensions upon Tuscany, summed up the sacrifices of the King of Naples [stipulated in the truce of Foligno, signed in February, 1801], who, considering how often he had braved Napoleon, had great reason to thank the Emperor of Russia for his effectual mediation.”—Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 38.

A. D. 1801 (February).—The Peace of Luneville.—The Rhine boundary confirmed. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803.

A. D. 1801 (March).—Recovery of Louisiana from Spain. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1798-1803.

A. D. 1801.—Expedition against the Blacks of Hayti. See HAYTI: A. D. 1632-1803.

A. D. 1801-1802.—The import of the Peace of Luneville.—Bonaparte's preparations for conflict with England.—The Northern Maritime League.—English bombardment of Copenhagen and summary crushing of the League.—Murder of the Russian Czar.—English expedition to Egypt.—Surrender of the French army.—Peace of Amiens.—“The treaty of Luneville was of far greater import than the treaties which had ended the struggle of the first coalition. . . . The significance then of the Peace of Luneville lay in this, not only that it was the close of the earlier revolutionary struggle for supremacy in Europe, the abandonment by France of her effort to ‘liberate the peoples,’ to force new institutions on the nations about her by sheer dint of arms; but that it marked the concentration of all her energies on a struggle with Britain for the supremacy of the world. For England herself the event which accompanied it, the sudden withdrawal of William Pitt from office, which took place in the very month of the treaty, was hardly less significant. . . . The bulk of the old Ministry returned in a few days to office with Mr. Addington at their head, and his administration received the support of the whole Tory party in Parliament. . . . It was with anxiety that England found itself guided by men like these. . . . The country stood utterly alone; while the peace of Luneville secured France from all hostility on the Continent. . . . To strike at England's wealth had been among the projects of the Directory: it was now the dream of the First Consul. It was in vain for England to produce, if he shut her out of every market. Her carrying-trade must be annihilated if he closed every port against her ships. It was this gigantic project of a ‘Continental System’ that revealed itself as soon as Buonaparte became finally master of France. From France itself and its dependencies in Holland and the Netherlands English trade was already excluded. But Italy also was shut against her after the Peace of Luneville [and the Treaty of Foligno with the King of Naples], and Spain not only closed her own ports but forced Portugal to break with her English ally. In the Baltic, Buonaparte was more active than even in the Mediterranean. In a treaty with America, which was destined to bring this power also in the end into his great attack, he had formally recognized the rights of neutral vessels which England was hourly disputing. . . . The only powers which now possessed naval resources were the powers of the North. . . . Both the Scandinavian states resented the severity with which Britain enforced that right of search which had brought about their armed neutrality at the close of the American war; while Denmark was besides an old ally of France, and her sympathies were still believed to be French. The First Consul therefore had little trouble in enlisting them in a league of Neutrals, which was in effect a declaration of war against England, and which Prussia as before showed herself ready to join. Russia indeed seemed harder to gain.” But Paul, the Czar, afraid of the opposition of England to his designs upon Turkey, dissatisfied with the operations of the coalition, and flattered by Bonaparte, gave himself up to the influence of the latter. “It was to check the action of Britain in the East that the Czar now turned to the French Consul, and seconded his efforts for

the formation of a naval confederacy in the North, while his minister, Rostopchin, planned a division of the Turkish Empire in Europe between Russia and her allies. . . . A squabble over Malta, which had been blockaded since its capture by Buonaparte, and which surrendered at last [September, 1800] to a British fleet, but whose possession the Czar claimed as his own on the ground of an alleged election as Grand Master of the Order of St. John, served as a pretext for a quarrel with England; and at the close of 1800 Paul openly prepared for hostilities. . . . The Danes, who throughout the year had been struggling to evade the British right of search, at once joined this neutral league, and were followed by Sweden in their course. . . . But dexterous as the combination was, it was shattered at a blow. On the 1st of April, 1801, a British fleet of 18 men-of-war [under Sir Hyde Parker, with Nelson second in command] forced the passage of the Belt, appeared before Copenhagen, and at once attacked the city and its fleet. In spite of a brave resistance from the Danish batteries and gunboats six Danish ships were taken, and the Crown Prince was forced to conclude an armistice which enabled the English ships to enter the Baltic. . . . But their work was really over. The seizure of English goods and the declaration of war had bitterly irritated the Russian nobles, whose sole outlet for the sale of the produce of their vast estates was thus closed to them; and on the 24th of March, nine days before the battle of Copenhagen, Paul fell in a midnight attack by conspirators in his own palace. With Paul fell the Confederacy of the North. . . . At the very moment of the attack on Copenhagen, a stroke as effective wrecked his projects in the East. . . . In March, 1801, a force of 15,000 men under General Abercrombie anchored in Aboukir Bay. Deserted as they were by Buonaparte, the French had firmly maintained their hold on Egypt. . . . But their army was foolishly scattered, and Abercrombie was able to force a landing five days after his arrival on the coast. The French however rapidly concentrated; and on the 21st of March their general attacked the English army on the ground it had won, with a force equal to its own. The battle [known as the battle of Alexandria] was a stubborn one, and Abercrombie fell mortally wounded ere its close; but after six hours' fighting the French drew off with heavy loss; and their retreat was followed by the investment of Alexandria and Cairo. . . . At the close of June the capitulation of the 13,000 soldiers who remained closed the French rule over Egypt.” Threatening preparations for an invasion of England were kept up, and gunboats and flatboats collected at Boulogne, which Nelson attacked unsuccessfully in August, 1801. “The First Consul opened negotiations for peace at the close of 1801. His offers were at once met by the English Government. . . . The negotiations which went on through the winter between England and the three allied Powers of France, Spain, and the Dutch, brought about in March, 1802, the Peace of Amiens.” The treaty secured “a pledge on the part of France to withdraw its forces from Southern Italy, and to leave to themselves the republics it had set up along its border in Holland, Switzerland, and Piedmont. In exchange for this pledge, England recognized the French government, restored all the colonies which they

had lost, save Ceylon and Trinidad, to France and its allies [including the restoration to Holland of the Cape of Good Hope and Dutch Guiana, and of Minorca and the citadel of Port Mahon to Spain, while Turkey regained possession of Egypt], acknowledged the Ionian Islands as a free republic, and engaged to restore Malta within three months to its old masters, the Knights of St. John."—J. R. Green, *Hist. of the English People*, bk. 9, ch. 5 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: R. Southey, *Life of Nelson*, ch. 7 (v. 2).—J. Gifford, *Political Life of Pitt*, ch. 47 (v. 6).—C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I.*, v. 1, ch. 4.—A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia*, v. 2, ch. 11-12.—G. R. Gleig, *Life of Gen. Sir R. Abercromby* (*Eminent British Military Commanders*, v. 3).

A. D. 1801-1803.—Domestic measures of Bonaparte.—His Legion of Honor.—His wretched educational scheme.—He is made First Consul for life.—His whittling away of the Constitution.—Revolutions instigated and dictated in the Dutch, Swiss, and Cisalpine Republics.—Bonaparte president of the Italian Republic.—"The concordat was succeeded by the emigrants' recall, which resolution was presented and passed April 26. The irrevocability of the sale of national property was again established, and amnesty granted to all emigrants but the leaders of armed forces, and some few whose offences were specially grave. The property of emigrants remaining unsold was restored, excepting forests, which Bonaparte reserved to be gradually returned as bribes to great families. . . . Two important projects were presented to the Tribunal and Legislative Corps, the Legion of Honor, and free schools. The Convention awarded prizes to the troops for special acts of daring, and the First Consul increased and arranged the distribution, but that was not enough: he wanted a vast system of rewards, adapted to excite amour propre, repay service, and give him a new and potent means of influencing civilians as well as soldiers. He therefore conceived the idea of the Legion of Honor, embracing all kinds of service and title to public distinction. . . . But this plan for forming an order of chivalry was contested even by the Council of State as offensive to that equality which its members were to defend [under the oath prescribed to the Legion], and as a renewal of aristocracy. It only passed the Tribunal and Legislative Corps by a very small majority, and this after the removal of so many of the opposition party. The institution of the Legion of Honor was specious, and, despite the opposition it met with in its early days, suits a people who love distinction, despite their passion for equality, provided it be not hereditary. As for the educational scheme, it was wretched, doing absolutely nothing for the primary schools. The state had no share in it. The Commune was to provide the buildings when the pupils could pay a teacher, thus forsaking the plans of the great assemblies. The wisest statesmen desired to sustain in an improved form the central schools founded by the Convention; but Bonaparte meant to substitute barracks to educate young men for his service. . . . He diminished scientific study; suppressed history and philosophy, which were incompatible with despotism; and completed his system of secondary instruction by creating 6,000 scholarships, to be used as means of influence, like the ribbon of the Legion of Honor. . . . All his

measures succeeded, and yet he was not content: he wanted to extend his power. . . . Cambacérès . . . , when the Amiens treaty was presented to the Tribunal and Legislature, . . . proposed, through the president of the former, that the Senate should be invited to give the First Consul some token of national gratitude (May 6, 1802). . . . The Senate only voted to prolong the First Consul's power for ten years (May 8), with but one protesting voice, that of Lanjuinais, who denounced the flagrant usurpation that threatened the Republic. This was the last echo of the Gironde ringing through the tame assemblies of the Consulate. Bonaparte was very angry, having expected more; but Cambacérès calmed him and suggested a mode of evading the question, namely, to reply that an extension of power could only be granted by the people, and then to make the Council of State dictate the formula to be submitted to the people, substituting a life-consulate for ten years. This was accordingly done. . . . The Council of State even added the First Consul's right to name his successor. This he thought premature and likely to make trouble, and therefore erased it. . . . Registers were opened at the record offices and mayoralties to receive votes, and there were three million and a half votes in the affirmative; a few thousand only daring to refuse, and many abstaining from voting. La Fayette registered a 'no' . . . and sent the First Consul a noble letter. . . . La Fayette then ceased the relations he had hitherto maintained with the First Consul since his return to France. . . . The Senate counted the popular vote on the proposal they did not make, and carried the result to the Tuileries in a body, August 3, 1802; and the result was proclaimed in the form of a *Senatus-Consultum*, in these terms: 'The French people name and the Senate proclaim Napoleon Bonaparte First Consul for life.' This was the first official use of the pre-nomen Napoleon, which was soon, in conformity with royal custom, to be substituted for the family name of Bonaparte. . . . The next day various modifications of the Constitution were offered to the Council of State. . . . The Senate were given the right to interpret and complete the Constitution, to dissolve the Legislature and Tribunal, and, what was even more, to break the judgment of tribunals, thus subordinating justice to policy. But these extravagant prerogatives could only be used at the request of the government. The Senate was limited to 120 members, 40 of whom the First Consul was to elect. The Tribunal was reduced to 50 members, and condemned to discuss with closed doors, divided into sections. . . . Despotism concentrated more and more. Bonaparte took back his refusal to choose his successor, and now claimed that right. He also formed a civil list of six millions. . . . The Senate agreed to everything, and the *Senatus-Consultum* was published August 5. . . . The Republic was now but a name. . . . Early in 1803 things grew dark on the English shore," and "the loss of San Domingo [to which Bonaparte had sent an expedition at the beginning of 1801] seemed inevitable [see HAYTT: A. D. 1632-1803]. While making this expedition, doomed to so fatal an end, Bonaparte continued his haughty policy on the European continent. By article second of the Lunéville treaty France and Austria mutually guaranteed the independence of the Dutch, Swiss, Cisalpine, and

Ligurian republics, and their freedom in the adoption of whatever form of government they saw fit to choose. Bonaparte interpreted this article by substituting for independence his own more or less direct rule in those republics. . . . During the negotiations preceding the Amiens treaty he stirred up a revolution in Holland. That country had a Directory and two Chambers, as in the French Constitution of year III., and he wished to impose a new constitution on the Chambers, putting them more into his power; they refused, and he expelled them by means of the Directory, whom he had won over to his side. The Dutch Directory, in this imitation of November 9, was sustained by French troops, occupying Holland under Augereau, now reconciled to Bonaparte (September, 1801). The new Constitution was put to popular vote. A certain number voted against it. The majority did not vote, Silence was taken for consent, and the new Constitution was proclaimed October 17, 1801. . . . The English government protested, but did not resist. At the same time he [Bonaparte] imposed on the Cisalpine republic, but without conflict or opposition, a constitution even more anti-liberal than the French one of year VIII.; the president who there replaced the First Consul having supreme power. But who was to be that President? The Cisalpines for an instant were simple enough to think that they could choose an Italian: they decided on Count Melzi, well known in the Milanese. They were soon undeceived, when Bonaparte called Cisalpine delegates to Lyons in midwinter. These delegates were landowners, scholars, and merchants, some hundreds in number, and his agents explained to them that none but Bonaparte 'was worthy to govern their republic or able to maintain it.' They eagerly offered him the presidency, which he accepted in lofty terms, and took Melzi for vice-president (January 25, 1802). Italian patriots were consoled for this subjection by the change of name from Cisalpine to Italian Republic, which seemed to promise the unity of Italy. Bonaparte threw out this hope, never meaning to gratify it. . . . He acted as master in Switzerland as well as Italy and Holland. Since Switzerland had ceased to be the scene of war, she had been given over to agitation, fluctuating between revolutionary democracy and the old aristocracy joined to the retrograde democracy of the small Catholic cantons. Modern democracy was at strife with itself. . . . Bonaparte encouraged the strife, that Switzerland might call him in as arbiter. Suddenly, late in July, 1802, he withdrew his troops, which had occupied Switzerland ever since 1798. Civil war broke out at once; the smaller Catholic cantons and the aristocrats of Berne and Zurich overthrew the government established at Berne by the moderate democrats. The government retired to Lausanne, and the country was thus divided. Bonaparte then announced that he would not suffer a Swiss counter-revolution, and that if the parties could not agree he must mediate between them. He summoned the insurrectional powers of Berne to dissolve, and invited all citizens who had held office in the central Swiss government within three years, to meet at Paris and confer with him, announcing that 30,000 men under General Ney were ready to support his mediation. The democratic government at Lausanne were willing to receive the French; the aristocratic government at Berne,

anxious to restore the Austrians, appealed to European powers, who replied by silence, England only protesting against French interference. . . . Bonaparte responded to the English protest by so extraordinary a letter that his chargé d'affaires at London dared not communicate it verbatim. It said that, if England succeeded in drawing the continental powers into her cause, the result would be to force France to 'conquer Europe! Who knows how long it would take the First Consul to revive the Empire of the West?' (October 23, 1802). . . . There was slight resistance to Ney's troops in Switzerland. All the politicians of the new democracy and some of the aristocrats went to Paris at the First Consul's summons. He did not treat their country as he had Holland and Italy, but gave her, instead, a vain show of institutions, a constitution imposing on the different parties a specious compromise. . . . Switzerland was dependent on France in regard to general policy, and was bound to furnish her with troops; but, at least, she administered her own affairs (January, 1803).—H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France from the First Rev.*, v. 2, ch. 8-9.

ALSO IN: F. C. Schlosser, *Hist. of the 18th Century*, v. 7, pp. 286-302.—Mrs. L. Hug and R. Stead, *Story of Switzerland*, ch. 30-31.—C. Botta, *Italy during the Consulate and Empire of Napoleon*, ch. 3.—M. Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 20-26.—Duchess D'Abrantes, *Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 1, ch. 80.—Count M. Dumas, *Memoirs*, ch. 9 (v. 2).—H. A. Taine, *The Modern Regime*, v. 1, bk. 3, ch. 3.

A. D. 1801-1804.—The Civil Code and the Concordat.—'Four years of peace separated the Treaty of Lunéville from the next outbreak of war between France and any Continental Power. They were years of the extension of French influence in every neighbouring State; in France itself, years of the consolidation of Bonaparte's power, and of the decline of everything that checked his personal rule. . . . Among the institutions which date from this period, two, equally associated with the name of Napoleon, have taken a prominent place in history, the Civil Code and the Concordat. Since the middle of the 18th century the codification of law had been pursued with more or less success by almost every Government in the western continent. The Constituent Assembly of 1789 had ordered the statutes by which it superseded the variety of local customs in France to be thus cast into a systematic form. . . . Bonaparte instinctively threw himself into a task so congenial to his own systematizing spirit, and stimulated the efforts of the best jurists in France by his own personal interest and pride in the work of legislation. A Commission of lawyers, appointed by the First Consul, presented the successive chapters of a Civil Code to the Council of State. In the discussions in the Council of State Bonaparte himself took an active, though not always a beneficial, part. . . . In March, 1804, France received the Code which, with few alterations, has formed from that time to the present the basis of its civil rights. . . . It is probable that a majority of the inhabitants of Western Europe believe that Napoleon actually invented the laws which bear his name. As a matter of fact, the substance of these laws was fixed by the successive Assemblies of the Revolution; and, in the final revision which produced the Civil Code, Napo-

leon appears to have originated neither more nor less than several of the members of his Council whose names have long been forgotten. He is unquestionably entitled to the honour of a great legislator, not, however, as one who, like Solon or like Mahomet, himself created a new body of law. . . . Four other Codes, appearing at intervals from the year 1804 to the year 1810, embodied, in a corresponding form, the Law of Commerce, the Criminal Law, and the Rules of Civil and of Criminal Process. . . . Far more distinctively the work of Napoleon himself was the reconciliation with the Church of Rome effected by the Concordat [July, 1801]. It was a restoration of religion similar to that restoration of political order which made the public service the engine of a single will. The bishops and priests, whose appointment the Concordat transferred from their congregations to the Government, were as much instruments of the First Consul as his prefects and his gendarmes. . . . An alliance with the Pope offered to Bonaparte the means of supplanting the popular organisation of the Constitutional Church by an imposing hierarchy, rigid in its orthodoxy and unquestioning in its devotion to himself. In return for the consecration of his own rule, Bonaparte did not shrink from inviting the Pope to an exercise of authority such as the Holy See had never even claimed in France. The whole of the existing French Bishops, both the exiled non-jurors and those of the Constitutional Church, were summoned to resign their sees into the hands of the Pope; against all who refused to do so sentence of deposition was pronounced by the Pontiff. . . . The sees were reorganised, and filled up by nominees of the First Consul. The position of the great body of the clergy was substantially altered in its relation to the Bishops. Episcopal power was made despotic, like all other powers in France. . . . In the greater cycle of religious change, the Concordat of Bonaparte appears in another light. . . . It converted the Catholicism of France from a faith already far more independent than that of Fénelon and Bossuet into the Catholicism which in our day has outstripped the bigotry of Spain and Austria in welcoming the dogma of Papal infallibility."—C. A. Fyfe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 1, ch. 5.—"It is . . . easy, from the official reports which have been preserved, to see what part the First Consul took in the framing of the Civil Code. While we recognise that his intervention was advantageous on some minor points, . . . we must say that his views on the subjects of legislation in which this intervention was most conspicuous, were most often inspired by suggestions of personal interest, or by political considerations which ought to have no weight with the legislator. . . . Bonaparte came by degrees to consider himself the principal creator of a collective work to which he contributed little more than his name, and which probably would have been much better if the suggestions of a man of action and executive authority had not been blended with the views, necessarily more disinterested, larger and more humane, of the eminent jurists whose glory he tried to usurp."—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire*, v. 1, bk. 12-14.—W. H. Jervis, *Hist. of the Church of France*, v. 2, ch. 11.—J. E. Darras, *General Hist. of the Catholic Church*, v. 4,

pp. 547-554.—*The Code-Napoleon*, trans. by Richards.

A. D. 1802.—Fourcroy's education law. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, FRANCE: A. D. 1565-1802.

A. D. 1802 (August-September).—Annexation of Piedmont, Parma, and the Isle of Elba.—A "flagrant act of the First Consul's at this time was the seizure and annexation of Piedmont. Although that country was reconquered by the Austro-Russian army in 1799, the King of Sardinia had not been restored when, by the battle of Marengo, it came again into the possession of the French. Bonaparte then united part of it to the Cisalpine Republic, and promised to erect the rest into a separate State; but he afterwards changed his mind; and by a decree of April 20th 1801, ordered that Piedmont should form a military division of France. . . . Charles Emanuel, disgusted with the injustice and insults to which he was exposed, having abdicated his throne in favour of his brother Victor Emanuel, Duke of Aosta, June 4th 1802, Bonaparte . . . caused that part of Piedmont which had not been united to the Italian Republic to be annexed to France, as the 27th Military Department, by a formal Senatus-Consulte of September 11th 1802. A little after, October 11th, on the death of Ferdinand de Bourbon, Duke of Parma, father of the King of Etruria, that duchy was also seized by the rapacious French Republic. The isle of Elba had also been united to France by a Senatus-Consulte of August 26th."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 11 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: A. Gallenga, *Hist. of Piedmont*, v. 3, ch. 5.

A. D. 1802-1803.—Complaints against the English press.—The Peltier trial.—The First Consul's rage.—War declared by Great Britain.—Detention of all the English in France, Italy, Switzerland and the Netherlands.—Occupation of Hanover.—"Mr. Addington was wont to say in after years that the ink was scarcely dry, after the signature of the treaty of Amiens, when discontents arose which perilled the new peace. On the 24th of May [1802], M. Otto told Lord Glenbervie that if the English press were not controlled from censuring Napoleon, there must be a war to the death: and in the course of the summer, six requisitions were formally made to the British government, the purport of which was that the press must be controlled; the royal emigrants sent to Warsaw; the island of Jersey cleared of persons disaffected to the French government; and all Frenchmen dismissed from Great Britain who wore the decorations of the old monarchy. The reply was, that the press was free in England; and that if any of the emigrants broke the laws, they should be punished; but that otherwise they could not be molested. The government, however, used its influence in remonstrance with the editors of newspapers which were abusive of the French. Cobbet was pointed out by name by Napoleon, as a libeller who must be punished; and Peltier, a royalist emigrant, who had published some incentives to the assassination of the French ruler, or prophecies which might at such a crisis be fairly regarded as incentives. M. Peltier's object was to use his knowledge of the tools of Napoleon, and his great political and literary experience, in laying bare the character and policy of Napoleon; and he began, in the summer of 1802,

a journal, the first number of which occasioned the demand for his punishment. He was prosecuted by the Attorney-General, and defended by Sir James Mackintosh, in a speech which was translated into nearly all the languages of Europe, and universally considered one of the most prodigious efforts of oratory ever listened to in any age. The Attorney-General, Mr. Percival, declared in Court, that he could hardly hope for an impartial decision from a jury whose faculties had been so roused, dazzled and charmed. . . . M. Peltier was found guilty; but the Attorney-General did not call for judgment on the instant. War was then — at the close of February [1803] — imminent; and the matter was dropped. M. Peltier was regarded as a martyr, and, as far as public opinion went, was rather rewarded than punished in England. He was wont to say that he was tried in England and punished in France. His property was confiscated by the consular agents; and his only near relations, his aged father and his sister, died at Nantes, through terror at his trial. By this time the merchants of Great Britain were thoroughly disgusted with France. Not only had Napoleon prevented all commercial intercourse between the nations throughout the year, but he had begun to confiscate English merchant vessels, driven by stress of weather into his ports. By this time, too, the Minister's mind was made up as to the impossibility of avoiding war. . . . Napoleon had published [Jan. 30, 1803] a Report of an official agent of his, Sebastiani, who had explored the Levant, striving as he went to rouse the Mediterranean States to a desertion of England and an alliance with France. He reported of the British force at Alexandria, and of the means of attack and defence there; and his employer put forth this statement in the '*Moniteur*,' his own paper, while complaining of the insults of the English press towards himself. Our ambassador at Paris, Lord Whitworth, desired an explanation: and the reception of his demand by the First Consul . . . was characteristic. . . . He sent for Lord Whitworth to wait on him at nine in the morning of the 18th; made him sit down; and then poured out his wrath 'in the style of an Italian bully,' as the record has it: and the term is not too strong; for he would not allow Lord Whitworth to speak. The first impression was, that it was his design to terrify England: but Talleyrand's anxiety to smooth matters afterwards, and to explain away what his master had said, shows that the ebullition was one of mere temper. And this was presently confirmed by his behaviour to Lord Whitworth at a levee, when the saloon was crowded with foreign ambassadors and their suites, as well as with French courtiers. The whole scene was set forth in the newspapers of every country. Napoleon walked about, transported with passion: asked Lord Whitworth if he did not know that a terrible storm had arisen between the two governments; declared that England was a violator of treaties; took to witness the foreigners present that if England did not immediately surrender Malta, war was declared; and condescended to appeal to them whether the right was not on his side; and, when Lord Whitworth would have replied, silenced him by a gesture, and observed that, Lady Whitworth being out of health, her native air would be of service to her; and she should have it, sooner than she expected. — After this, there could be little

hope of peace in the most sanguine mind. . . . Lord Whitworth left Paris on the 12th of May; and at Dover met General Andreossi, on his way to Paris. On the 16th, it became publicly known that war was declared: and on the same day Admiral Cornwallis received telegraphic orders which caused him to appear before Brest on the 18th. On the 17th, an Order in Council, directing reprisals, was issued; and with it the proclamation of an embargo being laid on all French and Dutch ships in British ports. . . . On the next day, May 18th, 1803, the Declaration of War was laid before parliament, and the feverish state, called peace, which had lasted for one year and sixteen days, passed into one of open hostility. The reason why the vessels of the Dutch were to be seized with those of the French was that Napoleon had filled Holland with French troops, and was virtually master of the country. . . . In July, the militia force amounted to 173,000 men; and the deficiency was in officers to command them. The minister proposed, in addition to all the forces actually in existence, the formation of an army of reserve, amounting to 50,000 men: and this was presently agreed to. There was little that the parliament and people of England would not have agreed to at this moment, under the provocation of Napoleon's treatment of the English in France. His first act was to order the detention, as prisoners of war, of all the English then in the country, between the ages of 18 and 60. The exasperation caused by this cruel measure was all that he could have expected or desired. Many were the young men thus doomed to lose, in wearing expectation or despair, twelve of the best years of their lives, cut off from family, profession, marriage, citizenship — everything that young men most value. Many were the parents separated for twelve long years from the young creatures at home, whom they had left for a mere pleasure trip: and many were the grey-haired fathers and mothers at home who went down to the grave during those twelve years without another sight of the son or daughter who was pining in some small provincial town in France, without natural occupation, and well nigh without hope. In June, the English in Rouen were removed to the neighbourhood of Amiens; those in Calais to Lisle; those at Brussels to Valenciennes. Before the month was out, all the English in Italy and Switzerland, in addition to those in Holland, were made prisoners. How many the whole amounted to does not appear to have been ascertained: but it was believed at the time that there were 11,000 in France, and 1,300 in Holland. The first pretence was that these travellers were detained as hostages for the prizes which Napoleon accused us of taking before the regular declaration of war; but when proposals were made for an exchange, he sent a savage answer that he would keep his prisoners till the end of the war. It is difficult to conceive how there could be two opinions about the nature of the man after this act. The naval captures of which Napoleon complained, as made prior to a declaration of war, were of two merchant ships taken by English frigates: and we find notices of such being brought into port on the 25th of May. Whether they were captured before the 18th, there is no record that we can find. . . . On the sea, our successes seemed a matter of course; but meantime a blow was struck at Great Britain,

and especially at her sovereign, which proved that the national exasperation against France was even yet capable of increase. On the breaking out of the war, George III. issued a proclamation, as Elector of Hanover, declaring to Germany that the Germanic states had nothing to fear in regard to the new hostilities, as he was entering into war as King of Great Britain, and not as Elector of Hanover. Whatever military preparations were going forward in Hanover were merely of a defensive character. Napoleon, however, set such defence at defiance. On the 13th of June, news arrived of the total surrender of Hanover to the French. . . . Government resolved to declare the Elbe and the Weser, and all the ports of Western Germany, in a state of blockade; as the French had now command over all the intermediate rivers. It was calculated that this would annoy and injure Napoleon effectually, as it would cause the ruin of foreign merchants trading from the whole series of ports. English merchants would suffer deeply; but it was calculated that English capital and stock would hold out longer than those of foreign merchants. Thus was the sickening process of private ruin, as a check to public aggression, entered upon, before war had been declared a month."—H. Martineau, *Hist. of Eng.*, 1800-1815, bk. 1, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 28-30.—Sir J. Mackintosh, *Speech in Defense of Jean Peltier (Miscellaneous Works)*.—J. Ashton, *English Caricature and Satire on Napoleon I.*, v. 1, ch. 24-37.

A. D. 1803 (April-May).—Sale of Louisiana to the United States of America. See LOUISIANA: A. D. 1798-1803; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1803.

A. D. 1803.—Loss of San Domingo, or Hayti. See HAYTI: A. D. 1632-1803.

A. D. 1804-1805.—Royalist plots and Bonaparte's use of them.—The abduction and execution of the Duc d'Enghien.—The First Consul becomes Emperor.—His coronation by the Pope.—His acceptance of the crown of Italy.—Annexation of Genoa to France.—The rupture with England furnished Bonaparte "with the occasion of throwing off the last disguise and openly restoring monarchy. It was a step which required all his audacity and cunning. He had crushed Jacobinism, but two great parties remained. There was first the more moderate republicanism, which might be called Girondism, and was widely spread among all classes and particularly in the army. Secondly, there was the old royalism, which after many years of helpless weakness had revived since Brumaire. These two parties, though hostile to each other, were forced into a sort of alliance by the new attitude of Bonaparte, who was hurrying France at once into a new revolution at home and into an abyss of war abroad. England, too, after the rupture, favoured the efforts of these parties. Royalism from England began to open communications with moderate republicanism in France. Pichegru acted for the former, and the great representative of the latter was Moreau, who had helped to make Brumaire in the tacit expectation probably of rising to the consulate in due course when Bonaparte's term should have expired, and was therefore hurt in his personal claims as well as in his republican principles. Bonaparte watched the movement through his ubiquitous police, and

with characteristic strategy determined not merely to defeat it but to make it his stepping-stone to monarchy. He would ruin Moreau by fastening on him the stigma of royalism; he would persuade France to make him emperor in order to keep out the Bourbons. He achieved this with the peculiar mastery which he always showed in villainous intrigue. . . . Pichegru [who had returned secretly to France from England some time in January, 1804] brought with him wilder partisans, such as Georges [Cadoudal] the Chouan. No doubt Moreau would gladly have seen and gladly have helped an insurrection against Bonaparte. . . . But Bonaparte succeeded in associating him with royalist schemes and with schemes of assassination. Controlling the Senate, he was able to suppress the jury; controlling every avenue of publicity, he was able to suppress opinion; and the army, Moreau's fortress, was won through its hatred of royalism. In this way Bonaparte's last personal rival was removed. There remained the royalists, and Bonaparte hoped to seize their leader, the Comte d'Artois, who was expected, as the police knew, soon to join Pichegru and Georges at Paris. What Bonaparte would have done with him we may judge from the course he took when the Comte did not come. On March 15, 1804, the Duc d'Enghien, grandson of the Prince de Condé, residing at Ettenheim in Baden, was seized at midnight by a party of dragoons, brought to Paris, where he arrived on the 20th, confined in the castle of Vincennes, brought before a military commission at two o'clock the next morning, asked whether he had not borne arms against the republic, which he acknowledged himself to have done, conducted to a staircase above the moat, and there shot and buried in the moat. . . . That the Duc d'Enghien was innocent of the conspiracy, was nothing to the purpose; the act was political, not judicial; accordingly he was not even charged with complicity. That the execution would strike horror into the cabinets, and perhaps bring about a new Coalition, belonged to a class of considerations which at this time Bonaparte systematically disregarded. This affair led immediately to the thought of giving heredity to Bonaparte's power. The thought seems to have commended itself irresistibly even to strong republicans and to those who were most shocked by the murder. To make Bonaparte's position more secure seemed the only way of averting a new Reign of Terror or new convulsions. He himself felt some embarrassment. Like Cromwell, he was afraid of the republicanism of the army, and heredity pure and simple brought him face to face with the question of divorcing Josephine. To propitiate the army, he chose from the titles suggested to him—consul, stadtholder, &c.—that of emperor, undoubtedly the most accurate, and having a sufficiently military sound. The other difficulty after much furious dissension between the two families of Bonaparte and Beauharnais, was evaded by giving Napoleon himself (but none of his successors) a power of adoption, and fixing the succession, in default of a direct heir, natural or adoptive, first in Joseph and his descendants, then in Louis and his descendants. Except abstaining from the regal title, no attempt was made to conceal the abolition of republicanism. . . . The change was made by the constituent power of the Senate, and the *Senatus-consulte* is dated May 18, 1804. The title of Emperor had

an ulterior meaning. Adopted at the moment when Napoleon began to feel himself master both in Italy and Germany, it revived the memory of Charles the Great. To himself it was the more satisfactory on that account, and, strange to say, it gave satisfaction rather than offence to the Head of the Holy Roman Empire, Francis II. Since Joseph, the Habsburg Emperors had been tired of their title, which, being elective, was precarious. They were desirous of becoming hereditary emperors in Austria, and they now took this title (though without as yet giving up the other). Francis II. bartered his acknowledgement of Napoleon's new title against Napoleon's acknowledgement of his own. It required some impudence to condemn Moreau for royalism at the very moment that his rival was re-establishing monarchy. Yet his trial began on May 15th. The death of Pichegru, nominally by suicide, on April 6th, had already furnished the rising sultanism with its first dark mystery. Moreau was condemned to two years' imprisonment, but was allowed to retire to the United States."—J. R. Seeley, *Short Hist. of Napoleon I.*, ch. 3, sect. 4.—C. C. Fauriel, *The Last Days of the Consulate*.—Chancellor Pasquier, in his *Memoirs*, narrates the circumstances of the seizure of the Duc d'Enghien at considerable length, and says: "This is what really occurred, according to what I have been told by those better situated to know. A council was held on the 9th of March. It is almost certain that previous to this council, which was a kind of official affair, a more secret one had been held at the house of Joseph Bonaparte. At the first council, to which were convened only a few persons, all on a footing of family intimacy, it was discussed by order of the First Consul, what would be proper to do with a prince of the House of Bourbon, in case one should have him in one's power, and the decision reached was that if he was captured on French territory, one had the right to take his life, but not otherwise. At the council held on the 9th, and which was composed of the three Consuls, the Chief Justice, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and M. Fouché, although the latter had not then resumed the post of Minister of Police, the two men who expressed contrary opinions were M. de Talleyrand and M. de Cambacérès. M. de Talleyrand declared that the prince should be sent to his death. M. Lebrun, the Third Consul, contented himself with saying that such an event would have a terrible echo throughout the world. M. de Cambacérès contended earnestly that it would be sufficient to hold the prince as hostage for the safety of the First Consul. The latter sided with M. de Talleyrand, whose counsels then prevailed. The discussion was a heated one, and when the meeting of the council was over, M. de Cambacérès thought it his duty to make a last attempt, so he followed Bonaparte into his study, and laid before him with perhaps more strength than might be expected from his character, the consequences of the deed he was about to perpetrate, and the universal horror it would excite. . . . He spoke in vain. In the privacy of his study, Bonaparte expressed himself even with greater violence than he had done at the council. He answered that the death of the duke would seem to the world but a just reprisal for what was being attempted against him personally; that it was necessary to teach the House of Bourbon that the blows struck with its sanction were liable to

recoil on its own head; that this was the only way of compelling it to abstain from its dastardly schemes, and lastly, that matters had gone too far to retrace one's steps. M. de Talleyrand supplied this last argument."—Chancellor Pasquier, *Memoirs*, v. 1, pp. 190-191.—"Bonaparte's accession to the Empire was proclaimed with the greatest pomp, without waiting to inquire whether the people approved of his promotion or otherwise. The proclamation was coldly received, even by the populace, and excited little enthusiasm. . . . The Emperor was recognised by the soldiery with more warmth. He visited the encampments at Boulogne," and, afterwards, "accompanied with his Empress, who bore her honours both gracefully and meekly, visited Aix-la-Chapelle and the frontiers of Germany. They received the congratulations of all the powers of Europe, excepting England, Russia, and Sweden, upon their new exaltation. . . . But the most splendid and public recognition of his new rank was yet to be made, by the formal act of coronation, which, therefore, Napoleon determined should take place with circumstances of solemnity which had been beyond the reach of any temporal prince, however powerful, for many ages. . . . Though Charlemagne had repaired to Rome to receive inauguration from the hands of the Pontiff of that day, Napoleon resolved that he who now owned the proud, and in Protestant eyes profane, title of Vicar of Christ, should travel to France to perform the coronation. . . . The Pope, and the cardinals whom he consulted, implored the illumination of Heaven upon their councils; but it was the stern voice of necessity which assured them that, except at the risk of dividing the Church by a schism, they could not refuse to comply with Buonaparte's requisition. The Pope left Rome on the 5th November. . . . On the 2d December [1804] the coronation took place in the ancient cathedral of Notre Dame. . . . The crown having been blessed by the Pope, Napoleon took it from the altar with his own hands, and placed it on his brows. He then put the diadem on the head of his Empress, as if determined to show that his authority was the child of his own actions. . . . The northern states of Italy had followed the example of France through all her change of models. . . . The authorities of the Italian (late Cisalpine) Republic, had a prescient guess of what was expected of them. A deputation appeared at Paris to declare the absolute necessity which they felt, that their government should assume a monarchical and hereditary form. On the 17th March [1805], they obtained an audience of the Emperor, to whom they intimated the unanimous desire of their countrymen that Napoleon, founder of the Italian Republic, should be monarch of the Italian Kingdom. . . . Buonaparte granted the petition of the Italian States, and . . . upon the 11th April, . . . with his Empress, set off to go through the form of coronation as King of Italy. . . . The new kingdom was, in all respects, modeled on the same plan with the French Empire. An order, called 'of the Iron Crown,' was established on the footing of that of the Legion of Honour. A large French force was taken into Italian pay, and Eugene Beauharnais, the son of Josephine by her former marriage, who enjoyed and merited the confidence of his father-in-law, was created viceroy, and appointed to represent, in that character, the dignity of Napoleon. Napo-

leon did not leave Italy without further extension of his empire. Genoa, once the proud and the powerful, resigned her independence, and her Doge presented to the Emperor a request that the Ligurian Republic . . . should be considered in future as a part of the French nation."—Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 48 (*Paris ed.*, 1828).—"Genoa and the Ligurian Republic were incorporated with France, June 3d 1805. . . . The Duchies of Parma and Piacenza, which, together with Guastalla, had been already seized, were declared dependencies of the French Empire by an imperial decree of July 21st. The principality of Piombino was bestowed on Napoleon's sister Eliza, wife of the Senator Bacciocchi, but on conditions which retained it under the Emperor's suzerainty: and the little state was increased by the addition of the Republic of Lucca."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 11 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: C. Botta, *Italy during the Consulate and Empire of Napoleon*, ch. 3-4.—*Memoirs dictated by Napoleon to his Generals at St. Helena*, v. 6, pp. 219-225.—J. Fouché, *Memoirs*, pp. 260-274.—Count Miot de Melito, *Memoirs*, ch. 16-17.—W. Hazlitt, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 33-34 (v. 2).—M'me de Rémusat, *Memoirs*, bk. 1, ch. 4-10 (v. 1).—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 9-10.—M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 3, ch. 1-12.

A. D. 1805 (January—April).—The Third European Coalition.—"In England Pitt returned to office in May, 1804, and this in itself was an evil omen for France. He enjoyed the confidence, not only of his own nation but of Europe, and he at once set to work to resume the threads of that coalition of which England had formerly directed the resources. Alexander I. of Russia had begun to see through the designs of Napoleon; he found that he had been duped in the joint mediation in Germany, he resented the occupation of Hanover and he ordered his court to put on mourning for the duke of Enghien. Before long he broke off diplomatic relations with France (Sept. 1804), and a Russian war was now only a question of time. Austria was the power most closely affected by Napoleon's assumption of the imperial title. . . . While hastening to acknowledge Napoleon, Austria was busied in military preparations and began to resume its old connection with England. Prussia was the power on which France was accustomed to rely with implicit confidence. But the occupation of Hanover and the interference with the commerce of the Elbe had weakened Frederick William III.'s belief in the advantages of a neutral policy, and, though he could not make up his mind to definite action, he began to open negotiations with Russia in view of a rupture with France. The fluctuations of Prussian policy may be followed in the alternating influence of the two ministers of foreign affairs, Haugwitz and Hardenberg. Meanwhile Napoleon, ignorant or reckless of the growing hostility of the great powers, continued his aggressions at the expense of the lesser states. . . . These acts gave the final impulse to the hostile powers, and before Napoleon quitted Italy the Coalition had been formed. On the 11th of April, 1805, a final treaty was signed between Russia and England. The two powers pledged themselves to form an European league against France, to conclude no peace without mutual consent, to settle disputed points in a congress at the end of the war, and to form a federal tribunal

for the maintenance of the system which should then be established. The immediate objects of the allies were the abolition of French rule in Italy, Holland, Switzerland, and Hanover; the restoration of Piedmont to the king of Sardinia; the protection of Naples; and the erection of a permanent barrier against France by the union of Holland and Belgium under the House of Orange. The coalition was at once joined by Gustavus IV. of Sweden, who inherited his father's devotion to the cause of legitimate monarchy, and who hoped to recover power in Pomerania. Austria, terrified for its Italian possessions by Bonaparte's evident intention to subdue the whole peninsula, was driven into the league. Prussia, in spite of the attraction of recovering honour and independence, refused to listen to the solicitations of England and Russia, and adhered to its feeble neutrality. Of the other German states Bavaria, Baden, and Wurtemberg were allies of France. As far as effective operations were concerned, the coalition consisted only of Austria and Russia. Sweden and Naples, which had joined secretly, could not make efforts on a great scale, and England was as yet content with providing subsidies and the invaluable services of its fleet. It was arranged that one Austrian army under the archduke Charles should invade Lombardy, while Mack, with a second army and the aid of Russia, should occupy Bavaria and advance upon the Rhine."—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, ch. 24, sect. 13-15.

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789-1815, ch. 39 (v. 9).

A. D. 1805 (March—December).—Napoleon's plans and preparations for the invasion of England.—Nelson's long pursuit of the French fleets.—His victory and death at Trafalgar.—Napoleon's rapid march to the Danube.—Capitulation of Mack at Ulm.—The French in Vienna.—The great battle of Austerlitz.—"While the coalition was forming, and Napoleon seemed wantonly to be insulting Europe and ignoring the danger of exciting fresh enemies, he was in fact urging on with all rapidity his schemes for the invasion of England, which he probably hoped might be so successful as to paralyse all action on the part of the European powers. The constantly repeated representations of his naval officers had forced him, much against his will, to believe that his descent upon England would be impracticable unless secured by the presence of his fleet. In spite of the general voice of those who knew the condition of the French navy, he determined to act with his fleet on the same principles as he would have acted with his army; a gigantic combination of various squadrons was to be effected, and a fleet great enough to destroy all hope of opposition to sweep the Channel. For this purpose the 18 ships of the line at Brest under Admiral Gantheaume, the squadron at Rochefort under Villeeneuve, and the Toulon fleet under Latouche-Tréville, were to unite. The last mentioned admiral was intrusted with the chief command. Sailing up the coast of France, he was to liberate from their blockade the squadrons of Rochefort and Brest, and with their combined fleets appear before Boulogne. But Latouche-Tréville died, and Napoleon intrusted his plans to Villeneuve. Those plans, all of them arranged without regard to the bad condition of the French ships, or to the uncertainty of the weather, were fre-

quently changed; at one time Villeneuve from Toulon, and Missiessy, his successor, at Rochefort, were to proceed to the West Indies, drawing the English fleet thither; then Gantheaume was to appear from Brest, throw troops into Ireland, and thus cover the flotilla. At another time, all the fleets were to assemble at the West Indies, and, joining with the Spanish fleet at Ferrol, appear in the Straits of Calais. To complete this last measure Villeneuve set sail from Toulon on the 30th of March 1805, joined Gravina at Cadiz, and reached Martinique on the 13th of May with 20 ships of the line, and 7 frigates. His voyage was so slow that Missiessy had returned from the West Indies to France, and the junction failed. In hot pursuit of Villeneuve, Nelson, who had at length found out his destination, had hurried. At Martinique Gantheaume, with the Brest fleet, should have joined Villeneuve; unfortunately for him, Admiral Cornwallis blockaded his fleet. Villeneuve therefore had to return to Europe alone, sailing for Ferrol to pick up a squadron of 15 ships. He was then, at the head of 35 ships, ordered to appear before Brest, liberate Gantheaume, and appear in the Channel. Back again in pursuit of him Nelson sailed, but supposed that he would return to the Mediterranean and not to Ferrol; he therefore again missed him; but as he had found means to inform the English Government that Villeneuve was returning to Europe, Calder, with a fleet of 15 ships, was sent to intercept him. The fleets encountered off Cape Finisterre. The French had 27 vessels, Calder but 18, and after an indecisive battle, in which two Spanish ships were taken, he was afraid to renew the engagement, and Villeneuve was thus enabled to reach Ferrol in safety. However, all the operations towards concentration had led to absolutely nothing, and the English fleets, which the movements towards the West Indies were to have decoyed from the Channel, were either still off the coast of France or in immediate pursuit of the fleet of Villeneuve. Nelson returned to Gibraltar, and as soon as he found out where Villeneuve was, he joined his fleet to that of Cornwallis before Brest, and himself returned to England. . . . Meanwhile Villeneuve had not been able to get ready for sea till the 11th of August. . . . He was afraid to venture northwards, and with the full approbation of his Spanish colleague Gravina, determined to avail himself of a last alternative which Napoleon had suggested, and sailed to Cadiz. This was a fatal blow to the gigantic schemes of Napoleon. Up till the 22nd of August he still believed that Villeneuve would make his appearance, and in fact wrote to him that day at Brest, closing his letter with the words, 'England is ours.' As the time for his great stroke drew near he grew nervously anxious, constantly watching the Channel for the approach of the fleet, and at last, when his Minister of Marine, Decrès, told him that the fleet had gone to Cadiz, he broke forth in bitter wrath against both his Minister and Villeneuve, whom he accused of the most shameful weakness. But Napoleon was not a man who let his success be staked upon one plan alone. Though studiously hiding from his people the existence of the coalition, and not scrupling to have recourse to forged letters and fabricated news for the purpose, he was fully aware of its existence. . . . Without much difficulty, therefore, he at once resigned his great plans

upon England, and directed his army towards the eastern frontier."—J. F. Bright, *Hist. of England, period 3, pp. 1261–1264.*—"In the first days of September, 1805, Napoleon's great army was in full march across France and Germany, to attain the Danube. . . . The Allies . . . had projected four separate and ill-combined attacks; the first on Hanover and Holland by a Russian and British force; the second, on Lower Italy by a similar body; the third, by a great Austrian army on Upper Italy; and the fourth, by a United Austrian and Russian army, moving across Southern Germany to the Rhine. . . . By this time, the Austrian Mack had drawn close to the Inn, in order to compel Bavaria to join the Allies, and was even making his way to the Iller, but his army was far distant from that of the Russian chief, Kutusoff, and still further from that of Buxhöwden, the one in Galicia, the other in Poland. . . . Napoleon had seized this position of affairs, with the comprehensive knowledge of the theatre of war, and the skill of arranging armies upon it, in which he has no equals among modern captains. He opposed Masséna to the Archdukes, with a much weaker force, confident that his great lieutenant could hold them in check. He neglected the attacks from the North Sea, and the South; but he resolved to strike down Mack, in overwhelming strength, should he advance without his Russian supports. . . . The great mass of the Grand Army had reached the Main and Rhine by the last week of September. The left wing, joined by the Bavarian forces, and commanded by Bernadotte and Marmont, had marched from Hanover and Holland, and was around Wurtzburg; the centre, the corps of Soult, and Davoust, moved from the channel, was at Spire and Mannheim, and the right wing, formed of the corps of Ney and Lannes, with the Imperial Guard, and the horse of Murat, filled the region between Carlsruhe and Strashurg, the extreme right under Augereau, which had advanced from Brittany, being still behind but drawing towards Hünigen. By this time Mack was upon the Iller, holding the fortress of Ulm on the upper Danube, and extending his forces thence to Memmingen. . . . By the first days of October the great French masses . . . were in full march from the Rhine to the Main, across Würtemberg and the Franconian plains; and cavalry filled the approaches to the Black Forest, in order to deceive and perplex Mack. . . . The Danube ere long was reached and crossed, at Donauwörth, Ingolstadt, and other points; and Napoleon already stood on the rear of his enemy, interposing between him and Vienna, and cut him off from the Russians, even now distant. The net was quickly drawn round the ill-fated Mack. . . . By the third week of October, the Grand Army had encompassed the Austrians on every side, and Napoleon held his quarry in his grasp. Mack . . . had not the heart to strike a desperate stroke, and to risk a battle; and he capitulated at Ulm on the 19th of October. Two divisions of his army had contrived to break out; but one was pursued and nearly destroyed by Murat, and the other was compelled by Augereau to lay down its arms, as it was on its way to the hills of the Tyrol. An army of 85,000 men had thus, so to speak, been well-nigh effaced; and not 20,000 had effected their escape. France meanwhile had met a crushing disaster on the element which England

had made her own. We have seen how Villeneuve had put into Cadiz, afraid to face the hostile fleets off Brest, and how this had baffled the project of the descent. Napoleon was indignant with his ill-fated admiral. . . . At a hint of disgrace the susceptible Frenchman made up his mind, at any risk, to fight. By this time Nelson had left England, and was off Cadiz with a powerful fleet; and he actually weakened his force by four sail-of-the-line, in order to lure his adversary out. On the 20th of October, 1805, the allied fleet was in the open sea; it had been declared at a council of war, that a lost battle was almost certain, so bad was the condition of many of the crews; but Villeneuve was bent on challenging Fate; and almost courted defeat, in his despair. . . . On the morning of the 21st, the allied fleet, 33 war ships, and a number of frigates, was off Cape Trafalgar, making for the Straits. . . . Nelson advanced slowly against his doomed enemy, with 27 ships and their attendant frigates; the famous signal floated from his mast, 'England expects every man to do his duty'; and, at about noon, Collingwood pierced Villeneuve's centre, nearly destroying the Santa Anna with a single broadside. Ere long Nelson had broken Villeneuve's line, with the Victory, causing frightful destruction; and as other British ships came up by degrees they relieved the leading ships from the pressure of their foes, and completed the ruin already begun. At about one, Nelson met his death wound, struck by a shot from the tops of the Redoubtable. . . . Pierced through and through, the shattered allied centre was soon a collection of captured wrecks. . . . Only 11 ships out of 33 escaped; and the burning Achilles, like the Orient at the Nile, added to the grandeur and horrors of an appalling scene. Villeneuve, who had fought most honourably in the Bucentaure, was compelled to strike his flag before the death of Nelson. The van of the allies that had fled at Trafalgar, was soon afterwards captured by a British squadron. Though dearly bought by the death of Nelson, the victory may be compared to Lepanto; and it blotted France out as a great Power on the ocean. Napoleon . . . never tried afterwards to meet England at sea. . . . His success, at this moment, had been so wonderful, that what he called 'the loss of a few ships at sea,' seemed a trifling and passing rebuff of fortune. . . . He had discomfited the whole plan of the Allies; and the failure of the attack on the main scene of the theatre had caused all the secondary attacks to fail. . . . Napoleon, throwing out detachments to protect his flanks, had entered Vienna on the 14th of November. . . . The House of Hapsburg and its chief had fled. . . . Extraordinary as his success had been, the position of the Emperor had, in a few days, become grave. . . . Napoleon had not one hundred thousand men in hand—apart from the bodies that covered his flanks—to make head against his converging enemies. Always daring, however, he resolved to attack the Allies before they could receive aid from Prussia; and he marched from Vienna towards the close of November, having taken careful precautions to guard his rear. . . . By this time the Allies were around Olmütz, the Archdukes were not many marches away, and a Prussian army was nearly ready to move. Had the Russians and Austrians fallen back from Olmütz and effected their junction

with the Archdukes, they could, therefore, have opposed the French with a force more than two-fold in numbers. . . . But the folly and presumption which reigned among the young nobles surrounding the Czar—Alexander was now at the head of his army—brought on the Coalition deserved punishment, and pedantry had its part in an immense disaster. The force of Napoleon appeared small, his natural line of retreat was exposed, and a theorist in the Austrian camp persuaded the Czar and the Austrian Emperor, who was at the head of his troops at Olmütz, to consent to a magnificent plan of assailing Napoleon by the well-known method of Frederick the Great, in the Seven Years' War, of turning his right wing, by an attack made, in the oblique order, in great force, and of cutting him off from his base at Vienna, and driving him, routed, into Bohemia. This grand project on paper, which involved a march across the front of the hostile army within reach of the greatest of masters of war, was hailed with exultation. . . . The Allies were soon in full march from Olmütz, and preparations were made for the decisive movement in the night of the 1st December, 1805. Napoleon had watched the reckless false step being made by his foes with unfeigned delight; 'that army is mine,' he proudly exclaimed. . . . The sun of Austerlitz rose on the 2nd, the light of victory often invoked by Napoleon. . . . The dawn of the winter's day revealed three large columns, succeeded by a fourth at no great distance, toiling through a tract of marshes and frozen lakes, to outflank Napoleon's right on the Goldbach, the allied centre, on the tableland of Prätzen, immediately before the French front, having been dangerously weakened by this great turning movement. The assailants were opposed by a small force only, under Davoust, one of the best of the marshals. . . . Ere long Napoleon, who, like a beast of prey, had reserved his strength until it was time to spring, launched Soult in force against the Russian and Austrian centre, enfeebled by the detachment against the French right and exposed to the whole weight of Napoleon's attacks; and Prätzen was stormed after a fierce struggle, in which Bernadotte gave the required aid to Soult. The allied centre was thus rent asunder. Lannes meanwhile had defeated the allied right. . . . Napoleon now turned with terrible energy and in overwhelming strength against the four columns, that had assailed his right, but had begun to retreat. His victorious centre was aided by his right, now set free; the Russians and Austrians were struck with panic, a horrible scene of destruction followed, the flying troops were slain or captured in thousands, and multitudes perished, engulfed in the lakes, the French artillery shattering their icy surface. The rout was decisive, complete, and appalling; about 80,000 of the Allies were engaged; they lost all their guns and nearly half their numbers, and the remains of their army were a worthless wreck. Napoleon had only 60,000 men in the fight. . . . The memorable campaign of 1805 is, perhaps, the grandest of Napoleon's exploits in war."—W. O'C. Morris, *Napoleon*, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and Empire*, bk. 22 (v. 2).—R. Southey, *Life of Nelson*, ch. 8-9 (v. 2).—W. C. Russell, *Nelson and the Naval Supremacy of Eng.*, ch. 17-20.—Lord Nelson, *Dispatches and Letters*, v. 6-7.—Capt. E. J. de la Gravière, *Sketches of the last Naval War*,

pt. 6 (v. 2).—C. Adams, *Great Campaigns in Europe, from 1796 to 1870*, ch. 3.—Baron de Marbot, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 20–23.—A. T. Mahan, *Influences of Sea Power upon the French Rev.*, ch. 15–16 (v. 2).

A. D. 1805–1806 (December–August).—The Peace of Presburg.—Humiliation of Austria.—Formation of the Confederation of the Rhine.—Extinction of the Holy Roman Empire.—The goading of Prussia to war. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805–1806; and 1806 (JANUARY–AUGUST).

A. D. 1805–1806 (December–September).—Dethronement of the dynasty of Naples.—Bestowal of the crown upon Joseph Bonaparte.—The treaty of Presburg was “immediately followed by a measure hitherto unprecedented in European history—the pronouncing a sentence of dethronement against an independent sovereign, for no other cause than his having contemplated hostilities against the French Emperor. On the 26th December [1805] a menacing proclamation proceeded from Presburg . . . which evidently bore marks of Napoleon’s composition, against the house of Naples. The conqueror announced that Marshal St. Cyr would advance by rapid strides to Naples, ‘to punish the treason of a criminal queen, and precipitate her from the throne. We have pardoned that infatuated king, who thrice has done everything to ruin himself. Shall we pardon him a fourth time? . . . No! The dynasty of Naples has ceased to reign—its existence is incompatible with the repose of Europe and the honour of my crown.’ . . . The ominous announcement, made from the depths of Moravia, that the dynasty of Naples had ceased to reign, was not long allowed to remain a dead letter. Massena was busily employed, in January, in collecting his forces in the centre of Italy, and before the end of that month 50,000 men, under the command of Joseph Buonaparte, had crossed the Pontifical States and entered the Neapolitan territory in three columns, which marched on Gaeta, Capua, and Itri. Resistance was impossible; the feeble Russian and English forces which had disembarked to support the Italian levies, finding the whole weight of the war likely to be directed against them, withdrew to Sicily; the court, thunderstruck by the menacing proclamation of 27th December, speedily followed their example. . . . In vain the intrepid Queen Caroline, who still remained at Naples, armed the lazzaroni, and sought to infuse into the troops a portion of her own indomitable courage; she was seconded by none; Capua opened its gates; Gaeta was invested; the Campagna filled with the invaders; she, vanquished but not subdued, compelled to yield to necessity, followed her timid consort to Sicily; and, on the 15th February, Naples beheld its future sovereign, Joseph Buonaparte, enter its walls. . . . During the first tumult of invasion, the peasantry of Calabria . . . submitted to the enemy. . . . But the protraction of the siege of Gaeta, which occupied Massena with the principal army of the French, gave them time to recover from their consternation. . . . A general insurrection took place in the beginning of March, and the peasants stood firm in more than one position; but they were unable to withstand the shock of the veterans of France, and in a decisive action in the plain of Campo-Tenese their tumultuary levies, though 15,000 strong, were entirely dispersed. The victorious Reynier penetrated even

to Reggio, and the standards of Napoleon waved on its towers, in sight of the English videttes on the shores of Sicily. When hostilities had subsided, Joseph repaired in person to the theatre of war. . . . He received at Savigliano, the principal town of the province, the decree by which Napoleon created him king of the Two Sicilies. By so doing, however, he was declared not to lose his contingent right of succession to the throne of France; but the two crowns were never to be united.”—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789–1815, ch. 40, sect. 150, and 42, sect. 21–23 (v. 9).—“Joseph’s tenure of his new dominions was yet incomplete. The fortress of Gaeta still held out, . . . and the British in Sicily (who had already taken the Isle of Capri, close to the capital) sent 5,000 men to their aid under Sir John Stuart, who encountered at Maida (July 6) a French corps of 7,500, under Reynier. The battle presented one of the rare instances in which French and British troops have actually crossed bayonets; but French enthusiasm sank before British intrepidity, and the enemy were driven from the field with the loss of half their number. The victory of Maida had a prodigious moral effect in raising the spirits and self-confidence of the British soldiery; but its immediate results were less considerable. The French were indeed driven from Calabria, but the fall of Gaeta (July 18th), after the loss of its brave governor, the Prince of Hesse-Philipsthal, released the main army under Massena: the British, exposed to be attacked by overwhelming numbers, re-embarked (Sept. 5) for Palermo, and the Calabrian insurrection was suppressed with great bloodshed. But an amnesty was at length . . . published by Joseph, who devoted himself with great zeal and admirable judgment to heal the wounds of his distracted kingdom.”—*Epitome of Alison’s Hist. of Europe*, sect. 398.

ALSO IN: P. Colletta, *Hist. of the Kingdom of Naples*, bk. 5, ch. 4, and bk. 6, ch. 1–3.—C. Botta, *Italy during the Consulate and Empire of Napoleon*, ch. 4.

A. D. 1806 (January–October).—Napoleon’s triumphant return to Paris.—Death of Pitt.—Peace negotiations with England.—King-making and prince-making by the Corsican Cæsar.—On the 27th of December, the day after the signing of the Treaty of Presburg, Napoleon left Vienna for Paris. “En route for Paris he remained a week at Munich to be present at the marriage of Eugene Beauharnais to the Princess Augusta, daughter of the King of Bavaria. Josephine joined him, and the whole time was passed in fêtes and rejoicings. On this occasion he proclaimed Eugene his adopted son, and, in default of issue of his own, his successor in the kingdom of Italy. Accompanied by Josephine, Napoleon re-entered Paris on the 26th of January, 1806, amidst the most enthusiastic acclamations. The national vanity was raised to the highest pitch by the glory and extent of territory he had acquired. The Senate at a solemn audience besought him to accept the title of ‘the Great’; and public rejoicings lasting many days attested his popularity. An important political event in England opened new views of security and peace to the empire. William Pitt, the implacable enemy of the Revolution, had died on the 23rd of January, at the early age of 47; and the Government was entrusted to the hands of his great opponent, Charles James Fox. The disastrous results of the war of

which Pitt had been the mainstay probably hastened his death. After the capitulation of Ulm he never rallied. The well-known friendship of Fox for Napoleon, added to his avowed principles, afforded the strongest hopes that England and France were at length destined to cement the peace of the world by entering into friendly relations. Aided by Talleyrand, who earnestly counselled peace, Napoleon made overtures to the English Government through Lord Yarmouth, who was among the détenus. He offered to yield the long-contested point of Malta—consenting to the continued possession of that island, the Cape of Good Hope, and other conquests in the East and West Indies by Great Britain, and proposing generally that the treaty should be conducted on the *uti possidetis* principle: that is, allowing each party to retain whatever it had acquired in the course of the war. Turkey acknowledged Napoleon as Emperor and entered into amicable relations with the French nation; and what was still more important, Russia signed a treaty of peace in July, influenced by the pacific inclinations of the English Minister. Napoleon resolved to surround his throne with an order of nobles, and to place members of his family on the thrones of the conquered countries adjoining France in order that they might become parts of his system and co-operate in his plans. Two decrees of the 31st of March declared Joseph Bonaparte King of Naples, and Murat Grand Duke of Berg and Cleves. Louis Bonaparte was made King of Holland a few months afterwards, and Jerome King of Westphalia in the following year. The Princess Pauline received the principality of Guastalla, and Talleyrand, Bernadotte, and Berthier those of Benevento, Ponte-Corvo, and Neuchâtel. Fifteen dukedoms were created and bestowed on the most distinguished statesmen and generals of the empire, each with an income amounting to a fifteenth part of the revenue of the province attached to it. These became grand fiefs of the empire. Cambracères and Lebrun were made Dukes of Parma and Placenza; Savary, Duke of Rovigo; Junot, of Abrantes; Lannes, of Montebello, &c. The manners of some of these Republican soldiers were ill adapted to courtly forms, and afforded amusement to the members of the ancient and legitimate order. . . . Napoleon's desire to conciliate and form alliances with the established dynasties and aristocracies of Europe kept pace with his daring encroachments on their hitherto exclusive dignity. Besides the marriage of Eugene Beauharnais to a Princess of Bavaria, an alliance was concluded between the hereditary Prince of Baden and Mademoiselle Stephanie Beauharnais, a niece of the Empress. The old French noblesse were also encouraged to appear at the Tuileries. During the Emperor's visit at Munich the Republican calendar was abolished and the usual mode of computing time restored in France. . . . The negotiations with England went on tardily, and the news of Fox's alarming state of health excited the gravest fears in the French Government. Lord Lauderdale arrived in Paris, on the part of England, in the month of August; but difficulties were continually started, and before anything was decided the death of Fox gave the finishing blow to all hope of peace. Lord Lauderdale demanded his passports and left Paris in October. Napoleon wished to add Sicily to his brother's new kingdom of Naples; but British ships were able to protect the King and

Queen of Naples in that insular position, and the English Government refused to desert their allies on this occasion or to consent to any compensation or adjustment offered. On this point principally turned the failure of the attempt at peace as far as can be discovered from the account of the negotiations."—R. H. Horne, *Hist. of Napoleon*, ch. 26.

ALSO IN: M'me de Rémusat, *Memoirs*, ch. 16-21 (v. 2).—Duke of Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 1, pt. 2, ch. 18-21.—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 15.

A. D. 1806 (October).—The subjugation of Prussia at Jena. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1806-1807.—Napoleon's campaign against the Russians.—Eylau and Friedland. See GERMANY: A. D. 1806-1807; and 1807 (FEBRUARY-JUNE).

A. D. 1806-1810.—Commercial warfare with England.—British Orders in Council and Napoleon's Berlin and Milan Decrees.—The "Continental System."—"As the war advanced, after the Peace of Amiens, the neutrals became bolder and more aggressive. American ships were constantly arriving at Dutch and French ports with sugar, coffee, and other productions of the French and Spanish West Indies. And East India goods were imported by them into Spain, Holland, and France. . . . By the rivers and canals of Germany and Flanders goods were floated into the warehouses of the enemy, or circulated for the supply of his customers in neutral countries. . . . It was a general complaint, therefore, that the enemy carried on colonial commerce under the neutral flag, cheaply as well as safely; that he was enabled not only to elude British hostilities, but to rival British merchants and planters in the European markets; that by the same means the hostile treasuries were filled with a copious stream of revenue; and that by this licentious use of the neutral flag, the enemy was enabled to employ his whole military marine for purposes of offensive war, without being obliged to maintain a squadron or a ship for the defence of his colonial ports. . . . Such complaints made against neutral states found a powerful exposition in a work entitled 'War in Disguise and the Frauds of the Neutral Flag,' supposed to have been written by Mr. James Stephen, the real author of the orders in Council. The British Government did not see its way at once to proceed in the direction of prohibiting to neutral ships the colonial trade, which they had enjoyed for a considerable time; but the first step was taken to paralyse the resources of the enemy, and to restrict the trade of neutrals, by the issue of an order in Council in May 1806, declaring that all the coasts, ports, and rivers from the Elbe to Brest should be considered blockaded, though the only portion of those coasts rigorously blockaded was that included between the Ostend and the mouth of the Seine, in the ports of which preparations were made for the invasion of England. The northern ports of Germany and Holland were left partly open, and the navigation of the Baltic altogether free. Napoleon, then in the zenith of his power, saw, in this order in Council, a fresh act of wantonness, and he met it by the issue of the Berlin decree of November 21, 1806. In that document, remarkable for its boldness and vigour, Napoleon charged England with having set at nought the dictates of international law, with having made

prisoners of war of private individuals, and with having taken the crews out of merchant ships. He charged this country with having captured private property at sea, extended to commercial ports the restrictions of blockade applicable only to fortified places, declared as blockaded places which were not invested by naval forces, and abused the right of blockade in order to benefit her own trade at the expense of the commerce of Continental states. He asserted the right of combating the enemy with the same arms used against himself, especially when such enemy ignored all ideas of justice and every liberal sentiment which civilisation imposes. He announced his resolution to apply to England the same usages which she had established in her maritime legislation. He laid down the principles which France was resolved to act upon until England should recognise that the rights of war are the same on land as on sea. . . . And upon these premises the decree ordered, 1st, That the British islands should be declared in a state of blockade. 2nd, That all commerce and correspondence with the British islands should be prohibited; and that letters addressed to England or Englishmen, written in the English language, should be detained and taken. 3rd, That every British subject found in a country occupied by French troops, or by those of their allies, should be made a prisoner of war. 4th, That all merchandise and property belonging to British subjects should be deemed a good prize. 5th, That all commerce in English merchandise should be prohibited, and that all merchandise belonging to England or her colonies, and of British manufacture, should be deemed a good prize. And 6th, That no vessel coming direct from England or her colonies be allowed to enter any French port, or any port subject to French authority; and that every vessel which, by means of a false declaration, should evade such regulations, should at once be captured. The British Government lost no time in retaliating against France for so bold a course; and, on January 7, 1807, an order in Council was issued, which, after reference to the orders issued by France, enjoined that no vessel should be allowed to trade from one enemy's port to another, or from one port to another of a French ally's coast shut against English vessels; and ordered the commanders of the ships of war and privateers to warn every neutral vessel coming from any such port, and destined to another such port, to discontinue her voyage, and that any vessel, after being so warned, which should be found proceeding to another such port should be captured and considered as lawful prize. This order in Council having reached Napoleon at Warsaw, he immediately ordered the confiscation of all English merchandise and colonial produce found in the Hanseatic Towns. . . . But Britain, in return, went a step further, and, by order in Council of November 11, 1807, declared all the ports and places of France, and those of her allies, and of all countries where the English flag was excluded, even though they were not at war with Britain, should be placed under the same restrictions for commerce and navigation as if they were blockaded, and consequently that ships destined to those ports should be liable to the visit of British cruisers at a British station, and there subjected to a tax to be imposed by the British Parliament. Napoleon was at Milan when this order in Coun-

cil was issued, and forthwith, on December 17, the famous decree appeared, by which he imposed on neutrals just the contrary of what was prescribed to them by England, and further declared that every vessel, of whatever nation, that submitted to the order in Council of November 11, should by that very act become denationalised, considered as British property, and condemned as a good prize. The decree placed the British islands in a state of blockade, and ordered that every ship, of whatever nation, and with whatever cargo, proceeding from English ports or English colonies to countries occupied by English troops, or going to England, should be a good prize. This England answered by the order in Council of April 26, 1809, which revoked the order of 1807 as regards America, but confirmed the blockade of all the ports of France and Holland, their colonies and dependencies. And then France, still further incensed against England, issued the tariff of Trianon, dated August 5, 1810, completed by the decree of St. Cloud of September 12, and of Fontainebleau of October 19, which went the length of ordering the seizure and burning of all British goods found in France, Germany, Holland, Italy, Spain, and in every place occupied by French troops. . . . The princes of the Rhenish Confederation hastened to execute it, some for the purpose of enriching themselves by the wicked deed, some out of hatred towards the English, and some to show their devotion towards their master. From Carlsruhe to Munich, from Cassel to Dresden and Hamburg, everywhere, bonfires were made of English goods. And so exacting were the French that when Frankfort exhibited the least hesitation in carrying out the decree, French troops were sent to execute the order. By means such as these [known as the Continental System of Napoleon] the commerce of the world was greatly deranged, if not destroyed altogether, and none suffered more from them than England herself."—L. Levi, *Hist. of British Commerce*, pt. 2, ch. 4 (*with appended text of Orders and Decrees*).—"The object of the Orders in Council was . . . twofold: to embarrass France and Napoleon by the prohibition of direct import and export trade, of all external commerce, which for them could only be carried on by neutrals; and at the same time to force into the Continent all the British products or manufactures that it could take. . . . The whole system was then, and has since been, roundly abused as being in no sense a military measure, but merely a gigantic exhibition of commercial greed; but this simply begs the question. To win her fight Great Britain was obliged not only to weaken Napoleon, but to increase her own strength. The battle between the sea and the land was to be fought out on Commerce. England had no army wherewith to meet Napoleon; Napoleon had no navy to cope with that of his enemy. As in the case of an impregnable fortress, the only alternative for either of these contestants was to reduce the other by starvation. On the common frontier, the coast line, they met in a deadly strife in which no weapon was drawn. The imperial soldiers were turned into coast-guards-men to shut out Great Britain from her markets; the British ships became revenue cutters to prohibit the trade of France. The neutral carrier, pocketing his pride, offered his service to either for pay, and the other then regarded him as taking part

in hostilities. The ministry, in the exigencies of debate, betrayed some lack of definite conviction as to their precise aim. Sometimes the Orders were justified as a military measure of retaliation; sometimes the need of supporting British commerce as essential to her life and to her naval strength was alleged; and their opponents in either case taunted them with inconsistency. Napoleon, with despotic simplicity, announced clearly his purpose of ruining England through her trade, and the ministry really needed no other arguments than his avowals. 'Salus civitatis suprema lex.' To call the measures of either not military, is as inaccurate as it would be to call the ancient practice of circumvallation unmilitary, because the only weapon used for it was the spade. . . . The Orders in Council received various modifications, due largely to the importance to Great Britain of the American market, which absorbed a great part of her manufactures; but these modifications, though sensibly lightening the burden upon neutrals and introducing some changes of form, in no sense departed from the spirit of the originals. The entire series was finally withdrawn in June, 1812, but too late to avert the war with the United States, which was declared in the same month. Napoleon never revoked his Berlin and Milan decrees, although by a trick he induced an over-eager President of the United States to believe that he had done so. . . . The true function of Great Britain in this long struggle can scarcely be recognized unless there be a clear appreciation of the fact that a really great national movement, like the French Revolution, or a really great military power under an incomparable general, like the French Empire under Napoleon, is not to be brought to terms by ordinary military successes, which simply destroy the organized force opposed. . . . If the course of aggression which Bonaparte had inherited from the Revolution was to continue, there were needed, not the resources of the Continent only, but of the world. There was needed also a diminution of ultimate resistance below the stored-up aggressive strength of France; otherwise, however procrastinated, the time must come when the latter should fail. On both these points Great Britain withstood Napoleon. She shut him off from the world, and by the same act prolonged her own powers of endurance beyond his power of aggression. This in the retrospect of history was the function of Great Britain in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period; and that the successive ministries of Pitt and his followers pursued the course best fitted, upon the whole, to discharge that function, is their justification to posterity."—Capt. A. T. Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power upon the French Rev. and Empire*, ch. 18-19 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: H. Adams, *Hist. of the U. S.*, v. 3, ch. 4 and 16, and v. 4, ch. 4.—Lord Brougham, *Life and Times, by himself*, ch. 10 (v. 2). See also: UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804-1809.

A. D. 1807 (February—September).—The Turkish alliance.—Ineffective attempts of England against Constantinople and in Egypt.—See TURKS: A. D. 1806-1807.

A. D. 1807 (June—July).—The Treaties of Tilsit with Russia and Prussia.—The latter shorn of half her territory.—Formation of the kingdom of Westphalia.—Secret understand-

ings between Napoleon and the Czar. See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (JUNE—JULY).

A. D. 1807 (July—December).—The seeming power and real weakness of Napoleon's empire.—"The dangers . . . that lay hid under the new arrangement of the map of Europe [by the Treaty of Tilsit], and in the results of French conquests, were as yet withdrawn from almost every eye; and the power of Napoleon was now at its height, though his empire was afterwards somewhat enlarged. . . . If England still stood in arms against it, she was without an avowed ally on the Continent; and, drawing to itself the great Power of the North, it appeared to threaten the civilized world with that universal and settled domination which had not been seen since the fall of Rome. The Sovereign of France from the Scheldt to the Pyrenees, and of Italy from the Alps to the Tiber, Napoleon held under his immediate sway the fairest and most favored part of the Continent; and yet this was only the seat and centre of that far-spreading and immense authority. One of his brothers, Louis, governed the Batavian Republic, converted into the kingdom of Holland; another, Joseph, were the old Crown of Naples; and a third, Jerome, sat on the new throne of Westphalia; and he had reduced Spain to a simple dependency, while, with Austria humbled and Prussia crushed, he was supreme in Germany from the Rhine to the Vistula, through his confederate, subject, or allied States. This enormous Empire, with its vassal appendages, rested on great and victorious armies in possession of every point of vantage from the Niemen to the Adige and the Garonne, and proved as yet to be irresistible; and as Germany, Holland, Poland, and Italy swelled the forces of France with large contingents, the whole fabric of conquest seemed firmly cemented. Nor was the Empire the mere creation of brute force and the spoil of the sword; its author endeavoured, in some measure, to consolidate it through better and more lasting influences. Napoleon, indeed, suppressed the ideas of 1789 everywhere, but he introduced his Code and large social reforms into most of the vassal or allied States; he completed the work of destroying Feudalism which the Revolution had daringly begun; and he left a permanent mark on the face of Europe, far beyond the limit of Republican France, in innumerable monuments of material splendour. . . . Nor did the Empire at this time appear more firmly established abroad than within the limits of the dominant State which had become mistress of Continental Europe. The prosperity of the greater part of France was immense; the finances, fed by the contributions of war, seemed overflowing and on the increase; and if sounds of discontent were occasionally heard, they were lost in the universal acclaim which greeted the author of the national greatness, and the restorer of social order and welfare. . . . In the splendour and success of the Imperial era, the animosities and divisions of the past disappeared, and France seemed to form a united people. If, too, the cost of conquest was great, and exacted a tribute of French blood, the military power of the Empire shone with the brightest radiance of martial renown; Marengo, Austerlitz, Jena, and Friedland could in part console even thinned households. . . . The magnificent public works with which Napoleon adorned this part of his reign increased this sentiment of

national grandeur; it was now that the Madeleine raised its front, and the Column, moulded from captured cannon; . . . and Paris, decked out with triumphal arches, with temples of glory, and with stately streets, put on the aspect of ancient Rome, gathering into her lap the gorgeous spoils of subjugated and dependent races. . . . Yet, notwithstanding its apparent strength, this structure of conquest and domination was essentially weak, and liable to decay. The work of the sword, and of new-made power, it was in opposition to the nature of things. . . . The material and even social benefits conferred by the Code, and reform of abuses, could not compensate vanquished but martial races for the misery and disgrace of subjection; and, apart from the commercial oppression [of the Continental System, which destroyed commerce in order to do injury to England], . . . the exasperating pressure of French officials, the exactions of the victorious French armies, and the severities of the conscription introduced among them, provoked discontent in the vassal States on which the yoke of the Empire weighed. . . . The prostration, too, of Austria and Prussia . . . had a direct tendency to make these powers forget their old discords in common suffering, and to bring to an end the internal divisions through which France had become supreme in Germany. . . . The triumphant policy of Tilsit contained the germs of a Coalition against France more formidable than she had yet experienced. At the same time, the real strength of the instrument by which Napoleon maintained his power was being gradually but surely impaired; the imperial armies were more and more filled with raw conscripts and ill-affected allies, as their size increased with the extension of his rule; and the French element in them, on which alone reliance could be placed in possible defeat, was being dissipated, exhausted, and wasted. . . . Nor was the Empire, within France itself, free from elements of instability and decline. The finances, well administered as they were, were so burdened by the charges of war that they were only sustained by conquest; and, flourishing as their condition seemed, they had been often cruelly strained of late, and were unable to bear the shock of disaster. The seaports were beginning to suffer from the policy adopted to subdue England. . . . Meanwhile, the continual demands on the youth of the nation for never-ceasing wars were gradually telling on its military power; Napoleon, after Eylau, had had recourse to the ruinous expedient of taking beforehand the levies which the conscription raised; and though complaints were as yet rare, the anticipation of the resources of France, which filled the armies with feeble boys, unequal to the hardships of a rude campaign, had been noticed at home as well as abroad. Nor were the moral ills of this splendid despotism less certain than its bad material results. . . . The inevitable tendency of the Empire, even at the time of its highest glory, was to lessen manliness and self-reliance, to fetter and demoralize the human mind, and to weaken whatever public virtue and mental independence France possessed; and its authority had already begun to disclose some of the harsher features of Cæsarian despotism."—W. O'C. Morris, *The French Rev. and First Empire*, ch. 12.—"Notwithstanding so many brilliant and specious appearances, France did not possess either true prosperity or true greatness. She

was not really prosperous; for not only was there no feeling of security, a necessary condition for the welfare of nations, but all the evils produced by so many years of war still weighed heavily on her. . . . She was not really great, for all her great men had either been banished or put to silence. She could still point with pride to her generals and soldiers, although the army, which, if brave as ever, had gradually sunk from the worship of the country and liberty to that of glory, and from the worship of glory to that of riches, was corrupt and degenerate; but where were her great citizens? Where were her great orators, her great politicians, her great philosophers, her great writers of every kind? Where, at least, were their descendants? All who had shown a spark of genius or pride had been sacrificed for the benefit of a single man. They had disappeared; some crushed under the wheels of his chariot, others forced to live obscurely in some unknown retreat, and, what was graver still, their race seemed extinct. . . . France was imprisoned, as it were, in an iron net, and the issues were closed to all the generous and ardent youth that had either intellectual or moral activity."—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 3, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: H. A. Taine, *The Modern Regime*, bk. 1, ch. 2, and bk. 3, ch. 3 (v. 1).

A. D. 1807 (September—November).—Forcible seizure of the Danish fleet by the English.—Frustration of Napoleon's plans.—Alliance with Denmark.—War with Sweden. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1807-1810.

A. D. 1807 (October—November).—French invasion and occupation of Portugal.—Flight of the royal family to Brazil.—Delusive treaty of partition with Spain. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1807.

A. D. 1807-1808.—Napoleon's alienation of Talleyrand and others.—Charles Maurice Talleyrand de Perigord, made Bishop of Autun by King Louis XVI., in 1789, and Prince of Benevento by Napoleon, in 1806, had made his first appearance in public life as one of the clerical deputies in the States-General of 1789, and had taken the popular side. He was the only bishop having a benefice in France who took the new oath required of the clergy, and he proposed the appropriation of church property to the wants of the public treasury. He subsequently consecrated the first French bishops appointed under the new constitution, and was excommunicated therefor by the Pope. On the approach of the Terror he escaped from France and took refuge first in England, afterwards in the United States. In 1795 he was permitted to return to Paris, and he took an important part in the revolution of the 18th Brumaire which overthrew the Directory and made Napoleon First Consul. In the new government he received the post of Minister of Foreign Affairs, which he retained under the Empire, until 1807, when he obtained permission to retire, with the title of "vice-grand electeur." "M. de Talleyrand, the Empire once established and fortunate, had attached himself to it with a sort of enthusiasm. The poesy of victory, and the eloquence of an exalted imagination, subdued for a time the usual nonchalance and moderation of his character. He entered into all Napoleon's plans for reconstituting an empire of the Franks, and reviving the system of fiefs and feudal dignitaries. . . . 'Any other

system,' he said, 'but a military one, is in our circumstances at present impossible. I am, then, for making that system splendid, and compensating France for her liberty by her grandeur.' The principality he enjoyed, though it by no means satisfied him, was a link between him and the policy under which he held it. . . . But he had a strong instinct for the practical; all governments, according to his theory, might be made good, except an impossible one. A government depending on constant success in difficult undertakings, at home and abroad, was, according to his notions, impossible. This idea, after the Peace of Tilsit, more or less haunted him. It made him, in spite of himself, bitter against his chief—bitter at first, more because he liked him than because he disliked him. He would still have aided to save the Empire, but he was irritated because he thought he saw the Empire drifting into a system which would not admit of its being saved. A sentiment of this kind, however, is as little likely to be pardoned by one who is accustomed to consider that his will must be law, as a sentiment of a more hostile nature. Napoleon began little by little to hate the man for whom he had felt at one time a predilection, and if he disliked any one, he did that which it is most dangerous to do, and most useless; that is, he wounded his pride without diminishing his importance. It is true that M. de Talleyrand never gave any visible sign of being irritated. But few, whatever the philosophy with which they forgive an injury, pardon an humiliation; and thus, stronger and stronger grew by degrees that mutual dissatisfaction which the one vented at times in furious reproaches, and the other disguised under a studiously respectful indifference. This carelessness as to the feelings of those whom it would have been wiser not to offend, was one of the most fatal errors of the conqueror. . . . He had become at this time equally indifferent to the hatred and affection of his adherents; and . . . fancied that everything depended on his own merits, and nothing on the merits of his agents. The victory of Wagram, and the marriage with Marie-Louise, commenced, indeed, a new era in his history. Fouché was dismissed, though not without meriting a reprimand for his intrigues; and Talleyrand fell into unequivocal disgrace, in some degree provoked by his witticisms; whilst round these two men gathered a quiet and observant opposition, descending with the clever adventurer to the lowest classes, and ascending with the dissatisfied noble to the highest. . . . M. de Talleyrand's house then (the only place, perhaps, open to all persons, where the government of the day was treated without reserve) became a sort of 'rendezvous' for a circle which replied to a victory by a bon mot, and confronted the borrowed ceremonies of a new court by the natural graces and acknowledged fashions of an old one."—Sir H. L. Bulwer, *Historical Characters*, v. 1: *Talleyrand*, pt. 4, sect. 9-10.

ALSO IN: C. K. McHarg, *Life of Prince Talleyrand*, ch. 1-13.—*Memoirs of Talleyrand*, v. 1.

A. D. 1807-1808.—Napoleon's over-ingenious plottings in Spain for the theft of the crown.—The popular rising. See SPAIN: A. D. 1807-1808.

A. D. 1807-1808 (November—February).—Napoleon in Italy.—His arbitrary changes in the Italian constitution.—His annexation of

Tuscany to France.—His quarrel with the Pope and seizure of the Papal States.—"Napoleon . . . set out for Italy, where great political changes were in progress. Destined, like all the subordinate thrones which surrounded the great nation, to share in the rapid mutations which its government underwent, the kingdom of Italy was soon called upon to accept a change in its constitution. Napoleon, in consequence, suppressed the legislative body, and substituted in its room a Senate, which was exclusively intrusted with the power of submitting observations to government on the public wants, and of superintending the budget and public expenditure. As the members of this Senate were nominated and paid by government, this last shadow of representative institutions became a perfect mockery. Nevertheless Napoleon was received with unbounded adulation by all the towns of Italy; their deputies, who waited upon him at Milan, vied with each other in elegant flattery. He was the Redeemer of France, but the Creator of Italy: they had supplicated heaven for his safety, for his victories; they offered him the tribute of their eternal love and fidelity. Napoleon received their adulation in the most gracious manner; but he was careful not to lose sight of the main object of his policy, the consolidation of his dominions, the rendering them all dependent on his imperial crown, and the fostering of a military spirit among his subjects. . . . From Milan the Emperor travelled by Verona and Padua to Venice; he there admired the marble palaces, varied scenery, and gorgeous architecture of the Queen of the Adriatic, which appeared to extraordinary advantage amidst illuminations, fireworks, and rejoicings; and returning to Milan, arranged, with an authoritative hand, all the affairs of the peninsula. The discontent of Melzi, who still retained a lingering partiality for the democratic institutions which he had vainly hoped to see established in his country, was stifled by the title of Duke of Lodi. Tuscany was taken from the King of Etruria, on whom Napoleon had settled it, and united to France by the title of the department of Taro; while magnificent public works were set on foot at Milan to dazzle the ardent imagination of the Italians, and console them for the entire loss of their national independence and civil liberty. The cathedral was daily adorned with fresh works of sculpture; its exterior decorated and restored to its original purity, while thousands of pinnacles and statues rose on all sides, glittering in spotless brilliancy in the blue vault of heaven. The Forum of Buonaparte was rapidly advancing; the beautiful basso-reliefs of the arch of the Simplon already entranced the admiring gaze of thousands; the roads of the Simplon and Mount Cenis were kept in the finest order, and daily attracted fresh crowds of strangers to the Italian plains. But in the midst of all this external splendour, the remains of which still throw a halo round the recollection of the French domination in Italy, the finances of all the states were involved in hopeless embarrassment, and suffering of the most grinding kind pervaded all classes of the people. . . . The encroachments thus made on the Italian peninsula were not the only ones which Napoleon effected, in consequence of the liberty to dispose of western Europe acquired by him at the treaty of Tilsit. The territory of the great nation was rounded also on the side of Germany and Holland.

On the 11th of November, the important town and territory of Flushing were ceded to France by the King of Holland, who obtained, in return, merely an elusory equivalent in East Friesland. On the 21st of January following, a decree of the senate united to the French empire, besides these places, the important towns of Kehl Cassel, and Wesel, on the right bank of the Rhine. Shortly after, the French troops, who had already taken possession of the whole of Tuscany, in virtue of the resignation forced upon the Queen of Etruria, invaded the Roman territories, and made themselves masters of the ancient capital of the world. They immediately occupied the castle of St. Angelo, and the gates of the city, and entirely dispossessed the papal troops [see PAPACY: A. D. 1808-1814]. . . . France now, without disguise, assumed the right of annexing neutral and independent states to its already extensive dominions, by no other authority than the decree of its own legislature."—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789-1815, ch. 51, sect. 51-53 (v. 11).

ALSO IN: C. Botta, *Italy during the Consulate and Empire of Napoleon*, ch. 5.

A. D. 1807-1809.—The American embargo and non-intercourse laws. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1804-1809, and 1808.

A. D. 1808 (May—September).—Bestowal of the Spanish crown on Joseph Bonaparte.—The national revolt.—French reverses.—Flight of Joseph Bonaparte from Madrid.—Landing of British forces in the Peninsula. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808 (MAY—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1808 (September—October).—Imperial conference and Treaty of Erfurt.—The assemblage of kings.—"Napoleon's relations with the Court of Russia, at one time very formal, became far more amicable, according as Spanish affairs grew complicated. After the capitulation of Baylen they became positively affectionate. The Czar was too clear-sighted not to understand the meaning of this gradation. He quickly understood that the more difficulties Napoleon might create for himself in Spain, the more would he be forced to make concessions to Russia. . . . The Russian alliance, which at Tilsit had only been an arrangement to flatter Napoleon's ambition, had now become a necessity to him. Each side felt this; hence the two sovereigns were equally impatient to meet again; the one to strengthen an alliance so indispensable to the success of his plans, the other to derive from it all the promised advantages. It was settled, therefore, that the desired interview should take place at Erfurt towards the end of September, 1808. . . . The two Emperors met on the 27th of September, on the road between Weimar and Erfurt. They embraced each other with that air of perfect cordiality of which kings alone possess the secret, especially when their intention is rather to stifle than to embrace. They made their entry into the town on horseback together, amidst an immense concourse of people. Napoleon had wished by its magnificence to render the reception worthy of the illustrious guests who had agreed to meet at Erfurt. He had sent thither from the storehouses of the crown, bronzes, porcelain, the richest hangings, and the most sumptuous furniture. He desired that the Comédie-Française should heighten the brilliant effects of these fêtes by performing the chief masterpieces of our stage, from 'Cinna' down to 'La Mort de César,' before this royal audience. . . . All the

natural adherents of Napoleon hastened to answer his appeal by flocking to Erfurt, for he did not lose sight of his principal object, and his desire was to appear before Europe surrounded by a court composed of kings. In this cortege were to be seen those of Bavaria, of Wurtemberg, of Saxony, of Westphalia, and Prince William of Prussia; and beside these stars of first magnitude twinkled the obscure Pleiades of the Rhenish Confederation. The reunion, almost exclusively German, was meant to prove to German idealists the vanity of their dreams. Were not all present who had any weight in Germany from their power, rank, or riches? Was it not even hinted that the Emperor of Austria had implored the favour, without being able to obtain it, of admission to the conferences of Erfurt? This report was most improbable. . . . The kings of intellect came in their turn to bow down before Cæsar. Goethe and Wieland were presented to Napoleon; they appeared at his court, and by their glory adorned his triumph. German patriotism was severely tried at Erfurt; but it may be said that of all its humiliations the one which the Germans most deeply resented was that of beholding their greatest literary genius decking himself out with Napoleon's favours [the decoration of the Legion of Honour, which Goethe accepted]. . . . The theatrical effect which Napoleon had in view in this solemn show at Erfurt having once been produced, his principal object was attained, for the political questions which remained for settlement with Alexander could not raise any serious difficulty. In view of the immediate and certain session of two such important provinces as those of Wallachia and Moldavia, the Czar, without much trouble, renounced that division of the Ottoman Empire with which he had been tantalised for more than a year. . . . He bound himself . . . by the Treaty of Erfurt to continue his co-operation with Napoleon in the war against England (Article 2), and, should it so befall, also against Austria (Article 10); but the affairs in Spain threw every attack upon England into the background. . . . The only very distinct engagement which the treaty imposed on Alexander was the recognition of 'the new order of things established by France in Spain.'"—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 3, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: Prince Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, v. 1.

A. D. 1808-1809.—Reverses in Portugal.—Napoleon in the field.—French victories resumed.—The check at Corunna. See SPAIN: A. D. 1808-1809 (AUGUST—JANUARY).

A. D. 1809 (January—September).—Reopened war with Austria.—Napoleon's advance to Vienna.—His defeat at Aspern and victory at Wagram.—The Peace of Schönbrunn.—Fresh acquisitions of territory. See GERMANY: A. D. 1809 (JANUARY—JUNE), and (JULY—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1809 (February—July).—Wellington's check to the French in Spain and Portugal.—His passage of the Douro.—Battle of Talavera. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JULY).

A. D. 1809 (May).—Annexation of the States of the Church.—Removal of the Pope to Savona. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808-1814.

A. D. 1809 (December).—Withdrawal of the English from Spain into Portugal. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1810 (February — December). — Annexations of territory to the empire.—Holland, the Hanse Towns, and the Valais in Switzerland.—Other reconstructions of the map of Germany.—“It was not till December 10th 1810 [after the abdication of King Louis — see NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1806-1810] that Holland was united to France by a formal *senatus-consulte*. By the first article of the same law, the Hanse Towns [Hamburg, Bremen, and Lubeck], the Duchy of Lauenburg, and the countries situated between the North Sea and a line drawn from the confluence of the Lippe with the Rhine to Halteren, from Halteren to the Ems above Telgte, from the Ems to the confluence of the Werra with the Weser, and from Stolzenau on that river to the Elbe, above the confluence of the Stecknitz, were at the same time incorporated with the French Empire. . . . The line described would include the northern part of Westphalia and Hanover, and the duchy of Oldenburg. . . . The Duke of Oldenburg having appealed to the Emperor of Russia, the head of his house, against this spoliation, Napoleon offered to compensate him with the town and territory of Erfurt and the lordship of Blankenheim, which had remained under French administration since the Peace of Tilsit. But this offer was at once rejected, and Alexander reserved, by a formal protest, the rights of his relative. This annexation was only the complement of other incorporations with the French Empire during the year 1810. Early in the year, the Electorate of Hanover had been annexed to the Kingdom of Westphalia. On February 16th Napoleon had erected the Grand Duchy of Frankfurt, and presented it to the Prince Primate of the Confederation of the Rhine, with a reversal in favour of Eugène Beaubarnais. On November 12th the Valais in Switzerland was also annexed to France, with the view of securing the road over the Simplon. Of all these annexations, that of the Hanse Towns and the districts on the North Sea was the most important, and one of the principal causes of the war that ensued between France and Russia. These annexations were made without the slightest negotiation with any European cabinet, and it would be superfluous to add, without even a pretext of right, though the necessity of them from the war with England was alleged as the motive.”—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 15, with foot-note (v. 4).—“The English,” said Napoleon, ‘have torn asunder the public rights of Europe; a new order of things governs the universe. Fresh guarantees having become necessary to me, the annexation of the mouths of the Scheldt, of the Meuse, of the Rhine, of the Ems, of the Weser, and of the Elbe to the Empire appears to me to be the first and the most important. . . . The annexation of the Valais is the anticipated result of the immense works that I have been making for the past ten years in that part of the Alps.’ And this was all. To justify such violence he did not condescend to allege any pretext—to urge forward opportunities that were too long in developing, or to make trickery subserv the use of force—he consulted nothing but his policy; in other words, his good pleasure. To take possession of a country, it was sufficient that the country suited him: he said so openly, as the simplest thing in the world, and thought proper to add that these new usurpations were but a beginning, the first, accord-

ing to his own expression, of those which seemed to him still necessary. And it was Europe, discontented, humbled, driven wild by the barbarous follies of the continental system, that he thus defied, as though he wished at any cost to convince every one that no amicable arrangement or conciliation was possible; and that there was but one course for governments or men of spirit to adopt, that of fighting unto death.”—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 4, ch. 2.

A. D. 1810-1812.—Continued hostile attitude towards the United States of America. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1810-1812.

A. D. 1810-1812.—The War in the Peninsula.—Wellington's Lines of Torres Vedras.—French retreat from Portugal.—English advance into Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809-1810 (OCTOBER—SEPTEMBER), and 1810-1812.

A. D. 1810-1812.—Napoleon's divorce from Josephine and marriage to Marie-Louise of Austria.—His rupture with the Czar and preparations for war with Russia.—“Napoleon now revived the idea which he had often entertained before, of allying himself with one of the great ruling families. A compliant senate and a packed ecclesiastical council pronounced his separation from Josephine Beaubarnais, who retired with a magnificent pension to Malmaison, where she died. As previous marriage proposals to the Russian court had not been cordially received, Napoleon now turned to Austria. The matter was speedily arranged with Metternich, and in March, 1810, the archduchess Maria Louisa arrived in France as the emperor's wife. The great importance of the marriage was that it broke the last links which bound Russia to France, and thus overthrew the alliance of Tilsit. Alexander had been exasperated by the addition of Western Galicia to the grand-duchy of Warsaw, which he regarded as a step towards the restoration of Poland, and therefore as a breach of the engagement made at Tilsit. The annexation of Oldenburg, whose duke was a relative of the Czar, was a distinct personal insult. Alexander showed his irritation by formally deserting the continental system, which was more ruinous to Russia than to almost any other country, and by throwing his ports open to British commerce (Dec. 1810). . . . The chief grievance to Russia was the apparent intention of Napoleon to do something for the Poles. The increase of the grand-duchy of Warsaw by the treaty of Vienna was so annoying to Alexander that he began to meditate on the possibility of restoring Poland himself, and making it a dependent kingdom for the Czar, in the same way as Napoleon had treated Italy. He even went so far as to sound the Poles on the subject; but he found that they had not forgotten the three partitions of their country, and that their sympathies were rather with France than with Russia. At the same time Napoleon was convinced that until Russia was subdued his empire was unsafe, and all hopes of avenging himself upon England were at an end. All through the year 1811 it was known that war was inevitable, but neither power was in a hurry to take the initiative. Meanwhile the various powers that retained nominal independence had to make up their minds as to the policy they would pursue. For no country was the decision harder than for Prussia. Neutrality was out of the question, as the Prussian territories, lying between the two combatants, must be occupied

by one or the other. The friends and former colleagues of Stein were unanimous for a Russian alliance and a desperate struggle for liberty. But Hardenberg, who had become chancellor in 1810, was too prudent to embark in a contest which at the time was hopeless. The Czar had not been so consistent in his policy as to be a very desirable ally; and, even with Russian assistance, it was certain that the Prussian frontiers could not be defended against the French, who had already garrisons in the chief fortresses. Hardenberg fully sympathised with the patriots, but he sacrificed enthusiasm to prudence, and offered the support of Prussia to France. The treaty was arranged on the 24th of February, 1812. Frederick William gave the French a free passage through his territories, and undertook to furnish 20,000 men for service in the field, and as many more for garrison duty. In return for this Napoleon guaranteed the security of the Prussian kingdom as it stood, and held out the prospect of additions to it. It was an unnatural and hollow alliance, and was understood to be so by the Czar. Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, and other friends of Stein resigned their posts, and many Prussian officers entered the service of the Czar. Austria, actuated by similar motives, adopted the same policy, but with less reluctance. After this example had been set by the two great powers, none of the lesser states of Germany dared to disobey the peremptory orders of Napoleon. But Turkey and Sweden, both of them old allies of France, were at this crisis in the opposition. . . . The Swedes were threatened with starvation by Napoleon's stern command to close their ports not only against English, but against all German vessels. Bernadotte, who had just been adopted as the heir of the childless Charles XIII., determined to throw in his lot with his new country, rather than with his old commander. He had also hopes of compensating Sweden for the loss of Finland by wresting Norway from the Danes, and this would never be agreed to by France. Accordingly Sweden prepared to support the cause of Alexander."—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, ch. 24, sect. 38 and 41.—"Napoleon's Russian expedition should not be regarded as an isolated freak of insane pride. He himself regarded it as the unfortunate effect of a fatality, and he betrayed throughout an unwonted reluctance and perplexity. 'The war must take place,' he said, 'it lies in the nature of things.' That is, it arose naturally, like the other Napoleonic wars, out of the quarrel with England. Upon the Continental system he had staked everything. He had united all Europe in the crusade against England, and no state, least of all such a state as Russia, could withdraw from the system without practically joining England. Nevertheless, we may wonder that, if he felt obliged to make war on Russia, he should have chosen to wage it in the manner he did, by an overwhelming invasion. For an ordinary war his resources were greatly superior to those of Russia. A campaign on the Lithuanian frontier would no doubt have been unfavourable to Alexander, and might have forced him to concede the points at issue. Napoleon had already experienced in Spain the danger of rousing national spirit. It seems, however, that this lesson had been lost on him."—J. R. Seeley, *Short Hist. of Napoleon*, ch. 5, sect. 3.—"Warnings and cautions were not . . . wanting to him. He had been at

several different times informed of the desperate plans of Russia and her savage resolve to destroy all around him, provided he could be involved in the destruction of the Empire. He was cautioned, with even more earnestness, of the German conspiracies. Alquier transmitted to him from Stockholm a significant remark of Alexander's: 'If the Emperor Napoleon should experience a reverse, the whole of Germany will rise to oppose his retreat, or to prevent the arrival of his reinforcements.' His brother Jerome, who was still better situated for knowing what was going on in Germany, informed him, in the month of January, 1811, of the proposal that had been made to him to enter into a secret league against France, but the only thanks he received from Napoleon was reproach for having encouraged such overtures by his equivocal conduct. . . . Marshal Davout and General Rapp transmitted him identically the same information from Hamburg and Dantzic. But far from encouraging such confidential communications, Napoleon was irritated by them. . . . 'I do not know why Rapp meddles in what does not concern him [he wrote]. . . . I beg you will not place such rhapsodies under my eyes. My time is too precious to waste on such twaddle.' . . . In presence of such hallucination, caused by pride and infatuation, we seem to hear Macbeth in his delirium insulting the messengers who announced to him the approach of the enemy's armies."—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 4, ch. 6.—"That period ought to have been esteemed the happiest of Napoleon's life. What more could the wildest ambition desire? . . . All obeyed him. Nothing was wanting to make him happy! Nothing, if he could be happy who possessed not a love of justice. . . . The being never existed who possessed ampler means for promoting the happiness of mankind. Nothing was required but justice and prudence. The nation expected these from him, and granted him that unlimited confidence which he afterwards so cruelly abused. . . . Instead of considering with calmness and moderation how he might best employ his vast resources, he ruminated on projects beyond the power of man to execute; forgetting what innumerable victims must be sacrificed in the vain attempt. . . . He aspired at universal despotism, for no other reason than because a nation, isolated from the continent and profiting by its happy situation, had refused to submit to his intolerable yoke. . . . In the hope of conquering that invincible enemy, he vainly endeavoured to grasp the extremities of Europe. . . . Misled by his rash and hasty temper, he adopted a false line of politics, and converted in the north, as he had done before in the south, the most useful and powerful of his allies into a dangerous enemy."—E. Labaume, *Circumstantial Narrative of the Campaign in Russia*, pt. 1, bk. 1.

ALSO IN: C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I.*, v. 2, ch. 3.—Imbert de Saint Amand, *Memoirs of the Empress Marie Louise*.

A. D. 1812 (June).—The captive Pope brought to Fontainebleau. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808-1814.

A. D. 1812 (June-August).—Defeat by the English in Spain at Salamanca.—Abandonment of Madrid by King Joseph. See SPAIN: A. D. 1812 (JUNE-AUGUST).

A. D. 1812 (June-December).—Napoleon's Russian campaign.—The advance to Moscow.

—The burning of the city.—The retreat and its horrors. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1812.

A. D. 1812-1813 (December—March).—Napoleon's return from Russia.—His measures for creating a new army.—"Whilst Europe, agitated at once by hope, by fear, and by hatred, was inquiring what had become of Napoleon, whether he had perished or had been saved, he was crossing in a sledge—accompanied by the Duke of Vicenza, the Grand Marshal Duroc, Count Lobau, General Lefevre-Desnouettes, and the Mameluke Rustan—the vast plains of Lithuania, of Poland, and of Saxony, concealed by thick furs; for if his name had been imprudently uttered, or his countenance recognised, a tragical catastrophe would have instantly ensued. The man who had so greatly excited the admiration of nations, who was the object of their . . . superstition, would not at that moment have escaped their fury. In two places only did he allow himself to be known, Warsaw and Dresden. . . . That he might not occasion too great surprise, he caused himself to be preceded by an officer with a few lines for the 'Moniteur,' saying that on December 5 he had assembled his generals at Smorgoni, had delegated the command to King Murat, only so long as military operations were interrupted by the cold, that he had traversed Warsaw and Dresden, and that he was about to arrive in Paris to take in hand the affairs of the Empire. . . . Napoleon followed close on the steps of the officer who was to announce his arrival. On December 18, at half-past 11 P. M., he entered the Tuileries. . . . On the next morning, the 19th, he received the ministers and grantees of the court . . . with extreme hauteur, maintaining a tranquil but severe aspect, appearing to expect explanations instead of affording them himself, treating foreign affairs as of minor consequence, and those of a domestic nature as of principal import, demanding some light upon these last,—in short, questioning others in order to avoid being questioned himself. . . . On Sunday, the 20th of December, the second day after his arrival, Napoleon received the Senate, the Council of State, and the principal branches of the administration," which severally addressed to him the most fulsome flatteries and assurances of support. "After an infuriated populace basely outraging vanquished princes, nothing can be seen more melancholy than these great bodies prostrating themselves at the feet of a power, bestowing upon it a degree of admiration which increases with its errors, speaking with ardour of their fidelity, already about to expire, and swearing to die in its cause when they are on the eve of hailing the accession of another. Happy are those countries whose established Constitutions spare them these humiliating spectacles!" As speedily as possible, Napoleon applied himself to the recreation of his lost army, by anticipating the conscription for 1814, and by making new calls upon the classes which had already furnished their contingents. All his measures were submissively sanctioned by the obsequious Senate; but many murmurs of discontent were heard among the people, and some movements of resistance needed to be put down. "However, when the enlightened classes of a country approve a measure, their support is extremely efficacious. In France, all those classes perceiving that it was necessary energetically to defend the country against a for-

eign enemy, though the Government had been still more in the wrong than they were, the levies were effected, and the high functionaries, sustained by a moral acquiescence which they had not always obtained, fulfilled their duty, though in heart full of sad and sinister forebodings."—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire*, bk. 47 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: Duchess d'Abrantes, *Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 43.

A. D. 1812-1813.—Germanic rising against Napoleon.—War of Liberation.—Lützen.—Bautzen.—Dresden.—Leipsic.—The retreat of the French from beyond the Rhine. See GERMANY: A. D. 1812-1813, to 1813 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1813 (February—March).—The new Concordat signed and retracted by the Pope. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808-1814.

A. D. 1813 (June—November).—Defeat at Vittoria and in the Pyrenees.—Retreat from Spain. See SPAIN: A. D. 1812-1814.

A. D. 1813 (November—December).—Dutch independence regained. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1813.

A. D. 1814 (January).—The Pope set free, to return to Rome. See PAPACY: A. D. 1808-1814.

A. D. 1814 (January—March).—The allied invasion.—Napoleon's campaign of defense.—His cause lost.—Surrender of Paris.—"The battle of Leipzig was the overthrow of the French rule in Germany; there only remained, as evidence of what they had lost, 150,000 men, garrisons of the fortresses of the Vistula, the Oder, and the Elbe. Each success of the allies had been marked by the desertion of one of the peoples that had furnished its contingent to the Grand Army of 1812: after Prussia, Austria; at Leipzig the Saxons: the French had not been able to regain the Rhine except by passing over the bodies of the Bavarians at Hanau. Baden, Wurtemberg, Hesse, and Darmstadt declared their defection at nearly the same time; the sovereigns were still hesitating whether to separate themselves from Napoleon, when their people and regiments, worked upon by the German patriots, had already passed into the allied camp. Jerome Bonaparte had again quitted Cassel; Denmark found itself forced to adhere to the Coalition. Napoleon had retired to the left bank of the Rhine. Would Alexander cross this natural frontier of revolutionary France? 'Convinced,' says M. Bogdanovitch, 'by the experience of many years, that neither losses inflicted on Napoleon, nor treaties concluded with him, could check his insatiable ambition, Alexander would not stop at setting free the involuntary allies of France, and resolved to pursue the war till he had overthrown his enemy.' The allied sovereigns found themselves reunited at Frankfort, and an immediate march to Paris was discussed. Alexander, Stein, Blücher, Gneisenau, and all the Prussians were on the side of decisive action. The Emperor Francis and Metternich only desired Napoleon to be weakened, as his downfall would expose Austria to another danger, the preponderance of Russia on the Continent. Bernadotte insisted on Napoleon's dethronement, with the ridiculous design of appropriating the crown of France, traitor as he was to her cause. England would have preferred a solid and immediate peace to a war which would exhaust her in subsidies, and augment her already enormous debt. These divergencies, these hesi-

tations, gave Napoleon time to strengthen his position. After Hanau, in the opinion of Ney, 'the allies might have counted their stages to Paris.' Napoleon had re-opened the negotiations. The relinquishment of Italy (when Murat on his side negotiated the preservation of his kingdom of Naples), of Holland, of Germany, and of Spain, and the confinement of France between her natural boundaries of the Rhine and the Alps; such were the 'Conditions of Frankfort.' Napoleon sent an answer to Metternich, 'that he consented to the opening of a congress at Mannheim: that the conclusion of a peace which would insure the independence of all the nations of the earth had always been the aim of his policy.' This reply seems evasive, but could the proposals of the allies have been serious? Encouraged by disloyal Frenchmen, they published the declaration of Frankfort, by which they affirmed 'that they did not make war with France, but against the preponderance which Napoleon had long exercised beyond the limits of his empire.' Deceitful assurance, too obvious snare, which could only take in a nation weary of war, enervated by twenty-two years of sterile victories, and at the end of its resources! During this time Alexander, with the deputies of the Helvetic Diet summoned at Frankfort, discussed the basis of a new Swiss Confederation. Holland was already raised by the partisans of the house of Orange, and entered by the Prussians. The campaign of France began. Alexander issued at Freiburg a proclamation to his troops. . . . He refused to receive Caulaincourt at Freiburg, declaring that he would only treat in France. 'Let us spare the French negotiator the trouble of the journey,' he said to Metternich. 'It does not seem to me a matter of indifference to the allied sovereigns, whether the peace with France is signed on this side of the Rhine, or on the other, in the very heart of France. Such an historical event is well worth a change of quarters.' Without counting the armies of Italy and the Pyrenees, Napoleon had now a mere handful of troops, 80,000 men, spread from Nîmes to Bâle, to resist 500,000 allies. The army of the North (Wintzingerode) invaded Holland, Belgium, and the Rhenish provinces; the army of Silesia (Blücher) crossed the Rhine between Mannheim and Coblenz and entered Nancy; the army of Bohemia (Schwarzenberg) passed through Switzerland, and advanced on Troyes, where the Royalists demanded the restoration of the Bourbons. Napoleon was still able to bar for some time the way to his capital. He first attacked the army of Silesia; he defeated the vanguard, the Russians of Sacken, at St. Didier, and Blücher at Brienne; but at La Rothière he encountered the formidable masses of the Silesian and Bohemian armies, and after a fierce battle (1st February, 1814) had to fall back on Troyes. After this victory had secured their junction, the two armies separated again, the one to go down the Marne, the other the Seine, with the intention of reuniting at Paris. Napoleon profited by this mistake. He threw himself on the left flank of the army of Silesia, near Champeaubert, where he dispersed the troops of Olsoufieff and Poltarski, inflicting on them a loss of 2,500 men, and took the generals prisoners. At Montmirail, in spite of the heroism of Zigrote and Lapoukhine, he defeated Sacken; the Russians alone lost 2,800 men and five guns (11th February). At Château Thierry, he defeated Sacken and York reunited,

and again the Russians lost 1,500 men and five guns. At Vauchamp it was the turn of Blücher, who lost 2,000 Russians, 4,000 Prussians, and fifteen guns. The army of Silesia was in terrible disorder. 'The peasants, exasperated by the disorder inseparable from a retreat, and excited by exaggerated rumours of French successes, took up arms, and refused supplies. The soldiers suffered both from cold and hunger, Champagne affording no wood for bivouac fires. When the weather became milder, their shoes wore out, and the men, obliged to make forced marches with bare feet, were carried by hundreds into the hospitals of the country' (Bogdanovitch). Whilst the army of Silesia retreated in disorder on the army of the North, Napoleon, with 50,000 soldiers full of enthusiasm, turned on that of Bohemia, crushed the Bavarians and Russians at Mormans, the Wurtembergers at Montereau, the Prussians at Méry: these Prussians made part of the army of Blücher, who had detached a corps to hang on the rear of Napoleon. This campaign made a profound impression on the allies. Castlereagh expressed, in Alexander's presence, the opinion that peace should be made before they were driven across the Rhine. The military chiefs began to feel uneasy. Sesslavine sent news from Joigny that Napoleon had 180,000 men at Troyes. A general insurrection of the eastern provinces was expected in the rear of the allies. It was the firmness of Alexander which maintained the Coalition, it was the military energy of Blücher which saved it. Soon after his disasters he received reinforcements from the army of the North, and took the offensive against the marshals; then, hearing of the arrival of Napoleon at La Ferté Gaucher, he retreated in great haste, finding an unexpected refuge at Soissons, which had just been taken by the army of the North. At Craonne (March 7) and at Laon (10th to 12th March), with 100,000 men against 30,000, and with strong positions, he managed to repulse all the attacks of Napoleon. At Craonne, however, the Russian loss amounted to 5,000 men, the third of their effective force. The battle of Laon cost them 4,000 men. Meanwhile, De Saint Priest, a general in Alexander's service, had taken Rheims by assault, but was dislodged by Napoleon after a fierce struggle, where the émigré commander was badly wounded, and 4,000 of his men were killed (13th March). The Congress of Châtillon-sur-Seine was opened on the 28th of February. Russia was represented by Razoumovski and Nesselrode, Napoleon by Caulaincourt, Austria by Stadion and Metternich. The conditions proposed to Napoleon were the reduction of France to its frontiers of 1792, and the right of the allies to dispose, without reference to him, of the reconquered countries. Germany was to be a confederation of independent States, Italy to be divided into free States, Spain to be restored to Ferdinand, and Holland to the house of Orange. 'Leave France smaller than I found her? Never!' said Napoleon. Alexander and the Prussians would not hear of a peace which left Napoleon on the throne. Still, however, they negotiated. Austria and England were both agreed not to push him to extremities, and many times proposed to treat. After Napoleon's great success against Blücher, Castlereagh declared for peace. 'It would not be a peace,' cried the Emperor of Russia; 'it would be a truce which would not allow us to disarm one moment. I cannot come 400

leagues every day to your assistance. No peace, as long as Napoleon is on the throne.' Napoleon, in his turn, intoxicated by his success, enjoined Caulaincourt only to treat on the basis of Frankfurt—natural frontiers. . . . As fortune returned to the allies, the congress was dissolved (19th of March). The Bourbon princes were already in France; Louis XVIII. was on the point of being proclaimed. Alexander, tired of seeing the armies of Bohemia and Silesia fly in turn before thirty or forty thousand French, caused the allies to adopt the fatal plan of a march on Paris, which was executed in eight days. Blücher and Schwartzenberg united, with 200,000 men, were to bear down all opposition on their passage. The first act in the drama was the battle of Arcis-sur-Aube, where the Russians took six guns from Napoleon. The latter conceived a bold scheme, which perhaps might have saved him if Paris could have resisted, but which was his ruin. He threw himself on the rear of the allied army, abandoning to them the route to Paris, but reckoning on raising Eastern France, and cutting off their retreat to the Rhine. The allies, uneasy for one moment, were reassured by an intercepted letter of Napoleon's, and by the letters of the Parisian royalists, which revealed to them the weakness of the capital. 'Dare all!' writes Talleyrand to them. They, in their turn, deceived Napoleon, by causing him to be followed by a troop of cavalry, continued their march, defeated Marmont and Mortier, crushed the National Guards of Paethod (battle of La Fère-Champenoise), and arrived in sight of Paris. Barclay de Tolly, forming the centre, first attacked the plateau of Romainville, defended by Marmont; on his left, the Prince of Wurtemberg threatened Vincennes; and on his right, Blücher deployed before Montmartre, which was defended by Mortier. The heights of Chaumont and those of Montmartre were taken; Marmont and Mortier with Moncey were thrown back on the ramparts. Marmont obtained an armistice from Colonel Orlof, to treat for the capitulation of Paris. King Joseph, the Empress Marie-Louise, and all the Imperial Government had already fled to the Loire. Paris was recommended 'to the generosity of the allied monarchs'; the army could retire on the road to Orleans. Such was the battle of Paris; it had cost, according to M. Bogdanovitch, 8,400 men to the allies, and 4,000 to the French (30th March). . . . The allied troops maintained a strict discipline, and were not quartered on the inhabitants. Alexander had not come as a friend of the Bourbons—the fiercest enemy of Napoleon was least bitter against the French; he intended leaving them the choice of their government. He had not favoured any of the intrigues of the émigrés, and had scornfully remarked to Jomini, 'What are the Bourbons to me?'—A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia*, v. 2, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I.*, v. 3, ch. 1.—M. de Beauchamp, *Narrative of the Invasions of France, 1814-15*.—Duke de Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 3, pt. 2, ch. 20-32.—J. Philippart, *Campaign in Germany and France, 1813*, v. 1, p. 279 and after, and v. 2.

A. D. 1814 (January–May).—Desertion of Napoleon by Murat.—Murat's treaty with the allies.—French evacuation of Italy. See ITALY: A. D. 1814.

A. D. 1814 (February–April).—Reverses in the south.—Wellington's invasion. See SPAIN: A. D. 1812-1814.

A. D. 1814 (March–April).—Friendly reception of the Allies in Paris.—Collapse of the empire.—Abdication of Napoleon.—Treaty of Fontainebleau.—'At an early hour in the morning [of the 31st of March], the Allied troops had taken possession of the barriers, and occupied the principal avenues leading to the city. Picquets of the Cossacks of the Guard were stationed at the corners of the principal streets. Vast multitudes thronged the Boulevards, in anxious and silent expectation of pending events. The royalists alone were active. The leaders, a small band indeed, had early assembled in the Place Louis XV., whence, with Bourbon banners displayed, they proceeded along the principal streets, haranguing the people and National Guard; but though not interfered with by the police,—for all seemed to feel that the Imperial government was at an end,—they were listened to with such perfect indifference, that many began to think their cause absolutely hopeless. It was between ten and eleven o'clock when the procession began to enter the city. Light horsemen of the Russian Guard opened the march; at the head of the main column rode the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia. . . . Then followed 35,000 men, cavalry, infantry, and artillery, the élite of the armies, in all the pride and circumstance of war and conquest. At first the multitude looked on in silent amazement; but the affability of the officers, above all, the condescending manner of the Czar, dispelled any fear they might still entertain; and shouts of 'Vive Alexander!' began to be heard; cries of 'Vive le Roi de Prusse!' were soon added. . . . The shouts of welcome increased at every step. The conquerors were now hailed as liberators; 'Vivent les Allies!' 'Vivent nos libérateurs!' sounded through the air, mingled at last with the long-forgotten cry of 'Vive le Roi!' 'Vivent les Bourbons!' . . . The Emperor Alexander had no sooner seen the troops file past on the Place Louis XV., than he repaired to the hôtel of Talleyrand, where in the evening, a council was assembled to deliberate on the important step next to be taken, and on the best mode of turning the glorious victories achieved to an honourable and beneficial account. . . . The points discussed were: I. The possibility, on sufficient guarantees, of a peace with Napoleon; II. The plan of regency under Marie Louise; and, III. The restoration of the Bourbons. The choice was not without difficulties. The first plan was easily dismissed; as the reception of the Allies proved clearly that the power of Napoleon was broken. The second seemed more likely to find favour, as promising to please the Emperor of Austria; but was finally rejected, as being, in fact, nothing more than a continuance of the Imperial reign under a different title. Against the restoration of the Bourbons, it was urged that the nation at large had evinced no desire for their recall, and seemed to have almost forgotten them. This, Talleyrand said, was owing entirely to the Congress of Chatillon, and the negotiations carried on with Napoleon; introducing at the same time, the Abbé de Pradt and Baron Louis, who fully confirmed the assertion. On being asked how he expected to obtain a declaration in favour of the exiled family, Talleyrand replied, that he was certain of the Senate; and that their vote would influence Paris, the example of which would be followed by all France. Alexander having on this assurance taken the opinion

of the King of Prussia and Prince Schwarzenberg, signed a declaration to the effect that 'the Allies would treat no more with Napoleon Bonaparte, or with any member of his family.' A proclamation was issued at the same time, calling on the Conservative Senate to assemble and form a provisional government, for the purpose of drawing up a constitution suitable to the wishes of the French people. This the Allies promised to guarantee; as it was their wish, they said, to see France 'powerful, happy, and prosperous.' A printer was ready in attendance; and before dark, this memorable decree was seen placarded in all the streets of Paris. The inconstant populace had not even waited for such a signal, and had been already engaged in destroying the emblems of the Imperial government; an attempt had even been made to pull down the statue of Napoleon from the summit of the column of Austerlitz, in the Place Vendôme! The decisive impulse thus given, events moved rapidly forward. Caulaincourt's zealous efforts in favour of his master could effect nothing after the declaration already noticed. On the 2d, he took his departure for Fontainebleau; having, however, received the assurance that Napoleon would be suitably provided for. . . . The funds rose five per cent., and all other public securities in proportion, on the very day after the occupation of the capital; and wherever the Allied Sovereigns appeared in public, they were loudly cheered and hailed as liberators. From the first, officers of the Allied armies filled the public walks, theatres, and coffee-houses, and mixed with the people as welcome guests rather than as conquering invaders. The press, so long enslaved by Napoleon, took the most decided part against its oppressor; and from every quarter injurious pamphlets, epigrams, and satires, now poured upon the fallen ruler. Madame de Staël had characterised him as 'Robespierre on horseback'; De Pradt had more wittily termed him 'Jupiter Scapin'; and these sayings were not forgotten. But by far the most vivid sensation was produced by Chateaubriand's tract of 'Bonaparte and the Bourbons'; 30,000 copies of which are said to have been sold in two days. In proportion as the popular hatred of the Emperor evinced itself, grew the boldness of his adversaries. On the first of April, the Municipal Council of Paris met and already declared the throne vacant; on the next day, the Conservative Senate formed a Provisional Government, and issued a decree, declaring, first, 'That Napoleon Bonaparte had forfeited the throne and the right of inheritance established in his family; 2d, That the people and army of France were disengaged and freed from the oath of fidelity which they had taken to him and his constitution.' . . . The members of the Legislative Assembly who happened to be in Paris, followed the example of the Senate. The Assembly had been dissolved in January, and could not meet constitutionally unless summoned by the Sovereign; this objection was, however, set aside, and the Assembly having met, ratified the act of deposition passed by the Senate. All the public functionaries, authorities and constituted bodies in and near Paris, hastened to send in their submission to the new powers: it was a general race in which honour was not always the prize of speed; for every address, every act of submission sent in to the new government, teemed with invectives against the deposed ruler. . . . It was in the

night between the 2d and 3d, that Caulaincourt returned from his mission, and informed Napoleon of the events which had passed. . . . In what manner the Emperor received these fatal tidings we are not told. . . . At first it would seem that he entertained, or affected to entertain, thoughts of resorting to arms; for in the morning he reviewed his Guard, and addressed them in the following terms:—'Officers and soldiers of my Old Guard, the enemy has gained three marches on us, and outstripped us at Paris. Some factious men, emigrants whom I had pardoned, have surrounded the Emperor Alexander; they have mounted the white cockade, and would force us to do the same. In a few days I shall attack the enemy, and force them to quit the capital. I rely on you: am I right?' The troops readily replied with loud cheers to this address, calling out 'To Paris! to Paris!' but the Marshals and senior officers were by no means so zealous in the cause. . . . The Generals and Marshals . . . followed the Emperor to his apartments after the review; and having advised him to negotiate with the Allies, on the principle of a personal abdication, ended by informing him, that they would not accompany him if he persisted in the proposed attack on Paris. The scene which followed seems to have been of a very undignified description. Napoleon was almost convulsed with rage; he tore and trampled under foot the decree of the Senate; vowed vengeance against the whole body, who should yet, he said, be made to pay for their deed of 'felony'; but ended, nevertheless, by ignobly signing the abdication demanded of him. We say ignobly; for nothing can be more debasing in character, than to sink down from a very tempest of passion to tame submission. . . . The act of abdication was worded in the following terms: 'The Allied powers having proclaimed that the Emperor Napoleon is the sole obstacle to the re-establishment of peace in Europe, the Emperor Napoleon, faithful to his oath, declares that he is ready to descend from the throne, to quit France, and even to relinquish life, for the good of the country, which is inseparable from the rights of his son, from those of the regency in the person of the Empress, and from the maintenance of the laws of the empire. Done at our Palace of Fontainebleau, 4th April 1814. Napoleon.' Caulaincourt, Marshals Ney and M'Donald, were appointed to carry this conditional abdication to Paris. . . . The commissioners on returning to Fontainebleau found the Emperor in his cabinet, impatiently awaiting the result of their mission. Marshal Ney was the first to speak; and in that abrupt, harsh and not very respectful tone which he had lately assumed towards his falling sovereign, told him at once, that 'France, the army and the cause of peace, demanded his unconditional abdication.' Caulaincourt added, that the full sovereignty of the Isle of Elba, with a suitable establishment, had been offered by the Emperor Alexander; and Marshal M'Donald, who had so zealously defended the cause of his master, confirmed the statement,—declaring also that, 'in his opinion, the Imperial cause was completely lost, as they had all three—the commissioners—'failed against a resolution irrevocably fixed.' 'What!' exclaimed Napoleon, 'not only my own abdication, but that of Marie Louise, and of my son? This is rather too much at once.' And with these words he delayed the answer till next day.

intending, he said, to consider the subject, and consult the army. . . . Words ran high between the fallen chieftain and his former subordinates; there were altercations, recriminations, and painful scenes, and it was only when Napoleon had signed the following unconditional abdication that perfect calm was restored:—"The Allied Sovereigns having declared that the Emperor Napoleon is the only obstacle to the re-establishment of a general peace, the Emperor Napoleon, faithful to his oath, declares, that he renounces, for himself and his heirs, the throne of France and Italy; and that there is no personal sacrifice, not even that of life itself, which he is not willing to make for the interest of France. Napoleon. Fontainebleau, 6th April 1814." This deplorable document is written in so agitated and faltering a hand as to be almost illegible. . . . According to the treaty signed at Paris on the 10th, and usually called the Treaty of Fontainebleau, Napoleon, from being Emperor of France and King of Italy, became Emperor of Elba! He was to have a guard and a navy suited to the extent of his dominions, and to receive from France a pension of six millions of francs annually. The Duchies of Parma, Placentia and Guastala, were to be conferred in sovereignty on Marie Louise and her heirs. Two millions and a half of francs were further to be paid annually by the French government to the Empress Josephine and other members of the Bonaparte family. Splendid as these terms were for a dethroned and defenceless monarch, Napoleon ratified the treaty with reluctance, and delayed the signature as long as possible; still clinging, it would seem, to some vague hope of returning fortune. It is even related by Fain, Norvins, Constant, and in the pretended Memoirs of Caulaincourt, that he attempted to commit suicide by taking poison, and was only saved by the weakness of the dose, and the remedies administered by his attendants, who, hearing his groans, hastened to his bedside. It is certain that he was very unwell on the following morning, the 13th April, a circumstance easily accounted for by the anxiety he had undergone; but there can be little difficulty in rejecting the tale of poison, for it is mentioned in none of the St. Helena Memoirs."—Lieut.-Col. J. Mitchell, *The Fall of Napoleon*, bk. 3, ch. 3 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: M. de Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 4, ch. 20-23.—Duke of Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 4, pt. 1, ch. 4-10.—Prince Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, pt. 7 (v. 2).

A. D. 1814 (April—June).—Departure of Napoleon for Elba.—Louis XVIII. called to the throne.—Settlement of the constitution.—Evacuation of France by the Allies.—The Treaty of Paris.—Determination of the new boundaries of the kingdom.—"April 20, everything being ready for Napoleon's journey, and the commissioners of the four great powers who were to accompany him having arrived, the former drew up the imperial guard in the grand courtyard at Fontainebleau to take leave of them. 'Soldiers,' said he, 'I have one mission left to fulfil in life,—to recount to posterity the glorious deeds we have done together.' Would to Heaven he had kept his word and done nothing else! He kissed the flag, and his brave soldiers, who only saw the man who so often led them on to victory, burst into tears. Seven or eight hundred of them were to form the army left to

him who had had a million soldiers at his command, and they were sent in advance, Napoleon going by another road, unescorted save by General Drouot, Bertrand, and the four foreign commissioners with their people. In the first departments through which they passed . . . the people who had been eye-witnesses of the invasion forgot the evil wrought by Napoleon, and only saw the defender of his country. They shouted 'Long live the Emperor! Down with foreigners!' But beyond Lyons, where the foe never penetrated, the population became hostile: old royalist and Catholic passions were revived in proportion as they went farther south; the mob cried 'Long live the King! down with the tyrant!' and others howled 'Long live the allies!' At Avignon and Orgon a furious rabble attacked the carriages, demanding that the tyrant should be handed over to them to be hung or thrown into the Rhone. The man who braved the storm of shot and shell with utter indifference gave way before these ignoble perils, and disguised himself; otherwise the commissioners could scarcely have saved his life at Orgon. The sad journey closed at the Gulf of St. Raphael, on the coast of Provence. . . . An English frigate awaited him and bore him to Elba, where he landed at Porto-Ferraio, May 4. While the Empire was crumbling to dust . . . and the fallen Emperor went into exile, the new government was working hard to hold its own at Paris. The royalists were at sword's points with the national sovereignty party in the commission chosen by the senate to draw up a constitution. The pretender's agent, Abbé de Montesquiou, failed to win acceptance of the principle that royal right is superior to the nation's will; and the formula adopted was as follows: 'The French people freely call to the throne of France, Louis Stanislas Xavier de France, brother of the late king, and, after him, the other members of the house of Bourbon.' Thus they did not recognize in the king whom they elected the title of Louis XVIII., and did not admit that between him and his brother, Louis XVI., there had been a rightful king, the poor child who died in the Temple and whom royalists called Louis XVII. The reign of Louis Stanislas Xavier was to date from the day when he swore allegiance to the Constitution: the executive power was vested in the king, who shared the legislative power with the Senate and a Chamber of Deputies. The Constitution sanctioned individual liberty, freedom of worship and the press, the sale of national goods, the public debt, and proclaimed oblivion of all acts committed since the beginning of the Revolution. The principles of 1789 were maintained, and in the sad state of France there was nothing better to be done than to rally round this Constitution, which was voted by the Senate, April 6, and accepted by the Legislature. . . . The Senate's lack of popularity gave the royalist party hope that the act of April 6 might be retracted, and at this time that party won a faint success in a matter on which they laid great stress. Count d'Artois was on his way to Paris, and declared that he would not lay aside the white cockade on entering. The temporary government ordered the national guard to assume the white cockade, and let Count d'Artois in without conditions (April 12). He was received in solemn state, the marshals marching before him, still wearing their tri-colored cockades and plumes, which the gov-

ernment dared not attack. The rabble was cold, but the middle classes received the prince favorably, and he proved gracious to every one. . . . D'Artois . . . insisted on being recognized, unconditionally, as lieutenant-general of the kingdom, as he had entered Paris without making terms; but this time the Senate and temporary government did not yield. They intended that the prince should make a solemn promise, in his brother's name, in regard to the Constitution. The czar interfered and explained to D'Artois that the allies were pledged to the Senate and the nation, and he was forced to submit and receive the lieutenant-generalcy of the kingdom from the Senate, 'until Louis Stanislas Xavier of France should accept the Constitutional Charter.' . . . The day after his proclamation as lieutenant-general, the white cockade was finally adopted, and . . . imposed upon the army and various public buildings, though the national cockade was still worn by many French soldiers from the Garonne to the Elbe, and many warlike deeds still signalized the final efforts of their arms, even after Napoleon had laid aside his sword. . . . By degrees the truce became universal, and the next question was to fix the terms of peace. . . . The enemy held nothing but Paris and the unfortified towns, French garrisons still occupying all the strongholds of France, old and new, and several important places far beyond the Rhine. . . . This was a powerful means of gaining, not the preservation of the natural frontiers, which could no longer be hoped for, but at least an important advance on the limits of the ancient monarchy. Unluckily a movement, natural but hasty, broke out all over France, to claim the immediate evacuation of her soil by foreign armies;—"an impatience which allowed no time for bargaining in the matter, and which precipitated an agreement (April 23) with the allied powers "to leave the French dominion as it had been on the 1st of January, 1792, in proportion as the places still occupied beyond those limits by French troops should be evacuated and restored to the allies. . . . This compact surrendered to the allies, without any compensation, 53 strongholds, 12,600 pieces of ordnance, arsenals and magazines filled with vast supplies." The new king, calling himself Louis XVIII., arrived in Paris on the 3d of May, from England, where he had latterly resided. He had offended the czar, ruffled public feeling in France, even before he arrived, by saying publicly to the English people that he owed his restoration, under Providence, to them. Negotiations for a definite treaty of peace were opened at once. "At Metternich's suggestion, the allies decided to conclude their arrangements with France in Paris, and to reserve general arrangements with Europe for a congress at Vienna [see VIENNA: THE CONGRESS OF]. Talleyrand did not object, although this plan was evidently unfavorable to France. . . . The royal council directed Talleyrand to try to win for the northern frontier those million people promised beyond the old limits; but Louis XVIII., by angering the czar, completed the sad work of April 23. Alexander thought of renewing with the Bourbons the alliance that he had planned with Napoleon, and marrying to the Duke de Berri, Louis's nephew, that one of his sisters to whom Napoleon preferred Marie Louise. Louis . . . responded churlishly to the czar's advances. Accordingly, when France demanded

a solid frontier, including the South of Belgium, . . . Lord Castlereagh absolutely refused, and was supported by Prussia, hostile to France, and by Austria, indifferent on that score, but disposed to follow England in everything. Russia did not side with France. . . . The allies were willing to grant, in place of the old dominion of the monarchy, on the Rhine side, the line of the Queich, which opened communication with Landau, and to the southeast the department of Vaucluse (once County Venaissin) given up by the Pope, besides Chambéry and a part of Savoy; finally, in the Jura region, Montbéliard. This made nearly 600,000 people. As for the colonies, England reluctantly returned Martinique, Guadeloupe, and the Isle of Bourbon, but refused to restore the Isle de France [or Mauritius, captured in 1810], that great military post which is to the Indian Ocean what Malta is to the Mediterranean. This island was bravely defended for some years by its governor. . . . The English declared that they would also keep Malta, taken from France, and the Cape of Good Hope, wrested from Holland, saying that all these belonged to them, being on the road to India. . . . Secret articles provided that Holland, under the rule of the House of Orange, should be increased by the countries ceded by France, between the sea, the French frontier of 1790, and the Meuse (Austrian Netherlands and Liège). The countries ceded by France on the left bank of the Rhine were to be divided as 'compensation' among the German states. Austria was to have the country bounded by the Po, Ticino, and Lake Maggiore, that is, the old Venetian states, Milan, and Mantua. The territory of the former Republic of Genoa was to be given to the King of Sardinia. Such was the end of the wars of the Empire. Republican France reached the goal of the old monarchy, the natural limits of ancient Gaul; the Empire lost them."—H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France*, v. 2, ch. 17.—"The Peace of Paris [signed May 30] was followed by some subsidiary treaties. . . . By a Convention of June 3rd between Austria and Bavaria, Maximilian Joseph restored to Austria the Tyrol with the Vorarlberg, the principality of Salzburg, the district of the Inn and the Hausrück. During the visit of the Emperor Alexander and the King of Prussia to London in June, it was agreed that the Article of the Peace of Paris stipulating the aggrandisement of Holland, should be carried out by the annexation of Belgium to that country, an arrangement which was accepted by the Sovereign of the Netherlands, July 21st 1814."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 16.

ALSO IN: A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Restoration*, bk. 13-14 and 16 (v. 1-2).—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of the Reigns of Louis XVIII. and Charles X.*, v. 1, ch. 3.

A. D. 1814-1815.—Ten months of Bourbon rule and its follies.—Return of Napoleon from Elba.—Flight of the King.—The Hundred Days.—Preparations for war.—"The peace of Paris did not endure a year. Ten months of Bourbon rule, vengeful, implacable, stupid; alike violent in act and in language; sufficed to bring France once more to the brink of revolution. Two acts alone are sufficient to demonstrate the folly of the royalists—the resumption of the white flag, and the changing of the numbers of the regiments. A prudent king would have

adopted the tricolour when he agreed to a constitutional charter, and would have refrained from wounding military sensibility by destroying the numbers of the regiments. But more stupid than these acts was the political policy pursued, a policy which aroused on all sides suspicions of what was worse than the grinding but gilded despotism of Napoleon—namely, that the Government favoured a forcible resumption of the confiscated lands, the restoration of tithes, and of the abolished exactions and imposts of feudalism. It has been surmised, and with much reason, that had Napoleon not reappeared a popular movement would have extorted from the king a really constitutional government. In that case France might have taken some real steps towards a free government, and the bases of liberty rather than of equality might have been laid. But while the Powers were wrangling at Vienna, and the Bourbons were irritating France, Napoleon was watching from Elba for the opportunity of resuming empire. It was not in the nature of the man to yield passively to anything, even to the inevitable. So long as a chance remained he looked out keenly for the propitious hour. He selected Elba as a residence because thence 'he could keep an eye upon France and upon the Bourbons.' It was his duty, he said, to guard the throne of France for his family and for his son. Thus, in making peace at Fontainebleau, he only bowed to a storm he could not then resist, and cherished in his mind the project of an imperial restoration. The hour for which he waited came at length. In February, 1815, he had arrived at the conclusion that with the aid of the army he could overthrow the Bourbons, whose government, he said, was good for priests, nobles, and countesses of the old time, but worth nothing to the living generation. The army, he knew, was still, and would be always, devoted to him. . . . He had weighed all the chances for and against the success of his enterprise, and he had arrived at the conclusion that he should succeed; for, 'Fortune had never deserted him on great occasions.' It has been said that his departure was precipitated by a report of the dissolution of the Congress of Vienna. . . . It is possible, indeed, that the rumour of an intention to confine him upon an island in the Atlantic may have exercised some influence over him; but the real reasons for the selection of the 26th of February were that he was tired of inactivity, and convinced that the favourable moment had arrived. Therefore, instructing Murat to second him by assuming a strong position in front of Ancona, he embarked his faithful Thousand, and set sail for France. On the 1st of March he landed on the shores of the Gulf of Juan, and on the 20th he entered the Tuileries. As he had predicted, the army rallied to the tricolour; the generals could neither restrain nor guide their soldiers; the Bourbon dukes and princes, and the brave Duchess of Angoulême—'the only man of the family'—were utterly powerless before the universal military disaffection; and one after the other they were chased out of France. The army had restored Napoleon. Louis XVIII. drove out of Paris by the road to St. Denis on the 19th, a few hours before Napoleon, on the 20th, drove in by the Barrier of Italy; and on the 23rd, after a short stay at Lille, the King was safe in Ghent. 'The great question is,' wrote Lord Castlereagh to the Duke of Wellington three days afterwards,

while yet in ignorance of the event, 'can the Bourbons get Frenchmen to fight for them against Frenchmen?' The result showed that they could not. In the then state of France the army was master of France. Louis and his ministers had done nothing to conciliate, and almost everything to irritate, the people; and even so early as November, 1814, Wellington did not see what means the King had of resisting the attack of a few hundred officers determined to risk everything. During the period occupied by Napoleon in passing from Elba to Paris, the conduct of the sovereigns and diplomatists assembled at Vienna offered a striking contrast to the weakness and inaptitude of the Bourbons. . . . That there was fear in Vienna is manifest, but the acts of the Allied Powers show that fear speedily gave place to resolution. For, as early as the 12th of March, before the Allies knew where Napoleon was, or anything about him, except that he was somewhere at large in France, they drew up that famous declaration, and signed it the next day, in which they declared that he had broken the sole legal tie to which his existence was attached, and that it was possible to keep with him 'neither peace nor truce.' 'The Powers, in consequence,' so runs this document, 'declare that Napoleon Buonaparte is placed beyond the pale of civil and social relations, and that, as a common enemy and disturber of the peace of the world, he has delivered himself over to public justice.' This declaration, which has been the subject of vehement criticism, was the natural consequence of the prevailing and correct appreciation of Napoleon's character. There was not a nation in Europe which felt the slightest particle of confidence or trust in him. Hence this declaration, made so promptly, was drawn up in ignorance of any professions he might make, because, beforehand, Europe felt that no professions of his could be relied on. The news of his success was followed by a treaty, adopted on the 25th of March, renewing the alliance of Chaumont, whereby Great Britain, Russia, Austria, and Prussia bound themselves to provide each 150,000 men; to employ, in addition, all their resources, and to work together for the common end—the maintenance of the Treaty of Paris, and of the stipulations determined on and signed at the Congress of Vienna. Further, they engaged not to lay down their arms but by common consent; nor before the object of the war should have been attained; nor, continues the document, 'until Buonaparte shall have been rendered absolutely unable to create disturbance, and to renew attempts for possessing himself of supreme power in France.' All the Powers of Europe generally, and Louis XVIII. specially, were invited to accede to the treaty; but, at the instance of Lord Castlereagh, the Four Great Powers declared in the most solemn manner that, although they desired to see his Most Christian Majesty restored to the throne, and also to contribute to that 'auspicious result,' yet that their 'principles' would not permit them to prosecute the war 'with a view of imposing any particular Government on France.' With Napoleon they refused to hold any communication whatever; and when he sent couriers to announce that he intended to observe existing treaties, they were stopped on the frontiers. . . . Wellington, on his own responsibility, acted for England, signed treaties, undertook heavy engagements in her name, and agreed to command

an army to be assembled in Belgium; and having satisfied, as well as he could, the clamour of 'all' for subsidies from England, he took his departure from Vienna on the 29th of March, and arrived in Brussels on the 4th of April. The British Parliament and nation confirmed readily the proceedings of the Government and of the Duke of Wellington at Vienna. . . . Napoleon had formed a Ministry on the very evening of his return to the Tuileries. . . . He felt certain that war would ensue. Knowing that at the moment when he returned from Elba a large part of the best troops of England were in America, that the German force on the Rhine was weak, and that the Russian armies were in Poland, he calculated that the Allied Powers would not be in a position to open the campaign, at the earliest, until the middle of July; and, for a moment, he hoped that, by working on the feelings of his father-in-law, the Emperor of Austria, and by rousing the anger of the Emperor Alexander against his allies, he would be able, if not to reduce his enemies to two, England and Prussia, at least to defer the period of hostilities until the autumn. . . . Before his great schemes of military preparation were half complete he found himself compelled by events to begin the war. What he actually did accomplish between March and June has been the subject of fierce controversy. His friends exaggerate, his enemies undervalue, his exertions and their results. But no candid inquirer can fail to see, that if his energetic activity during this period is far below that of the Convention when threatened by Europe, it is far above the standard fixed by his passionate critics. The real reason why he failed to raise a larger military force during the hundred days was that his genius worked upon exhausted materials. The nation, to use an expressive vulgarism, was 'used up.' . . . The proper conscription for 1815 had been levied in the autumn of 1813. The drafts on the rising generation had been anticipated, and hence there remained little available except the old soldiers. . . . The result of Napoleon's prodigious exertions to augment the military force of France appears to be this: Napoleon found ready to his hand a force of 223,972 men of all arms, officers included, giving a disposable effective of 155,000 men ready to take the field. By the 13th of June he had raised this force to 276,982 men, officers included: that is 247,609 of the line, and 29,373 of the Imperial Guard. The number disposable for war was 198,130; and it therefore follows that Napoleon had increased the general effective by 53,010 men, and that part of it disposable for war by 43,130."—G. Hooper, *Waterloo*, bk. 1, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: Imbert de Saint-Amand, *The Duchess of Angoulême and the two Restorations*, pt. 1.—F. P. Guizot, *Memoirs of My Time*, v. 1, ch. 3.—J. C. Ropes, *The First Napoleon*, lect. 6.—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of the Reigns of Louis XVIII. and Charles X.*, v. 1, ch. 4-6.—R. H. Horne, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 41-42.—Gen. Sir N. Campbell, *Napoleon at Fontainebleau and Elba*.

A. D. 1814-1815.—The Congress of Vienna and the fruits of its labors. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1815 (June).—Napoleon's last campaign.—His final defeat and overthrow at Waterloo.—"The nearest troops of the allies were the Prussian army in the Rhenish prov-

inces, and the army of British, Dutch, Belgians, Brunswickers, and Hanoverians, occupying Belgium. Napoleon's scheme, the best in his desperate circumstances, was to expel the British and Prussians, who were moving west, from Belgium, win the Rhine frontier—to arouse the enthusiasm of all France—before the Austrians were ready, and carry the war out of France. The Duke of Wellington proceeded to Belgium, for the first and last time to measure his skill with Napoleon's, and Marshal Blücher took over from Kleist the command of the Prussians. The two armies, the Prussian and the British, took up a line extending from Liège to the sea. The country on this line was open along the west, affording by nature little means of resisting an invasion, but most of the fortresses commanding the roads had been put in a state of moderate repair. The Prussians held the line of the Meuse and Sambre to beyond Charleroi, the headquarters being at Namur. They numbered about 117,000 men . . . with 312 guns. . . . The motley mass of the British and their allies numbered 106,000 men . . . with 196 guns. . . . So entirely ignorant were the allies of Napoleon's movements, that on the very day on which he burst across the frontier, Wellington wrote to the Czar, who was at Vienna, respecting the general invasion of France. At that time the frontier of France approached within six miles of Charleroi (which is itself but 34 miles by the main road from Brussels). The Charleroi road was not only the most direct to Brussels, but was unprotected by fortresses; and the line of the allied armies was weakest here at the point of junction between them. . . . It was against the central weak point that Napoleon resolved to move, down the basins of the Sambre and the Meuse. . . . The mass of the troops was being assembled within a league of the frontier, but behind some small hills which completely screened them from the enemy's outposts. To conceal his designs to the last moment, the line of sentries along the frontier was tripled, and any attempt to pass the line was forbidden under pain of death. The arrangements were being carried out by Soult, who on the 2nd June had been appointed chief of the staff. . . . The army concentrated on the frontier consisted (according to Colonel Chesney) of 90,000 infantry and 22,000 cavalry—in all 112,000 men—with 344 guns. . . . Napoleon, accompanied by his brother Jerome, arrived in the camp, and in the evening of the 14th his soldiers, already elated by his presence, were excited to the highest pitch of enthusiasm by an address from Napoleon. . . . A general order fixed the attack upon the allies' position for three o'clock in the following morning (15th)." At the appointed time "the French left was in motion, Reille proceeding from Solre down the right bank of the Sambre. He was soon brought into collision with the Prussian outposts near Thuin: he drove them back and secured at ten o'clock the bridge of Marchiennes." The movements of other corps were delayed by various causes. Nevertheless, "of the Prussians only Ziethen's corps, and of Wellington's army only Perponcher's Dutch-Belgians, were as yet near the menaced position; while 40,000 French had passed the Sambre at Marchiennes and 70,000 more were entering Charleroi. When Reille deployed in front of Gosselles, the Prussians called in their detachments and retired from it upon Fleurus,

... leaving open the road through Quatre Bras to Brussels. Ney, who had just come up, then took command of the left, ... which was now directed upon Quatre Bras; and Napoleon galloped off to the road between Charleroi and Fleurus, where the retiring Prussians were concentrating. ... At dark Ziethen [with the First Prussian corps] still held Fleurus with his advanced guard, and the wood on its south, the bulk of his troops lay for the night upon the hill of Ligny, above the village of Bry. His loss during the day's manœuvring has been estimated at 2,000. On the French left, Ney ... had come in contact with the advance guard of Wellington's army, a battalion of Nassauers and a light battery, in front of the village of Frasnes, two miles from Quatre Bras, the name applied to the farm-buildings at the intersection of the four main roads, — Brussels, Nivelles, Charleroi, Namur. ... After a few cannon-shots the outpost fell back from Frasnes to Quatre Bras." Ney, after a reconnaissance, postponed attack until morning. "It had been intended by Napoleon that the whole army should have crossed the Sambre before noon; but from the several delays ... when night fell on the 15th, half of the cavalry of the guard, two of Grouchy's reserve divisions, Lobau's corps, and one-half of Gérard's corps were still on the south of the river. Apparently relying on secret information from Paris — which contradicted the rumours that Napoleon was about to join the army — Wellington had been lulled into a false security, and the reports as to the concentration had been neglected. News of the enemy's advance across the Sambre did not reach him till three o'clock in the afternoon of the 15th, when the Prince of Orange in person reported the skirmish at Thuin. As he did not yet know the point of concentration, the British general, 'never precipitate or nervous' (Hooper), merely issued orders for all the troops to be in readiness. ... At night intelligence was received from Mons that the French concentration was at Charleroi, and orders were issued for the immediate movement of the troops. ... Wellington and the Prince of Orange, with several of the staff officers, went — it is said, to prevent a panic in Brussels — to the Duchess of Richmond's ball, where 'Belgium's capital had gathered then her beauty and her chivalry,' and, 'while all went merry as a marriage bell,' the staff officers stole away one by one. The Duke himself, 'throwing away golden minutes' (Hamley), as if to show his confidence in his fortunes, remained to a late hour to return thanks after supper for the health of the Prince Regent of Great Britain, which the Prince of Orange proposed. ... Blücher had received, at his head-quarters at Namur, news on the morning of the 14th of the French concentration, and he had ordered forward the corps of Pirch and Thielemann. ... Napoleon did not foresee Blücher's promptitude, and nothing was done in the early morning of the 16th to proceed with the execution of the intended surprise. ... No orders were issued by the Emperor till eight, when Napoleon's resolution was taken, — to strike at the Prussians, who would, he believed, if defeated, retire upon their natural base of communications, through Namur and Liège, and he would thus be left to deal separately with the British, who could not move from their base, the sea. The French army was to advance in two wings, the left under Ney, the

right under Grouchy, with the reserve under the Emperor himself. Ney was to capture Quatre Bras, reconnoitre the Brussels road, and hold himself in readiness to march to Brussels, which Napoleon hoped to be able to enter the following morning. ... Napoleon had 64,000 men to attack the position at Ligny; Ney on the left wing had 45,000 for Quatre Bras; Lobau had 10,000 to support either wing of the Grand Army; 5,000 troops were in the rear; and the victorious wing, whether Ney's or Grouchy's, was to wheel round and manœuvre in the direction of the other. Thielemann having come up before the French delivered their attack, Blücher had 85,000 men on the field. Wellington arrived at Quatre Bras (which is 20 miles from Brussels) at 11 o'clock in the forenoon. As Marshal Ney gave no sign of an imminent attack, Wellington galloped over, about seven miles, to confer with Blücher. ... Wellington, after some discussion, in which he expressed his disapproval of Blücher's position, agreed to move to the rear of the Prussians, to act as a reserve, if his own position at Quatre Bras were not attacked. ... He reached Quatre Bras when his own position was being assailed, and no help could be sent to Blücher. ... At about three o'clock, when the heavy cannonade a few miles to the west intimated that a desperate battle was in progress at Quatre Bras, the signal for attack [on the Prussians, at Ligny] was given. The French left sped forward with impetuosity; the resistance was vigorous but futile, and the enemy streamed through the village. Blücher immediately moved forward fresh troops and retook the village, but was unable to retain it. ... Thrice the Grenadiers forced their way into and through the village, but only to be driven back again." But "Blücher gradually exhausted his reserves, and when, in the dusk, Napoleon saw the last battalion moved forward and the ground behind Ligny vacant, he exclaimed, 'they are lost!' The Guards and the Cuirassiers were immediately ordered to attack," and the wearied Prussian infantry were broken by their onset. "The fugitives fled precipitately over the fields and along the roads to the east, and the order for the whole to retire was immediately given. ... Blücher himself gathered a few of his squadrons to check the hot pursuit near Sombreffe, and thrice led them to the charge. His squadrons were broken, and after the last charge his horse fell dead, and the veteran marshal lay under it. His aid-de-camp, Nostitz, stood by him, and covered him with a cloak; the Cuirassiers galloped past without noticing him. ... Gneisenau, who took temporary command from the accident to Blücher, ordered a retreat upon Wavre, with the view of joining Bülow's corps and keeping open the communications with Wellington. ... The loss on each side has been very variously estimated. Napoleon put his own loss at 7,000 men, Charras puts it at 11,000, and the loss of the Prussians at 18,000. The retreat upon Wavre abandoned the communications with Namur and Liège, through which the Prussian supplies came from the lower Rhine, for a new line by Louvain, but it kept the Prussians on a line parallel to the road on which Wellington must retreat, and thus still enabled the two armies to aid each other. 'This noble daring at once snatched from Napoleon the hoped-for fruits of his victory, and the danger Ligny had for a few hours averted was left impending over him' (Chesney)." — H. R.

Clinton, *The War in the Peninsula and Wellington's Campaigns in France and Belgium*, ch. 12. — On Wellington's return to Quatre Bras from his interview with Blücher, he found, as stated above, that the Prince of Orange had already become desperately engaged with the superior forces of Ney. "The Duke's presence gave new life to the battle, and when Picton's division, followed by the Brunswickers and Van Merle's Belgian horse, arrived, he took the offensive, pushing forward right up to the edge of the farm of Gemioncourt. Ney, reinforced by the rest of Reille's corps and part of Kellerman's cavalry, violently retorted, and in the charge, which partially broke into spray before the squares, Wellington ran the risk of death or capture. But he leaped his horse over the 92d Highlanders lining the ditch on the Namur road, while his gallant pursuers, cut up by the infantry fire, were killed or driven off. Ney was further reinforced by more guns and cavalry, and Wellington's brigades continued to arrive in parcels. The Marshal was always superior in horsemen and cannon, but after 5 o'clock his opponent had larger numbers of foot. Holding firmly to the cross-roads and the highway to Namur, Wellington became the stronger as the day waned; and when the Guards emerged from the Nivelles road and the Allies pressed forward, Ney, who had no fresh troops, was driven back, and his antagonist remained at sundown master of the whole field of battle. The position was maintained, but the cost was great, for there were no fewer than 4,600 killed and wounded, more than half being British soldiers. The thunder of cannon to the eastward had also died away, but none knew as yet at Quatre Bras how Blücher had fared at the hands of his redoubtable foe. Wellington, who slept at his head-quarters in Genappe, was on the field and scrutinising his outposts at daybreak on the 17th. Soon after came a report, confirmed a little later, that the Prussians had retreated on Wavre. . . . Napoleon had a belief that Blücher would retreat upon Liège, which caused him at a late hour in the day to despatch Grouchy to that side, and thus touch was lost. While the French were cooking and Napoleon was pondering, definite intelligence was brought to Wellington, who, learning for certain that Blücher was at Wavre, promised to stand fast himself at Mont St. Jean and fight, if Blücher would support him with two corps. The intrepid Marshal replied that he would come with his whole army, and Wellington got the famous answer before night. Thus was made, between generals who thoroughly trusted each other, that combination which led to the Battle of Waterloo. It was no chance combat, but the result of a deliberate design, rendered capable of execution, even when Blücher was wounded, by his resolve to retreat upon Wavre, and by Napoleon, who acted on conjecture that the Prussians would hurry towards their base at Liège. The morning at Quatre Bras was peaceful; the Allies cooked their food before starting rearward. Wellington, it is said, lay down for a moment, and snatched perhaps a little sleep. There was no stir in front or on the exposed left flank; and, covered by a strong display of horsemen, the Allied divisions tramped steadily towards Mont St. Jean. . . . The retreat continued all day. A thunderstorm, so often a precursor of Wellington's battles, deluged the

fields with rain, and pursuer and pursued struggling through the mire, were drenched to the skin by nightfall. . . . The results of two days' warfare may be thus summed up. Napoleon had inflicted a defeat, yet not a decisive defeat, upon the Prussians, who escaped from his ken to Wavre. He had then, at a late hour on the 17th, detached Grouchy with 33,000 men to follow them, and Grouchy at night from Gembloux reported that they had retired in three directions. Moving himself in the afternoon, Napoleon, uniting with Ney, had pursued Wellington to Mont St. Jean, and slept in the comfortable belief that he had separated the Allies. At that very time Wellington, who had assembled his whole force except 17,000 men, . . . was in close communication with Blücher, and intended on the 18th to stop Napoleon by delivering battle, and to hold him fast until Blücher could cut in on his right flank and rear. Thus it was the Allies who were united practically, and the French army which was separated into two groups unable to support each other. . . . The tempest which burst over the retreating columns on the 17th followed them to their bivouacs and raged all night, and did not cease until late on the fateful Sunday. Wellington, mounting his faithful Copenhagen at break of day, rode from the village of Waterloo to the field, where the armies on both sides, protected by watchful sentries, were still contending with the mischiefs inflicted by the storm. The position was the crest of a gentle slope stretching from Smohain to the Nivelles road, having upon and in advance of its right the château, garden, and wood of Hougomont, and in the centre, where the Charleroi road cut through the little ridge, the farm of La Haye Sainte. Both these posts were occupied, but the latter, unfortunately, not so solidly as Hougomont. . . . The position was well filled by the 69,000 men of all arms and 156 guns which were present that day. Napoleon, who slept at the farm of Caillou, and who had been out on foot to the front during the night, was also early in the field, and glad of the gift which he thought fortune had placed in his hands. When Reille had joined him from Genappe, he had 72,000 men, all admirable soldiers, and 240 guns, with which to engage in combat, and he reckoned that the chances were ninety to ten in his favour. He mounted his charger, reconnoitred his opponent's position, and then gave the orders which, promptly and finely obeyed, disclosed the French array. . . . It was now nearly eleven o'clock, and, although his opponent knew it not, Wellington had got news of the march from Wavre of Bulow, whose leading troops were actually, at that time, close to the wood of St. Lambert on the French right; while Grouchy was at Sart les Walhain, between Gembloux and Wavre. It is not practicable here to give a full account of the battle of Waterloo; we can only describe its broad outlines. The first gun was fired about twenty or thirty minutes past eleven, and precluded a dashing and sustained attack on Hougomont, which failed to carry the house, garden, or orchard, but did gain the wood. It was probably intended to divert attention from the attack on the left and centre, which Ney, massing his guns opposite the British left, was preparing to execute. Wellington watched and in some measure controlled the fight for Hougomont, and then rode off to the centre, taking post

at a solitary tree which grew near the Charleroi road above La Haye Sainte. Ney at half past one sent forward the whole of D'Erlon's corps, and although some of them pushed close up to and over the Wavre road, stormed the orchard of La Haye Sainte and took the Pappelotte farm, yet at the critical moment Sir William Ponsonby's Union Brigade of horse charged into the French infantry, already shattered by the fire of Picton's troops, and the net result of the combined operation was that two eagles and 3,000 prisoners were captured, while nearly that number of killed and wounded remained on the ground. On the other side of La Haye Sainte the Household Brigade, led by Lord Anglesea in person, charged in upon and routed a large body of French cuirassiers. The grand attack thus completely failed, and the centre, like the right, remained intact. It was just before this combat began that Napoleon saw something like troops towards St. Lambert and despatched two brigades of light cavalry to reconnoitre. A Prussian staff officer was caught beyond Planchenoit, and from him came the unexpected and unwelcome information that the whole Prussian army was approaching. . . . The signs of danger on his right flank, the punishment of D'Erlon's corps, the ineffectual attempt upon the British Guards in and about Hougomout, were followed by a kind of pause and the combat reverted to cannonading and skirmishing. But towards four o'clock Napoleon, increasing the fire of his artillery, threw forward a mass of cavalry, forty squadrons, and then began that series of reiterated onsets of horse which lasted for two hours. . . . Twice they were driven down the slope, and the third time, when they came on, they were strengthened by Kellerman and Guyot until they reached a force of 77 squadrons, or 12,000 men; but these also were repulsed, the British horse, what remained of them, charging when the French were entangled among the squares and disordered by the musketry and guns. Four times these fine troopers charged, yet utterly failed to penetrate or move a single foot battalion. But some time before the final effort, Ney by a fierce attack got possession of La Haye Sainte, and thus, just as the cavalry were exhausted, the French infantry were established within sixty yards of the Allied centre. And although the Emperor was obliged to detach one-half of his Guard to the right, because Blücher had brought into play beyond Planchenoit against Lobau nearly 30,000 men, still the capture of La Haye Sainte was justly regarded as a grave event. Wellington during the cavalry fight had moved three brigades on his right nearer to Hougomout, and had called up Chassé and his Belgians to support them; and it was a little before this time that he cried out to Brigadier-General Adam, 'By G—, Adam, I think we shall beat them yet!'. . . The crisis of the battle had come for Napoleon. Unable after eight hours' conflict to do more than capture La Haye Sainte; hardly pressed by the Prussians, now strong and aggressive; owing such success as he had obtained to the valour and discipline of his soldiers—the Emperor delivered his last stroke, not for victory—he could no longer hope to win—but for safety. He sent forward the last ten battalions of his Guard to assail the British right, and directed the whole remaining infantry force available to attack all along the line.

The Guard marched onward in two columns, which came successively in contact with their opponents. Napier's guns and the British Guards, who rising from the ground showed across the head of the first column, fired heavily and charging drove them in confusion back towards La Belle Alliance; and the second column, struck in flank by the musketry of the 52nd and 95th was next broken by a bayonet charge and pursued by Colonel Colborne to and beyond the Charleroi road. As Ziethen's Prussians were falling upon the French near Pappelotte, and Pirch and Bulow wrestling with the Imperial Guard in Planchenoit, Wellington ordered the whole of the British line to advance. The cheers arising on the right where he was, extended along the front and gave new strength to the wearied soldiers. He led the way. As he neared the Charleroi road, the riflemen, full of Peninsular memories, began to cheer him as he galloped up, but he called out, 'No cheering, my lads; forward and complete your victory.' He found that good soldier, Colborne, halted for a moment before three squares of the rallied Imperial Guard. 'Go on, Colborne,' he said; 'better attack them, they won't stand.' Nor did they. Wellington then turned to the right, where Vivian's Light Cavalry were active in the gloom, and we next find him once more with the 52nd near Rossomme, the farthest point of the advance, where that regiment halted after its grand march over the battlefield. Somewhere on the highway he met Blücher, who had so nobly kept his word, and it was then that Gneisenau undertook to chase the fugitives over the frontier. The French, or perhaps we should say the Napoleonic army, was destroyed, and the power which its mighty leader had built up on the basis of its astonishing successes was gone for ever."—G. Hooper, *Wellington*, ch. 9.

ALSO IN: D. Gardner, *Quatre Bras, Ligny, and Waterloo*.—Lt. Col. C. C. Chesney, *Waterloo Lect's*.—W. Siborne, *Hist. of the War in France and Belgium in 1815*.—Gen. Sir J. S. Kennedy, *Notes on the Battle of Waterloo*.—W. H. Maxwell, *Life of Wellington*, v. 3, ch. 28–32.—G. R. Gleig, *Story of the Battle of Waterloo*.—W. O'C. Morris, *Great Commanders of Modern Times, and the Campaign of 1815*.

A. D. 1815 (June–August).—Napoleon's return to Paris.—His final abdication.—His surrender of himself to the English.—His captivity at St. Helena.—"The vanquished army had lost 200 pieces of ordnance, and 30,000 men hors de combat or prisoners; as many more remained, independently of Grouchy's 35,000 men; but the difficulty was to rally them in presence of an enemy, that had taken lessons in audacity and activity from Napoleon himself. The loss of the allies was not less considerable, but there remained to them 150,000 men, the confidence of victory, and the certainty of being seconded by 300,000 allies, who were crossing the Rhine from Mentz to Bâle. Such was the issue of this struggle, commenced under such happy auspices, and which resulted more fatal to France than the battles of Poitiers and Azincourt. It must be admitted, that this disaster was the work of a multitude of unheard-of circumstances: if Napoleon can be reproached for certain faults, it must be allowed that fortune dealt cruelly with him in the lesser details, and that his enemies, in return, were as fortunate as

they showed themselves skillful. However unjust be the spirit of party, we are forced to render homage to the merits of two generals, who, unexpectedly attacked in their cantonments extending from Dinant and Liège to Renaix, near Tournay, had taken such wise measures as to be in condition next morning for giving battle to equal forces, and for afterwards conquering by an able concentration of the two armies. . . . In the very battle of Waterloo, the French might be censured for having attempted the first attack in masses too deep. This system was never successful against the murderous fire of English infantry and artillery. . . . There were likewise extraordinary charges of cavalry, which, being devoid of support, became heroic but useless struggles. Notwithstanding all this, it is almost certain that Napoleon would have remained master of the field of battle, but for the arrival of 65,000 Prussians on his rear; a decisive and disastrous circumstance, that to prevent was not entirely in his power. As soon as the enemy led 130,000 men on the battle-field, with scarcely 50,000 to oppose them, all was lost. . . . Napoleon had but one course left him, which was to direct Grouchy through the Ardennes on Laon, to collect at this point all that could be drawn from the interior, from Metz and from Rapp's corps, leaving but garrisons in Lorraine and Alsace. The imperial cause was very much shaken, but not entirely lost; should all Frenchmen determine on opposing Europe with the courage of the Spartans of Leonidas, the energy of the Russians in 1812, or of the Spaniards of Palafox. Unfortunately for them, as for Napoleon, opinion was very much divided on this subject, and the majority still believing that the struggle interested only the power of the emperor and his family, the fate of the country seemed of little consequence. Prince Jerome had collected 25,000 men in rear of Avesnes; he was ordered to lead them to Laon; there remained 200 pieces of artillery, beside those of Grouchy. . . . Reaching Laon on the 19th, where he had at first resolved to await the junction of Grouchy and Jerome, the emperor discussed, with the small number of the trustworthy who had followed him, the course he should adopt after this frightful disaster. Should he repair to Paris, and concert with the chambers and his ministers, or else remain with the army, demanding of the chambers to invest him with dictatorial power and an unlimited confidence, under the conviction that he would obtain from them the most energetic measures, for saving France and conquering her independence, on heaps of ruins? As it always happens, his generals were divided in opinion; some wished him to proceed to Paris, and deposit the crown into the hands of the nation's delegates, or receive it from them a second time, with the means of defending it. Others, with a better appreciation of the views of the deputies, affirmed, that far from sympathizing with Napoleon, and seconding him, they would accuse him of having lost France, and would endeavor to save the country by losing the emperor. . . . Lastly, the most prudent thought that Napoleon should not go to Paris, but remain at the head of the army, in order to treat with the sovereigns himself, by offering to abdicate in favor of his son. It is said, that Napoleon inclined to the idea of remaining at Laon with the army; but the advice of the greatest number determined him,

and he departed for Paris."—Baron de Jomini, *Hist. of the Campaign of Waterloo*, pp. 184-189. —"It was a moment of unrelieved despair for the public men who gathered round him on his return to Paris, and among these were several whose fame was of earlier date than his own. La Fayette, the man of 1789; Carnot, organizer of victory to the Convention; Lucien, who had decided the revolution of Brumaire,—all these met in that comfortless deliberation. Carnot was for a dictatorship of public safety, that is, for renewing his great days of 1793; Lucien too liked the Roman sound of the word dictator. 'Dare!' he said to his brother, but the spring of that terrible will was broken at last. 'I have dared too much already,' said Napoleon. Meanwhile, in the Chamber of Representatives the word was not dictatorship but liberty. Here La Fayette caused the assembly to vote itself permanent, and to declare guilty of high treason whoever should attempt to dissolve it. He hinted that, if the word abdication were not soon pronounced on the other side, he would himself pronounce the word 'déchéance.' The second abdication took place on June 22d. 'I offer myself a sacrifice to the hatred of the enemies of France. My public life is finished, and I proclaim my son, under the title of Napoleon II., Emperor of the French.' On the 25th he retired to Malmaison, where Josephine had died the year before. He had by no means yet ceased to hope. When his son was passed over by the Chamber of Representatives, who named an executive commission of five, he protested that he had not intended to make way for a new Directory. . . . On the 27th he went so far as to offer his services once more as general, 'regarding myself still as the first soldier of the nation.' He was met by a refusal, and left Malmaison on the 29th for Rochefort, well furnished with books on the United States. France was by this time entering upon another Reign of Terror. Massacre had begun at Marseilles as early as the 25th. What should Napoleon do? He had been formerly the enemy of every other nation, and now he was the worst enemy, if not of France, yet of the triumphant faction in France. He lingered some days at Rochefort, where he had arrived on July 3d, and then, finding it impossible to escape the vigilance of the English cruisers, went on the 15th on board the 'Bellerophon' and surrendered himself to Captain Maitland. It was explained to him that no conditions could be accepted, but that he would be 'conveyed to England to be received in such manner as the Prince Regent should deem expedient.' He had written at the Île d'Aix the following characteristic letter to the Prince Regent:—'Royal Highness,—A prey to the factions which divide my country and to the enmity of the powers of Europe, I have terminated my public career, and I come, like Themistocles, to seat myself at the hearth of the British people. I place myself under the protection of its laws, which I claim from your Royal Highness as the most powerful, the most constant, and the most generous of my enemies.' It was perhaps the only course open to him. In France his life could scarcely have been spared, and Blücher talked of executing him on the spot where the Duc d'Enghien had fallen. He therefore could do nothing but what he did. His reference to Themistocles shows that he was conscious of being the worst enemy that England

had ever had. Perhaps he remembered that at the rupture of the treaty of Amiens he had studied to envenom the contest by detaining the English residents in France. Still he might reflect, on the other hand, that England was the only great country which had not been trampled down and covered with massacre by his soldiers. It would have been inexcusable if the English Government had given way to vindictive feelings, especially as they could well afford to be magnanimous, having just won the greatest of all victories. But it was necessary to deprive him of the power of exciting new wars, and the experiment of Elba had shown that this involved depriving him of his liberty. The frenzy which had cost the lives of millions must be checked. This was the principle laid down in the declaration of March 15th, by which he had been communicated as a public enemy. It was therefore necessary to impose some restraint upon him. He must be separated from his party and from all the revolutionary party in Europe. So long as he remained in Europe this would involve positive imprisonment. The only arrangement therefore which would allow him tolerable personal comfort and enjoyment of life, was to send him out of Europe. From these considerations grew the decision of the Government to send him to St. Helena. An Act of Parliament was passed 'for the better detaining in custody Napoleon Bonaparte,' and another Act for subjecting St. Helena to a special system of government. He was kept on board the 'Bellerophon' till August 4th, when he was transferred to the 'Northumberland.' On October 15th he arrived at St. Helena, accompanied by Counts Montholon, Las Cases, and Bertrand, with their families, General Gourgaud, and a number of servants. In April, 1816, arrived Sir Hudson Lowe, an officer who had been knighted for bringing the news of the capture of Paris in 1814, as governor. The rest of his life, which continued till May 5, 1821, was occupied partly in quarrels with this governor, which have now lost their interest, partly in the task he had undertaken at the time of his first abdication, that of relating his past life. He did not himself write this narrative, nor does it appear that he even dictated it word for word. It is a report made partly by General Gourgaud, partly by Count Montholon, of Napoleon's impassioned recitals; but they assure us that this report, as published, has been read and corrected throughout by him. It gives a tolerably complete account of the period between the siege of Toulon and the battle of Marengo. On the later period there is little, except a memoir on the campaign of 1815, to which the editors of the *Correspondence* have been able to add another on Elba and the Hundred Days.—J. R. Seeley, *Short Hist. of Napoleon I.*, ch. 6, sect. 5.

Also in: Count de Las Cases, *Life, Exile and Conversations of Napoleon*.—Gen. Count Montholon, *Hist. of the Captivity of Napoleon*.—W. Forsyth, *Hist. of the Captivity of Napoleon*.—B. E. O'Meara, *Napoleon in Exile*.—Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 49–56.—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire*, ch. 61–62 (v. 5).

A. D. 1815 (July–November).—English and Prussian armies in Paris.—Return of Louis XVIII.—Restoration of the art-spoils of Napoleon.—Indemnities demanded.—Russian, Austrian and Spanish armies on French soil.—The second Treaty of Paris.—"The 7th of July was

the proudest day in the annals of England. On that day her victorious army, headed by Wellington, made their public entry, along with the Prussians, into Paris, where an English drum had not been heard for nearly four hundred years. . . . The French regarded them with melancholy hearts and anxious looks. Few persons were to be seen in the streets. . . . The English established themselves in the Bois de Boulogne in a regular camp; the Prussians bivouacked in the churches, on the quays, and in the principal streets. On the following day Louis XVIII., who had followed in the rear of the English army from Ghent, made his public entrance, escorted by the national guard. But his entry was attended by still more melancholy circumstances, and of sinister augury to the future stability of his dynasty. Even the royalists were downcast; their patriotic feelings were deeply wounded by the defeat of France. . . . There was something in the restoration of the monarch by the arms of the old rivals and enemies of France which added inexpressibly to its bitterness. . . . The reality of subjugation was before their eyes. Blucher kept aloof from all intercourse with the court, and haughtily demanded a contribution of 100,000,000 francs . . . for the pay of his troops, as Napoleon had done from the Prussians at Berlin. Already the Prussian soldiers insisted with loud cries that the pillar of Austerlitz should be pulled down, as Napoleon had destroyed the pillar of Rosbach; and Blucher was so resolute to destroy the bridge of Jena, that he had actually begun operations by running mines under the arches for blowing it up. . . . Wellington as steadily resisted the ruthless act, but he had great difficulty in maintaining his point; and it was only by his placing a sentinel on the bridge, and repeated and earnest remonstrances, that the destruction of that beautiful monument was prevented. . . . A still more melancholy humiliation than they had yet experienced ere long befell the French nation. The Allied sovereigns now arrived in Paris, and insisted upon the restoration of the objects of art in the museum of the Louvre, which had been pillaged from their respective states by the orders of Napoleon. The justice of this demand could not be contested: it was only wresting the prey from the robber. . . . Nothing wounded the French so profoundly as this breaking up of the trophies of the war. It told them, in language not to be misunderstood, that conquest had now reached their doors: the iron went into the soul of the nation. A memorial from all the artists of Europe at Rome claimed for the Eternal City the entire restoration of the immortal works of art which had once adorned it. The Allied sovereigns acceded to the just demand; and Canova, impassioned for the arts and the city of his choice, hastened to Paris to superintend the removal. It was most effectually done. The bronze horses . . . [from Venice] were restored to their old station in front of the Church of St. Mark. The Transfiguration and the Last Communion of St. Jerome resumed their place in the halls of the Vatican; the Apollo and the Laocoon again adorned the precincts of St. Peter's; the Venus was enshrined anew amidst beauty in the Tribune of Florence; and the Descent from the Cross by Rubens was restored to the devout worship of the Flemings in the cathedral of Antwerp. . . . The claims preferred by the different Allied powers for restitution not merely of celebrated objects of art,

but of curiosities and valuable articles of all kinds, which had been carried off by the French during their occupation of the different countries of Europe, especially under Napoleon, were immense, and demonstrated at once the almost incredible length to which the system of spoliation and robbery had been carried by the republican and imperial authorities. Their amount may be estimated by one instance from an official list, prepared by the Prussian authorities in 1815. It appears that, during the years 1806 and 1807, there had been violently taken from the Prussian states, on the requisition of M. Donore, and brought to Paris,—statues, paintings, antiquities, cameos, manuscripts, maps, gems, antiques, rarities, and other valuable articles, the catalogue of which occupies 53 closely printed pages of M. Schoell's valuable *Recueil*. Among them are 127 paintings, many of them of the very highest value, taken from the palaces of Berlin and Potsdam alone; 187 statues, chiefly antique, taken from the same palaces during the same period; and 86 valuable manuscripts and documents seized in the city of Aix-la-Chapelle, on the occupation of that city, then a neutral power, in 1803, by the armies of the First Consul on the invasion of Hanover. The total articles reclaimed by the Prussians exceeded two thousand. . . . The claims of states and cities for indemnity on account of the enormous exactions made from them by the French generals, under the authority of the Convention and the Emperor, were still more extraordinary. . . . The vast amount of these claims for indemnities in money or territories, and the angry feelings with which they were urged, were of sinister augury to the French nation, and augmented, in a most serious degree, the difficulties experienced by those who were intrusted with the conduct of the negotiations. But, be they what they may, the French had no means of resisting them; all they could trust to was the moderation or jealousies of their conquerors. The force which, during the months of July and August, advanced from all quarters into their devoted territory, was immense, and such as demonstrated that, if Napoleon had not succeeded in dissolving the alliance by an early victory in the Netherlands, the contest, even without the battle of Waterloo, would have been hopeless. The united armies of Russians and Austrians, 350,000 strong, under Schwartzenberg and Barclay de Tolly, crossed the Rhine in various places from Bâle to Coblenz, and, pressing rapidly forward, soon occupied the whole eastern provinces of France. The Austrians and Piedmontese, a hundred thousand more, passed Mont Cenis, or descended the Rhone from Geneva to Lyons. The Spaniards made their appearance in Bearn or Roussillon. The armies of Blücher and Wellington, now reinforced to 200,000 effective men, occupied Paris, its environs, Normandy, and Picardy. Eighty thousand Prussians and Germans, in addition, were advancing through the Rhenish provinces and Belgium. Before the Allied sovereigns returned to Paris, in the middle of July, the French territory was occupied by 800,000 men, to oppose which no considerable force remained but the army beyond the Loire, which mustered 65,000 combatants. . . . Austria insisted upon getting back Lorraine and Alsace; Spain put in a claim to the Basque provinces; Prussia alleged that her security would be incomplete unless Mayence, Luxembourg, and all the

frontier provinces of France adjoining her territory, were ceded to her; and the King of the Netherlands claimed the whole of the French fortresses of the Flemish barrier. The monarchy of Louis seemed on the eve of dissolution; and so complete was the prostration of the vanquished, that there appeared no power capable of preventing it. It was with no small difficulty, and more from the mutual jealousies of the different powers than any other cause, that these natural reprisals for French rapacity were prevented from taking place. The negotiation was protracted at Paris till late in autumn; Russia, which had nothing to gain by the proposed partition, took part with France throughout its whole continuance; and the different powers, to support their pretensions in this debate, maintained their armies, who had entered on all sides, on the French soil; so that above 800,000 foreign troops were quartered on its inhabitants for several months. At length, however, by the persevering efforts of Lord Castlereagh, M. Nesselrode, and M. Talleyrand, all difficulties were adjusted, and the second treaty of Paris was concluded in November 1815, between France and the whole Allied powers. By this treaty, and the relative conventions which were signed the same day, conditions of a very onerous kind were imposed upon the restored government. The French frontier was restored to the state in which it stood in 1790, by which means the whole of the territory, far from inconsiderable, gained by the treaty of 1814, was resumed by the Allies. In consequence of this, France lost the fortresses of Landau, Sarre-Louis, Philipville, and Marienburg, with the adjacent territory of each. Versoix, with a small district round it, was ceded to the canton of Geneva; the fortress of Huningen was to be demolished; but the little country of the Venaisin, the first conquest of the Revolution, was preserved to France. Seven hundred millions of francs (£28,000,000 sterling) were to be paid to the Allied powers for the expenses of the war; in addition to which it was stipulated that an army of 150,000 men, composed of 30,000 from each of the great powers of England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, and the lesser powers of Germany, was to occupy, for a period not less than three, or more than five years, the whole frontier fortresses of France; . . . and this large force was to be maintained entirely at the expense of the French government. In addition to this, the different powers obtained indemnities for the spoiliations inflicted on them by France during the Revolution, which amounted to the enormous sum of 735,000,000 of francs more (£29,400,000 sterling). A hundred millions of francs were also provided to the smaller powers as an indemnity for the expenses of the war; so that the total sums which France had to pay, besides maintaining the army of occupation, amounted to no less than fifteen hundred and thirty-five millions of francs, or £61,400,000 sterling. . . . Great Britain, in a worthy spirit, surrendered the whole sum falling to her out of the indemnity for the war, amounting to nearly £5,000,000 sterling, to the King of the Netherlands, to restore the famous barrier against France which Joseph II. had so insensibly demolished."—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe, 1789–1815*, ch. 95 (v. 20).

Also in: Prince de Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, pt. 9 (v. 3).—E. Hertslet, *The Map of Europe by Treaty*, No. 40 (v. 1).

A. D. 1815 (September).—The Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1815-1830.—The restored monarchy.—Louis XVIII. and Charles X.—Career of the Reactionaries.—Conquest of Algiers.—Ordinances of July.—Revolution.—Abdication and exile of the king.—“France was defeated but not crushed. Indeed she had gained Avignon and some districts of Alsace since 1792, and she had gained social and political stability by having millions of peasants as small proprietors in the soil; moreover, as Napoleon always waged his wars at the expense of his conquered foes, the French national debt was after all the wars only one-sixth of the debt of Great Britain. So France soon rose to a position of strength and prosperity hardly equalled in all Europe, in spite of bad harvests, political unrest, and the foreign occupation which ended in 1818. The royalists, after a quarter of a century of repression, now revenged themselves with truly French vehemence. In France a victorious party generally crushes its opponents; and the elections, held during the full swing of the royalist reaction, sent up to Paris a Legislative Assembly ‘more royalist than the king himself.’ Before it assembled, Louis XVIII., in spite of his promise only to punish those who were declared by the Assembly to be traitors, proscribed fifty-seven persons who had deserted to Napoleon in the ‘Hundred Days.’ . . . Of the proscribed men thirty-eight were banished and a few were shot. Among the latter the most illustrious was Marshal Ney, whose past bravery did not shield him from the extreme penalty for the betrayal of the military oath. . . . This impolitic execution rankled deep in the breasts of all Napoleon’s old soldiers, but for the present all opposition was swept away in the furious tide of reaction. Brune, one of Napoleon’s marshals, was killed by the royalist populace of Avignon; and the Protestants of the south, who were suspected of favouring Napoleon’s home policy, suffered terrible outrages at Nîmes and Uzès in this ‘white terror.’ The restored monarchy had far stronger executive powers than the old system wielded before 1789, for it now drew into its hands the centralised powers which, under the Directory and the Empire, had replaced the old cumbrous provincial system; but even this gain of power did not satisfy the hot-headed royalists of the Chamber. They instituted judicial courts under a provost (*prévôt*), which passed severe sentences without right of appeal. Dismissing the comparatively Liberal ministers Talleyrand and Fouché, Louis in September 1816 summoned a more royalist ministry under the Duc de Richelieu, which was itself hurried on by the reactionaries. Chateaubriand fanned the flames of royalist passion by his writings, until the king even found it necessary to dissolve this mischievous Chamber, and the new deputies who assembled (February 1817) showed a more moderate spirit. France was soon delivered from the foreign armies of occupation, for the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, meeting at Aix-la-Chapelle (September 1818), in order to combat revolutionary attempts, decided that an early evacuation of French territory would strengthen the Bourbon rule in France; and they renewed the Quadruple Alliance, which aimed at upholding existing treaties. The discontent in Germany and Italy awakened a sympathetic echo in France, which

showed itself in the retirement of the Duc de Richelieu and the accession of a more progressive minister, Decazes (November 1819). This check to the royalist reaction was soon swept away by an event of sinister import. The Duc de Berry, second son of the Comte d’Artois, was assassinated (February 1820), as he was leaving the opera-house, by a fanatic who aimed at cutting off the direct Bourbon line (February 1820). His design utterly failed, for a posthumous son, the celebrated Comte de Chambord, was born in September 1820; and the only result was a new outburst of royalist fury. Liberty of the press was suspended, and a new complicated electoral system restricted the franchise to those who paid at least 1,000 francs a year in direct taxation: the Chamber of Deputies, a fifth part of which was renewed every year by an electorate now representing only the wealthy, became every year more reactionary, while the Left saw its numbers decline. The ultra-royalist ministry of Villèle soon in its turn aroused secret conspiracies, for the death of Napoleon (May 5, 1821) was now awakening a feeling of regret for the comparative liberty enjoyed in France during the Empire. Military conspiracies were formed, only to be discovered and crushed, and the veteran republican Lafayette was thought to be concerned in a great attempt projected in the eastern departments with its headquarters at Belfort; and the terrible society of the Carbonari secretly spread its arms through the south of France, where it found soil as favourable as in Italy itself. . . . A revolution in Spain held Ferdinand a prisoner in his palace at Madrid. Louis determined to uphold the throne of his Bourbon relative, and sent an army which quickly effected its object (1823). ‘The Pyrenees no longer exist,’ exclaimed Louis XVIII. In fact, everywhere in Europe absolutism seemed to be triumphant, and the elections of December 1823 sent up a further reinforcement to the royalist party; also the approaching end of the sensible old king foreshadowed a period of still more violent reaction under his hot-headed brother Charles. Louis XVIII. died on September 16, 1824. At his death the restoration seemed firmly established. . . . France had quickly recovered from twenty years of warfare, and was thought to have the strongest government in Europe. Always the chief of the reactionary nobles, Charles had said, ‘It is only Lafayette and I who have not changed since 1789.’ Honest, sincere, and affable as the new king was, yet his popularity soon vanished when it was seen how entirely he was under the control of his confessor; and the ceremonies of his coronation at Rheims showed that he intended to revive the almost forgotten past. In Guizot’s words, ‘Louis XVIII. was a moderate of the old system and a liberal-minded inheritor of the 18th century: Charles X. was a true *émigré*, and a submissive bigot.’ Among the first bills which Charles proposed to the Chambers was one to indemnify those who had lost their lands in the Revolution. To give these lands back would have caused general unsettlement among thousands of small cultivators; but the former landowners received an indemnity of a milliard of francs, which they exclaimed against for its insufficiency just as loudly as the radicals did for its extravagance: by this tardy act of justice the State endeavoured to repair some of the unjust confiscations of the revolutionary era.

... The attempts made by the Jesuits to regain their legal status in France, in spite of the prohibition dating from before the fall of the old régime, aroused further hostility to the king, who was well known to favour their cause. Nothing, however, so strengthened the growing opposition in the Chambers and in the country at large as a rigorous measure aimed at the newspapers, pamphlets, and books which combated the clerical reaction. These publications were to pay a stamp duty per page, while crushing fines were devised to ruin the offending critics. One of the leaders of the opposition, Casimir Périer, exclaimed against this measure as ruinous to trade: 'Printing would be suppressed in France and transferred to Belgium.' The king persevered in his mad enterprise: he refused to receive a petition from the most august literary society in Europe, the Académie Française, and cashiered its promoters as if they were clerks under his orders. Strange to say, the Chamber of Deputies passed the measure, while that of the Peers rejected it—an event greeted by illuminations all over Paris (April 1827). A few days afterwards, at a review of the National Guards in Paris, the troops raised cries for the liberty of the press and for the charter granted in 1815. The next day they were disbanded by royal command, but were foolishly allowed to retain their arms, which were soon to be used against the government. Charles next created seventy-six new peers to outvote his opponents in the Upper House. He also dissolved the Chamber of Deputies, but found the new members less pliable. Finally, Charles had to give way for the time, and accept a more moderate ministry under Martignac in place of the reactionary Villèle Cabinet. . . . Charles was soon able to dismiss this ministry, the last hope of conciliation, and formed (August 1829) a ministry under Count Polignac, one of whose colleagues was the General Bourmont who had deserted to the allies the day before Waterloo. The king's speech at the opening of the next session (March 1830) was curt and threatening, and the Chamber was soon prorogued. Reform banquets, a custom which the French borrowed from English reformers, increased the agitation, which the Polignac ministry vainly sought to divert by ambitious projects of invasion and partition of some neighbouring States. The only practical outcome of these projects was the conquest of the pirate stronghold of Algiers. This powerful fortress had been bombarded and reduced by Lord Exmouth with the British fleet in 1816, and the captives, mostly Italians, were released from that den of slave-dealers; but the Dey of Algiers had resumed his old habits, complaints from the French were met by defiance, and at last the French envoy quitted the harbour amid a shower of bullets. A powerful expedition effected a landing near the strongly-fortified harbour, and easily beat back the native attack; and then from the land side soon battered down the defences of the city [see BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1830]. Thus the city which had long been the terror of Mediterranean sailors became the nucleus of the important French colony of Algeria (July 4, 1830). The design of Charles X. and of his reactionary Polignac ministry to divert the French people from domestic grievances to foreign conquest needed the genius and strength of a Napoleon to ensure success. The mere fact of

the expedition being under the command of the hated General Bourmont had made it unpopular.

... So, although the victory was triumphantly announced throughout France, yet the elections sent up a majority hostile to the king. Nevertheless, with his usual blind obstinacy, Charles on the 25th July 1830 issued the famous ordinances which brought matters to a crisis. The first suspended the liberty of the press, and placed books under a strict censorship; the second dissolved the newly-elected Chamber of Deputies; the third excluded licensed dealers (*patentés*) from the franchise; the fourth summoned a new Chamber under the new conditions, every one of which violated the charter granted by the late king. The Parisians at once flew to arms, and raised barricades in the many narrow streets which then favoured street-defence. Marmont, hated by the people as being the first of Napoleon's marshals who had treated with the allies, was to quell the disturbances with some 20,000 troops of the line; but on the second day's fighting (July 28) the insurgents, aided by the disbanded National Guards, and veterans of the empire, beat back the troops; and on the third day the royal troops, cut off from food and supplies, and exhausted by the heat, gave way before the tricolour flag; the defection of two line regiments left the Louvre unguarded; a panic spread among other regiments, and soon the tricolour floated above the Tuileries. Charles thereupon set the undignified example, soon to be followed by so many kings and princes, of giving way when it was too late. He offered to withdraw the hated ordinances, but was forced to flee from St. Cloud. He then tried the last expedient, also doomed to failure, of abdicating in favour of his little grandson the Duc de Bordeaux, since better known as the Comte de Chambord. Retiring slowly with his family to Cherbourg, the baffled monarch set out for a second and last exile, spent first at Holyrood Palace, Edinburgh, and ended at Göritz in Bohemia. More than 5,000 civilians and 700 soldiers were killed or wounded in these terrible 'three days' of July 1830, which ended all attempts to re-establish the tyranny of the old régime. The victims were appropriately buried in the Place de la Bastille. They freed not France alone, but dealt a fierce blow at the system of Metternich." —J. H. Rose, *Century of Continental History*, ch. 23.

ALSO IN: D. Turnbull, *The French Rev. of 1830*.—A. de Lamartine, *The Restoration of Monarchy in France*, bk. 32-50 (v. 3-4).—E. E. Crowe, *Hist. of the Reigns of Louis XVIII. and Charles X.*—Prince de Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, pt. 10 (v. 3-4).—G. L. Dickinson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France*, ch. 3.

A. D. 1822.—The Congress of Verona.—French intervention in Spain approved. See VERONA: THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1823-1827.—Interference in Spain, to suppress the revolution and reinstate King Ferdinand. See SPAIN: A. D. 1814-1827.

A. D. 1827-1829.—Intervention on behalf of Greece.—Battle of Navarino. See GREECE: A. D. 1821-1829.

A. D. 1830-1840.—The monarchy renewed under Louis Philippe.—Its steady drift from the constitutional course.—"The Constitutional party set their hopes on Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans. This prince, born in 1773, was the

son of that notorious 'Egalité' who during the revolution had ended his checkered career under the guillotine. His grandmother was the noble Elizabeth Charlotte, a native of the Palatinate, who had the misfortune to be the wife of the effeminate Duke of Orleans, brother of Louis XIV. Louis Philippe was a Bourbon, like King Charles; but the opposition of several members of this Orleans branch of the royal house had caused it to be regarded as a separate family. From his youth up he had displayed a great deal of popular spirit and common-sense. . . . Seemingly created by his nature and career to be a citizen king, he had long since, as early as 1814, determined to accept the throne in case it were offered him." The offer came in 1830 with the revolution of July. On the 31st of that month he accepted the office of lieutenant-general of the kingdom, conferred by the vote of a meeting of fifty delegates. "The 'Society of the Friends of the People' [an organization of the pronounced republicans], not very well pleased with this result of the 'great week' [as the week of the revolution was called], laid before Lafayette, on the following day," their programme, "and commissioned him to make the duke guarantee the popular rights therein set forth by his signature. With this document in his pocket, Lafayette made his . . . visit to Louis Philippe in the Palais Royal. In the course of conversation he said to him, 'You know that I am a republican, and consider the American constitution the most perfect.' 'I am of the same opinion,' replied the duke; 'no one could have been two years in America and not share that view. But do you think that that constitution could be adopted in France in its present condition—with the present state of popular opinion?' 'No,' said Lafayette; 'what France needs is a popular monarchy surrounded by republican—thoroughly republican—institutions.' 'There I quite agree with you,' rejoined Louis Philippe. Enchanted with this political harmony, the old general considered it unnecessary to present the programme, and went security to the republicans for the duke, the patriot of 1789. . . . On the 3d of August the Chamber was opened by the Duke of Orleans, and the abdication of the king and dauphin announced. . . . The question whether the constitution was to be changed, and how, gave rise to an animated contest between radicals and liberals. The confidence in Louis Philippe was so great, that they were content with a few improvements. The throne was declared vacant, and Louis Philippe proclaimed king of the French. . . . August 8th, Louis Philippe appeared in the Palais Bourbon, took the oath to the constitution, and was thereupon proclaimed king. . . . None of the great monarchs had so difficult a task as Louis Philippe. If he attached himself to the majority of his people and showed himself in earnest with 'the republican institutions which ought to surround the throne,' he had all the continental powers against him; if he inclined toward the absolute system of the latter, then not alone the extreme parties, but also the men of the constitutional monarchy, . . . rose against him. . . . His system, which he himself named a happy medium (*juste milieu*), would have been a happy medium if he had struck the middle and kept it; but he gradually swerved so much toward the right that the middle was far to his left. From the outset he had

three parties against him—Legitimists, Bonapartists, and Republicans." At intervals, there were demonstrations and insurrections undertaken in the interest of each of these. In July, 1835, the assassination of the king was attempted, by the explosion of an infernal machine, which killed and wounded sixty people. "The whole Republican party was unjustly made responsible for this attempt, and new blows were struck at the juries and the Press. Every Press offence involving a libel of the king or the administration was to be tried from this time on before the Court of Peers, and the composition of that body rendered conviction certain. With these 'September laws' the reaction was complete, the power of the Republicans was broken. Their activity did not cease, however. Their numerous societies continued to exist in secret, and to the political affiliated themselves the social societies, which . . . demanded, among other impossibilities, the abolition of private property. It was these baleful excrescences which deprived republicanism of all credit, and outbreaks like that of May 12th, 1839, where a few hundred members of the 'Society of the Seasons,' with Barbès and Blanqui at their head, disarmed military posts and proclaimed the republic, found not the slightest response. The repeated attempts which were made on the king's life were also unsuccessful." The relations of Louis Philippe "to foreign powers became better the more he approximated to their system, putting restraints upon societies, the Press, and juries, and energetically crushing popular revolts. Naturally he was by this very means constantly further estranging the mass of the people. . . . What the Legitimists and Republicans had not effected—a change of government—the Napoleonids now took in hand." Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, son of ex-king Louis of Holland and Hortense Beauharnais, made his appearance among the soldiers of the garrison at Strasburg, October 30, 1836, with the expectation that they would proclaim him emperor and set the example of a rising in his favor. But the attempt was a wretched failure; Louis Napoleon was arrested and contemptuously sent out of the country, to America, without punishment. In 1840 he repeated his undertaking, at Boulogne, more abortively than in the first instance; was again made prisoner, and was consigned, this time, to the castle of Ham, from which he escaped six years later. "All the world laughed at his folly; but without the scenes of Strasburg and Boulogne, and the martyrdom of a six years' imprisonment, his name certainly would not have produced such an effect in the year 1848."—W. Müller, *Political History of Recent Times*, sect. 7 and 14.

ALSO IN: L. Blanc, *Hist. of Ten Years, 1830-1840*.—F. P. Guizot, *Memoirs to Illustrate the Hist. of My Own Time*, v. 3-4.

A. D. 1831-1832.—Intervention in the Netherlands.—Siege of Antwerp. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1830-1832.

A. D. 1833-1840.—The Turko-Egyptian question and its settlement. See TURKS: A. D. 1831-1840.

A. D. 1833-1846.—The subjugation of Algeria.—War with Abd-el-Kader. See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1830-1846.

A. D. 1841-1848.—The limited electoral body and its corruption.—Agitation for reform.—The suppressed banquet at Paris and the

revolution which followed.—**Abdication and flight of the king.**—"The monarchy of Louis Philippe lasted for 18 years. But the experiment was practicable only so long as the throne rested on a small body of obedient electors. The qualification for the franchise was so high that it was held only by 200,000 people. So small a constituency could be 'managed' by the skill of M. Guizot and M. Thiers [who were the chief rivals of the time in political leadership]. It could be 'managed' through gifts of places, bribes, the influence of local magnates, and the pressure of public officials. There was never perhaps so corrupt an electoral body. . . . M. Guizot, who was an austere puritan at home, and who has entered into a competition with Saint Augustin as a writer of religious meditations, raised many sneers to the lips of worldlings, not only by lending his hand to the infamous intrigue of the Spanish Marriages, but by allowing his subordinates to traffic in places for the sake of getting votes. His own hands, of course, were clean; no one spoke a whisper against his personal purity. But he seemed to have much practical sympathy with the advice which Pitt, in one of Landor's 'Imaginary Conversations,' gives to his young disciple Canning. Pecuniary corruption was the very breath of life to the constitutional monarchy. The voters were bought as freely as if they had stood in the market-place. The system admirably suited the purpose of the little family party of princes and parliamentary chiefs who ruled the country. But it was as artificial and fleeting as the sand castles which a child builds on the edge of the advancing tide."—J. Macdonell, *France since the First Empire*, pp. 172-174.—"The population of France was then 34,000,000, and the privilege of the political franchise was vested exclusively in those who paid in direct taxes a sum not less than £8. This class numbered little more than 200,000. . . . The government had 130,000 places at its disposal, and the use which was made of these during the 18 years of Louis Philippe's reign was productive of corruption more widespread and shameless than France had known since the first revolution. In the scarcely exaggerated language used by M. de Lamartine, the government had 'succeeded in making of a nation of citizens a vile band of beggars.' It was obvious to all who desired the regeneration of France that reform must begin with the representation of the people. To this end the liberals directed much effort. They did not as yet propose universal suffrage, and their leaders were divided between an extension of the franchise to all who paid £3 of direct taxes and an extension which went no lower than £4. The demand for reform was resisted by the government. . . . Among the leaders of the liberal party were men of high character and commanding influence. Arago, Odillon Barrot, Louis Blanc, Thiers, Lamartine, were formidable assailants for the strongest government to encounter. Under their guidance the agitation for reform assumed dimensions exceedingly embarrassing and even alarming. For once France borrowed from England her method of political agitation. Reform banquets, attended by thousands of persons, were held in all the chief towns, and the pressure of a peaceful public opinion was employed to obtain the remedy of a great wrong. The police made feeble attempts to prevent such gatherings, but were

ordinarily unsuccessful. But the king and M. Guizot, strong in the support of the army and a purchased majority of the deputies, and apparently little aware of the vehemence of the popular desire, made no effort to satisfy or propitiate. Louis Philippe had wisely set a high value on the maintenance of cordial relations with England. . . . The Queen of England gratified him by a visit [1843], which he returned a few months after. . . . During these visits there was much conversation regarding a Spanish matter which was then of some interest. The Spanish government was looking around to find suitable husbands for their young queen and her sister. The hands of the princesses were offered to two sons of Louis Philippe. But . . . England looked with disfavour upon a close alliance between the crowns of France and Spain. The king would not offend England. He declined the hand of the Spanish queen, but accepted that of her sister for his fourth son, the Duc de Montpensier. Queen Victoria and her ministers approved of that marriage on the condition voluntarily offered by King Louis, that it should not take place till the Spanish queen was married and had children. But in a few years the king violated his pledge, and pressed upon Spain an arrangement under which the two marriages were celebrated together [1846]. . . . To Louis Philippe himself the transaction was calamitous. He had broken his kingly word, and he stood before Europe and before his own people a dishonoured man. . . . Circumstances made it easy for the opposition to enhance the general discontent. Many evidences of shameless corruption were at this time brought to light. . . . The crops failed in 1845 and 1846, and prices rose to a famine point. . . . The demand for parliamentary reform became constantly more urgent; but M. Guizot heeded it not. The reformers took up again their work of agitation. They announced a great procession and reform banquet. The police, somewhat hesitatingly, interdicted the demonstration, and its promoters resolved to submit; but the people, insufficiently informed of these movements, gathered for the procession in the early morning. All that day [February 22, 1848] the streets were thronged, and the excitement of the people increased from hour to hour; but few soldiers were seen, and consequently no conflict occurred. Next morning the strategic points of the city were garrisoned by a strong force of soldiers and national guards, and the people saw that the government feared them. Business was suspended, and the constantly rising agitation foretold irrepressible tumults. The men of the faubourgs appeared once more. Towards evening a few barricades were thrown up, and a few gunsmiths' shops were plundered. Worst of all, the national guard appeared to sympathize with the people. . . . To appease the angry mob, no measure seemed so hopeful as the sacrifice of the ministry. Guizot resigned. Thiers and Odillon Barrot, chiefs of the liberal party, were received into the cabinet. Marshal Bugeaud was appointed to command the troops. But before the day closed a disaster had occurred which made all concession vain. Before one of the public offices there was stationed a battalion of infantry, around which there surged an excited crowd. A shot came from the crowd, and was promptly responded to by a volley which killed or wounded 50 persons. The bodies of the victims were

placed on waggons and drawn along the streets, that the fury of the people might be excited to the highest pitch. During that sleepless night, Marshal Bugeaud, skilfully directing the forces which he commanded, had taken the barricades and effectively checked the rioters. But in early morning the new ministers ordered him to desist and withdraw his troops. They deemed it useless to resist. Concession was, in their view, the only avenue to tranquillity. The soldiers retired; the crowds pressed on to the Tuileries." The king, terrified by their approach, was persuaded to sign an abdication in favor of his grandson, the Comte de Paris, and to fly in haste, with his family, from the palace and from Paris. A week later the royal family "reached the coast and embarked for England. . . . their majesties travelling under the lowly but well-chosen incognito of Mr. and Mrs. Smith. . . . Immediately on the departure of the king, a provisional government was organized, with M. Lamartine at its head."—R. Mackenzie, *The Nineteenth Century*, bk. 3, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: F. P. Guizot, *France under Louis Philippe*.—M. Caussidière, *Mémoires*, v. 1.

A. D. 1848 (February—May).—The three months of Provisional Government.—Its extraordinary measures.—Its absolutism.—Creation of the Ateliers Nationaux.—The consequences.—On the morning of February 24th—the morning of the king's flight—M. de Lamartine, entering the Palais Bourbon, where the Chamber of Deputies held its meetings, found in the vestibule seven or eight persons waiting for him. "Who they were we are not told—or what they were, except that they belonged to the newspaper press. Even the names of the papers with which they were connected are not expressly stated—though the 'National' and 'Réforme' are indicated. They demanded a secret conference. Lamartine took them into a distant apartment." There they "proposed to him to substitute for Louis-Philippe the Comte de Paris as king, and the Duchess of Orleans as regent, and to place him [Lamartine] over them as minister." "Lamartine does not appear to have been surprised at the proposal. He does not appear to have doubted the power of seven or eight journalists to dethrone a king, create a regent, and appoint a minister! And he was right. The 'National' and the 'Réforme,' whose representatives stood before him, did more than all this, a couple of hours after. . . . He objected to their scheme that such an arrangement would not last, and declared himself in favour of a republic, based on universal suffrage; . . . they expressed their conviction, and separated, agreed, apparently, on the course of action to be pursued." A few hours later, the Chamber was invaded by a body of rioters, fresh from the sack of the Tuileries. The Duchess of Orleans, who had presented herself at the Chamber with her two children, fled before them. "M. Sauzet, the President, disappeared. Lamartine [who was speaking] remained in the tribune, and desired Dupont de l'Eure to take the vacant chair." Thereupon a Provisional Government was appointed, in some fashion not clearly detailed. It underwent certain changes, by unexplained additions, within the following day or two, but "in the 'Moniteur' of February 27 (the third day of the existence of the Provisional Government), its members are arranged thus:—MM. Arago, Dupont de l'Eure, Albert

(ouvrier), F. Marrast, F. Flocon, Lamartine, Marie, L. Blanc, Crémieux, Ledru Rollin, Garnier Pagès. . . . Within two days after its formation it was on the brink of ruin under an attack from the Terrorists [or Red Republicans, who assumed the red flag as their standard]. . . . The contest had left the members of the government in a state of mind which M. de Lamartine thinks peculiarly favourable to wise legislation. . . . 'Every member of the Council sought [he says], in the depths of his heart and of his intellect, for some great reform, some great legislative, political, or moral improvement. Some proposed the instantaneous abolition of negro slavery. Others, the abolition of the restrictions imposed by the laws of September upon the press. Some, the proclamation of fraternity among nations, in order to abolish war by abolishing conquest. Some, the abolition of the qualification of electors. And all, the principles of mutual charity among all classes of citizens. As quickly as these great democratic truths, rather felt than discussed, were converted into decrees, they were printed in a press set up at the door of the council-room, thrown from the windows to the crowd, and despatched by couriers through the departments.' . . . The important decrees, which actually bear date February 25 or 26, and which may therefore be referred to this evening of instinct, inspiration, and enthusiasm, are these:—The 18th, which sets at liberty all persons detained on political grounds. The 19th, by which the government—1, Engages to secure the existence of the operative (ouvrier) by employment: 2, Engages to secure employment (garantir du travail) to all citizens: 3, Admits that operatives ought to combine in order to enjoy the fruits of their labour: 4, And promises to return to the operatives, whose property it is, the million which will fall in from the civil list. The 22nd, which dissolves the Municipal Guards. The 26th, which declares that the actual government of France is republican, and that the nation will immediately be called on to ratify by its votes this resolution of the government and of the people of Paris. The 29th, which declares that Royalty, under any name whatever, . . . is abolished. . . . And the 30th, which directs the immediate establishment of national workshops (ateliers nationaux). We confess that we agree with Lamartine in thinking that they bear the stamp of instinct much more than that of reason. . . . The declaration that the actual government of France was republican . . . was palpably untrue. The actual government of France at that time was as far removed from republicanism as it was possible for a government to be. It was a many-headed Dictatorship—a despotic oligarchy. Eleven men—some appointed in the offices of a newspaper, and the others by a mob which had broken into the Chamber of Deputies—ruled France, during three months, with an absoluteness of which there is no other example in history. . . . They dissolved the Chamber of Deputies; they forbade the peers to meet; they added 200,000 men to the regular army, and raised a new metropolitan army of 20,000 more at double the ordinary pay; to meet this expense they added 45 centimes to the direct taxes; they restricted the Bank from cash payments; they made its paper a legal tender, and then required it to lend them fifty millions; . . . they altered the hours of labour throughout France, and sub-

jected to heavy fines any master who should allow his operatives to remain at work for the accustomed period. . . . The necessary consequence of the 19th decree, promising employment to all applicants, was the creation of the ateliers nationaux by the 30th. These workshops were immediately opened in the outskirts of Paris. A person who wished to take advantage of the offers of the Government took from the person with whom he lodged a certificate that he was an inhabitant of the Département de la Seine. This certificate he carried to the mairie of his arrondissement, and obtained an order of admission to an atelier. If he was received and employed there, he obtained an order on his mairie for forty sous. If he was not received, after having applied at all of them, and found them all full, he received an order for thirty sous. Thirty sous is not high pay; but it was to be had for doing nothing; and hopes of advancement were held out. Every body of eleven persons formed an escouade; and their head, the escouadier, elected by his companions, got half a franc a day extra. Five escouades formed a brigade; and the brigadier, also elected by his subordinates, received three francs a day. Above these again were the lieutenants, the chefs de compagnie, the chefs de service, and the chefs d'arrondissement, appointed by the Government, and receiving progressively higher salaries. Besides this, bread was distributed to their families in proportion to the number of children. The hours supposed to be employed in labour were nine and a half. . . . This semi-military organisation, regular payment, and nominal work produced results which we cannot suppose to have been unexpected by the Government. M. Émile Thomas tells us that in one mairie, that containing the Faubourg St.-Antoine, a mere supplemental bureau enrolled, from March 12 to 20, more than 1,000 new applicants every day. We have before us a list of those who had been enrolled on May 19, and it amounts to 87,942. A month later it amounted to 125,000—representing, at 4 to a family, 600,000 persons—more than one half of the population of Paris. To suppose that such an army as this could be regularly organised, fed, and paid, for months in idleness, and then quietly disbanded, was a folly of which the Provisional Government was not long guilty. They soon saw that the monster which they had created could not be subdued, if it could be subdued at all, by any means short of civil war. . . . 'A thunder-cloud (says M. de Lamartine) was always before our eyes. It was formed by the ateliers nationaux. This army of 120,000 work-people, the great part of whom were idlers and agitators, was the deposit of the misery, the laziness, the vagrancy, the vice, and the sedition which the flood of the revolution had cast up and left on its shores.' . . . As they were managed, the ateliers nationaux, it is now admitted, produced or aggravated the very evils which they professed to cure or to palliate. They produced or continued the stagnation of business which they were to remedy; and, when they became absolutely intolerable, the attempt to put an end to them occasioned the civil war which they were to prevent."—N. W. Senior, *Journals kept in France and Italy, 1848-1852*, v. 1, pp. 14-59.

ALSO IN: Marquis of Normanby, *A Year of Revolution*, ch. 3-11 (v. 1).—L. Blanc, *Historical*

Revelations, 1848.—A. de Lamartine, *Hist. of the Revolution of 1848*.—J. P. Simpson, *Pictures from Revolutionary Paris*.

A. D. 1848 (April—December). The Constituent National Assembly, and the Constitution of the Second Republic.—Savage and terrible insurrection of the workmen of the Ateliers Nationaux.—Vigorous dictatorship of Cavaignac.—Appearance of Louis Napoleon.—His election to the Presidency of the Republic.—The election by universal suffrage of a Constituent National Assembly, twice deferred on account of fears of popular turbulence, took place on the 23d of April, and resulted in the return of a very Conservative majority, largely composed of Napoleonists, Legitimists and Orleanists. The meeting of the Assembly was opened on the 7th of May. "The moderates were anxious to invest M. de Lamartine with a dictatorial authority," which he declined. "Eventually an executive commission of five was appointed. . . . The commission consisted of Arago, Garnier Pagès, Marie, Lamartine, and Ledru Rollin. . . . This conciliatory executive commission was elected by the Assembly on the 10th of May. On the 15th, the 'conciliated' mob broke into the chamber, insulted the deputies, turned them out, proclaimed a provisional government, and then marched to the Hôtel de Ville, where they were installed with due revolutionary solemnity;" but the National Guard rallied to the support of the government, and the insurrection was promptly suppressed. "Eleven vacancies in the Assembly had to be filled in the department of the Seine, on account of double returns. These elections produced fresh uneasiness in Paris. Eighth on the list stood Louis Napoleon Bonaparte; and among the names mentioned as candidates was that of Prince de Joinville, the most popular of the Orleans princes. The executive commission appears to have been more afraid of the latter than of the former; and to prevent the disagreeable circumstance of France returning him to the Assembly as one of her representatives, they thought themselves justified in declaring the whole Orleans family incapable of serving France in any capacity. . . . Louis Napoleon, on the first proclamation of the Republic, had at once offered his services; but was by the Provisional Government requested to withdraw, as his great name might trouble the republic. . . . Two Bonapartes had been elected members for Corsica, and three sat in the Assembly; but, as the next heir of the Emperor, Louis Napoleon caused them much uneasiness. . . . Already mobs had gone about the Boulevard crying 'Vive l'Empereur.' The name of Bonaparte was not unpopular with the bourgeoisie; it was a guarantee of united and strong government to all. On his election, Louis Napoleon wrote to the President of the Assembly: a phrase in his letter gave considerable offence. Some days before, Lamartine had proposed his exclusion from the Assembly and the country; but, as it appeared he was in no way implicated in the seditious cries, they voted his admission by a large majority. The phrase which gave umbrage was: 'If the country imposes duties upon me, I shall know how to fulfil them.' . . . However, by a subsequent letter, dated the 15th, he restored confidence, by saying he would resign rather than be a cause of tumult. But the real difficulties of the government arose from a different cause. The National

Assembly bore with impatience the expense of the Ateliers Nationaux: it was enough to submit to the factious spirit of those bodies; but it was too much to pay them for keeping on foot an organized insurrection, ever ready to break out and deluge the capital in blood. The executive commission had been desirous of finding means gradually to lessen the numbers receiving wages; and on the 12th of May, it was resolved to close the lists. The commission foresaw that if the Ateliers were at once abolished, it would produce a rebellion in Paris; and they hoped, first, by preventing any more being inscribed, and then by setting them to task-work, that they should gradually get the numbers reduced. . . . But the Assembly would not wait; they ordered all the workmen between 18 and 25 years old, and unmarried, to be drafted into the army, or to be discharged; and they were breaking them up so rapidly, that if the workmen wanted to fight it was evident that it must be done at once or not at all. . . . General Cavaignac, who had been sent for from Africa, was on his arrival in Paris named Minister at War, and had command of the troops. . . . Preparations for the conflict commenced on Thursday the 22nd of June; but it was noon of the following day ere the first shot was fired. It is said, that had the executive commission known what they were about, the heads of the insurrection might have been all arrested in the meantime, for they were walking about all day, and at one time met in the Jardin des Plantes. The fighting on the 23d continued all day, with much slaughter, and little practical result. . . . The extent of the insurgent lines swallowed up the troops, so that, though great numbers were in Paris, there appeared to be a deficiency of them, and loud complaints were made against the inefficiency of the executive commission. During the night the fighting ceased, and both parties were occupied in strengthening their positions. The Assembly was sitting in permanence; they were highly incensed against the executive commission, and wished them to send in their resignations; but the latter refused, saying it was cowardly to do so in the face of insurrection. The Assembly then formally deposed the commission, and appointed Cavaignac dictator; to which arrangement the executive commission at once assented. The General instantly ordered the National Guards to prevent assemblages in the streets, and that no one should go out without a pass; any one going about, out of uniform, without permission, was walked home. In this manner many persons carrying ammunition to the insurgents were arrested. At noon, he sent a flag of truce with a proclamation, offering an amnesty to the rebels, at the suggestion of the ex-prefect Caussidière; but it was unhesitatingly rejected. This latter personage, though he was not among the barricades, was by many thought to be the head of the insurrection. The troops of the insurgents were managed with great military skill, showing that persons of military knowledge must have had the command; though no one knew who were their leaders. . . . During the early part of the day, the fighting was mainly on the southern side of the river. The church of St. Gervais and the bridges were carried with great slaughter, as well as the church of St. Severin, and their great head-quarters the Pantheon; and by four o'clock, the troops had conquered the whole

of the south bank of the Seine. On the other side, a hot engagement was going on in the Faubourgs Poissonnière and St. Denis: these were carried with great loss at a late hour, whence the insurrection was forced back to its great stronghold, the Clos St. Lazare; which defied every effort of General Lamoricière to take it on Saturday. An unfinished hospital served as a citadel, and several churches and public buildings as out-posts; while the old city wall, which they had loop-holed, enabled them to fire on the troops in comparative security; but the buildings were breached with cannon, and the insurgents by four o'clock on Sunday were dispersed. . . . A desperate struggle was going on at a late hour in the Faubourg du Temple; and on the Monday morning the insurgents made a stand behind the Canal St. Martin, where they sent to treat on condition of retaining their arms. But Cavaignac would hear of no terms. It was thought, at one time, that they had surrendered; when some soldiers, going within the lines, were surprised and murdered. Hostilities at once began again, and the insurgents were finally subdued by one o'clock on Monday the 26th. The victory was dearly bought: 8,000 were ascertained to have been killed or wounded; and, as many bodies were thrown into the Seine unrecognised, this is much under the number. Nearly 14,000 prisoners were taken, and 3,000 of these died of gaol fever. . . . The excellent Archbishop of Paris, Denis Auguste Affre, fell a sacrifice to his Christian benevolence. Horrified at the slaughter, he, attended by two of his vicars carrying the olive-branch of peace, passed between the combatants. The firing ceased at his appearance; but, from the discharge of a single musket, it began again; he, nevertheless, mounted the barricade and descended into the midst of the insurgents, and was in the act of addressing them, when some patriot, fearing the effect of his exhortations, shot him from a window. . . . General Cavaignac, immediately after the pacification of Paris, laid down the temporary dictatorship with which he had been invested by the Assembly; but their gratitude for the salvation of society led them to appoint him President of the Council, with the power to name his own Ministry. He at once sent adrift all the red republican party, and chose a Ministry from among the moderate class of republicans; to which he afterwards added some members of the old opposition. . . . Prince Louis Napoleon was again thrust upon the Assembly, by being elected for Corsica; but he wrote a letter on the 8th of July, saying, that though he did not renounce the honour of one day sitting as a representative of the people, he would wait till the time when his return to France could not in any way serve as a pretext to the enemies of the republic. . . . On Tuesday, the 26th of September, shortly after the president had taken his seat, Louis Napoleon appeared quietly in the chamber, and placed himself on one of the back benches. . . . The discussion of the constitution, which had been referred to a committee, was the only subject of interest, except the important question of how the president should be elected. It was proposed by some that the assembly itself should elect a president, a proposition which was eventually negated by a large majority. The real object was to exclude Louis Napoleon, whose great name gave him every chance of success, if an appeal were made to the universal suffrage of

the nation, which the republicans distrusted. Another amendment was moved to exclude all pretenders to the throne; on which, allusion being made to Louis Napoleon, he mounted the rostrum, and denied that he was a pretender. . . . The red republicans were desirous of having no president, and that the constituent assembly itself should name the ministers. It was not the only constitutional point in dispute: for weeks and months the debate on the constitution dragged its weary length along; amendments were discussed, and the work when turned out was, as might have been expected, a botch after all. . . . It was eventually agreed, that to give validity to the election of a president it should be necessary that he should have more than a half of all the votes given; that is to say, more votes than all the other candidates put together; if not, the assembly was to choose between the highest candidate on the list and his competitors, by which means they hoped to be able to get rid of Bonaparte. . . . The constitution was proclaimed on the 10th of November. . . . The legitimist and Orleanist parties refused to start a candidate for fear of weakening Bonaparte, and thus throwing the choice into the hands of the assembly, who would choose General Cavaignac. Both these parties gave the former at least a negative support; and as M. Thiers declared that nine-tenths of the country were opposed to the General as too revolutionary, it was clear that in the country itself reaction was going on faster than in the assembly. . . . Louis Napoleon's chief support was from the inhabitants of the country districts, the peasantry. . . . On the 10th of December, 5,534,520 votes were recorded for Louis Napoleon. General Cavaignac had 1,448,302. Then came Ledru Rollin; then Raspail. Lamartine got 17,914; 23,219 were disallowed, as being given for some of the banished royal family. The total number of voters was 7,449,471."—E. S. Cayley, *The European Revolution of 1848*, v. 1, ch. 4-5.

ALSO IN: J. F. Corkran, *Hist. of the Constituent National Assembly from May, 1848*.—Marquis of Normanby, *A Year of Revolution*, ch. 13-15 (v. 2). H. C. Lockwood, *Const. Hist. of France*, ch. 5, and app. 8.

A. D. 1849.—Intervention at Rome, to crush the revolutionary republic and restore the Pope.—French capture and occupation of the city. See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849.

A. D. 1849-1850.—Disagreement with England in Greece.—The Don Pacifico affair. See GREECE: A. D. 1846-1850.

A. D. 1851.—The plot of the Coup d'État.—"In the beginning of the winter of 1851 France was still a republic; but the Constitution of 1848 had struck no root. There was a feeling that the country had been surprised and coerced into the act of declaring itself a republic, and that a monarchical system of government was the only one adapted for France. The sense of instability which sprang from this belief was connected with an agonising dread of insurrections. . . . Moreover, to those who watched and feared, it seemed that the shadow on the dial was moving on with a terrible steadiness to the hour when a return to anarchy was, as it were, pre-ordained by law; for the constitution required that a new president should be chosen in the spring of the following year. . . . In general, France thought it best that, notwithstanding the Rule of the Constitu-

tion, which stood in the way, the then President should be quietly re-elected; and a large majority of the Assembly, faithfully representing this opinion, had come to a vote which sought to give it effect; but their desire was baffled by an unwise provision of the Republican Charter which had laid it down that no constitutional change should take place without the sanction of three-fourths of the Assembly. By this clumsy bar the action of the State system was hampered, and many whose minds generally inclined them to respect legality were forced to acknowledge that the Constitution wanted a wrench." The President of the republic, Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, "had always wished to bring about a change in the constitution, but, originally, he had hoped to be able to do this with the aid and approval of some at least of the statesmen and eminent generals of the country." But, "although there were numbers in France who would have been heartily glad to see the Republic crushed by some able dictator, there were hardly any public men who believed that in the President of the Republic they would find the man they wanted. Therefore his overtures to the gentlemen of France were always rejected. Every statesman to whom he applied refused to entertain his proposals. Every general whom he urged always said that for whatever he did he must have 'an order from the Minister of War.' The President being thus rebuffed, his plan of changing the form of government with the assent of some of the leading statesmen and generals of the country degenerated into schemes of a very different kind; and at length he fell into the hands of persons of the quality of Persigny, Morny, and Fleury. . . . The President had been a promoter of the law of the 31st of May, restricting the franchise, but he now became the champion of universal suffrage. To minds versed in politics this change might have sufficed to disclose the nature of the schemes upon which the Chief of the State was brooding; but, from first to last, words tending to allay suspicion had been used with great industry and skill. From the moment of his coming before the public in February 1848, the Prince laid hold of almost every occasion he could find for vowing, again and again, that he harbored no schemes against the Constitution. . . . It was natural that in looking at the operation which changed the Republic into an Empire, the attention of the observer should be concentrated upon the person who, already the Chief of the State, was about to attain to the throne; and there seems to be no doubt that what may be called the literary part of the transaction was performed by the President in person. He was the lawyer of the confederacy. He no doubt wrote the Proclamations, the Plebiscites, and the Constitutions, and all such like things; but it seems that the propelling power which brought the plot to bear was mainly supplied by Count de Morny, and by a resolute Major, named Fleury. M. Morny was a man of great daring, and gifted with more than common powers of fascination. He had been a member of the Chamber of Deputies in the time of the monarchy; but he was rather known to the world as a speculator than as a politician. He was a buyer and seller of those fractional and volatile interests in trading adventures, which go by the name of 'Shares.' . . . He knew how to found a 'company,' and he now undertook to establish institu-

tions which were destined to be more lucrative to him than any of his former adventures. . . . It seems, however, that the man who was the most able to make the President act, to drive him deep into his own plot, and fiercely carry him through it, was Major Fleury. . . . He was daring and resolute, and his daring was of the kind which holds good in the moment of danger. If Prince Louis Bonaparte was bold and ingenious in designing, Fleury was the man to execute. . . . The language held by the generals who declared that they would act under the authority of the Minister of War and not without it, suggested the contrivance which was resorted to. Fleury determined to find a military man capable of command, capable of secrecy, and capable of a great venture. The person chosen was to be properly sounded, and if he seemed willing, was to be admitted into the plot. He was then to be made Minister of War, in order that through him the whole of the land forces should be at the disposal of the plotters. Fleury went to Algeria to find the instrument required, and he so well performed his task that he hit upon a general officer who was christened, it seems, Jacques Arnaud Le Roy, but was known at this time as Achille St. Arnaud. . . . He readily entered into the plot. From the moment that Prince Louis Bonaparte and his associates had entrusted their secret to the man of Fleury's selection, it was perhaps hardly possible for them to flinch, for the exigencies of St. Arnaud, formerly Le Roy, were not likely to be on so modest a scale as to consist with the financial arrangements of a Republic governed by law, and the discontent of a person of his quality with a secret like that in his charge would plainly bring the rest of the brethren into danger. He was made Minister of War. This was on the 27th of October. At the same time M. Maupas or de Maupas was brought into the Ministry. . . . Persigny, properly Fialin, was in the plot. He was descended on one side of an ancient family, and disliking his father's name he seems to have called himself for many years after the name of his maternal grandfather. . . . It was necessary to take measures for paralyzing the National Guard, but the force was under the command of General Perrot, a man whose honesty could not be tampered with. To dismiss him suddenly would be to excite suspicion. The following expedient was adopted: the President appointed as Chief of the Staff of the National Guard, a person named Vieyra. The past life and the then repute of this person were of such a kind, that General Perrot, it seems, conceived himself insulted by the nomination, and instantly resigned. That was what the brethren of the Elysée wanted. On Sunday, the 30th, General Lawestine was appointed to the command. . . . His function was—not to lead the force of which he took the command but—to prevent it from acting. . . . Care had been taken to bring into Paris and its neighborhood the regiments most likely to serve the purpose of the Elysée, and to give the command to generals who might be expected to act without scruples. The forces in Paris and its neighborhood were under the orders of General Magnan. . . . From time to time the common soldiery were gratified with presents of food and wine, as well as with an abundance of flattering words, and their exasperation against civilians was so well kept alive that men used to African warfare were brought into

the humor for calling the Parisians 'Bedouins.' There was massacre in the very sound. The army of Paris was in the temper required. It was necessary for the plotters to have the concurrence of M. St. Georges, the director of the state printing-office. M. St. Georges was suborned. Then all was ready. On the Monday night between the 1st and 2d of December, the President had his usual assembly at the Elysée. Ministers who were loyally ignorant of what was going on were mingled with those who were in the plot. . . . At the usual hour the assembly began to disperse, and by eleven o'clock there were only three guests who remained. These were Morny (who had previously taken care to show himself at one of the theatres), Maupas, and St. Arnaud, formerly Le Roy. There was, besides, an orderly officer of the President, called Colonel Beville, who was initiated in the secret. . . . They were to strike the blow that night. . . . By and by they were apprised that an order which had been given for the movement of a battalion of gendarmerie, had duly taken effect without exciting remark. . . . The President entrusted a packet of manuscripts to Colonel Beville, and despatched him to the state printing-office. It was in the streets which surround this building that the battalion of gendarmerie had been collected. When Paris was hushed in sleep, the battalion came quietly out, and folded round the state printing-office. From that moment until their work was done the printers were all close captives, for no one of them was suffered to go out. . . . It is said that there was something like resistance, but in the end, if not at first, the printers obeyed. Each compositor stood whilst he worked between two policemen, and, the manuscript being cut into many pieces, no one could make out the sense of what he was printing. By these proclamations the President asserted that the Assembly was a hot-bed of plots; declared it dissolved; pronounced for universal suffrage; proposed a new constitution; vowed anew that his duty was to maintain the Republic; and placed Paris and the twelve surrounding departments under martial law. In one of the proclamations he appealed to the army, and strove to whet its enmity against civilians, by reminding it of the defeats inflicted upon the troops in 1830 and 1848. The President wrote letters dismissing the members of the Government who were not in the plot; but he did not cause these letters to be delivered until the following morning. He also signed a paper appointing Morny to the Home Office. . . . The order from the Minister of War was probably signed by half-past two in the morning, for at three it was in the hands of Magnan. At the same hour Maupas (assigning for pretext the expected arrival of foreign refugees), caused a number of Commissaries to be summoned in all haste to the Prefecture of Police. At half-past three in the morning these men were in attendance. . . . It was then that, for the first time, the main secret of the confederates passed into the hands of a number of subordinate agents. During some hours of that night every one of those humble Commissaries had the destinies of France in his hands; for he might either obey the Minister, and so place his country in the power of the Elysée, or he might obey the law, denounce the plot, and bring its contrivers to trial. Maupas gave orders for the seizure at the same minute of

the foremost Generals of France, and several of her leading Statesmen. Parties of the police, each under the orders of a Commissary, were to be at the doors of the persons to be arrested some time beforehand, but the seizures were not to take place until a quarter past six. . . . At the appointed minute, and whilst it was still dark, the designated houses were entered. The most famous generals of France were seized. General Changarnier, General Bedeau, General Lamoricière, General Cavaignac, and General Leflô were taken from their beds, and carried away through the sleeping city and thrown into prison. In the same minute the like was done with some of the chief members and officers of the Assembly, and amongst others with Thiers, Miot, Baze, Colonel Charras, Roger du Nord, and several of the democratic leaders. Some men believed to be the chiefs of secret societies were also seized. The general object of these night arrests was that, when morning broke, the army should be without generals inclined to observe the law, that the Assembly should be without the machinery for convoking it, and that all the political parties in the State should be paralyzed by the disappearance of their chiefs. The number of men thus seized in the dark was seventy-eight. Eighteen of these were members of the Assembly. Whilst it was still dark, Morny, escorted by a body of infantry, took possession of the Home Office, and prepared to touch the springs of that wondrous machinery by which a clerk can dictate to a nation. Already he began to tell 40,000 communes of the enthusiasm with which the sleeping city had received the announcement of measures not hitherto disclosed. When the light of the morning dawned, people saw the Proclamations on the walls, and slowly came to hear that numbers of the foremost men of France had been seized in the night-time, and that every General to whom the friends of law and order could look for help was lying in one or other of the prisons. The newspapers, to which a man might run in order to know truly what others thought and intended, were all seized and stopped. The gates of the Assembly were closed and guarded, but the Deputies, who began to flock thither, found means to enter by passing through one of the official residences which formed part of the building. They had assembled in the Chamber in large numbers, and some of them having caught Dupin, their reluctant President, were forcing him to come and take the chair, when a body of infantry burst in and drove them out, striking some of them with the butt-ends of their muskets. . . . Driven from their Chamber, the Deputies assembled at the Mayoralty of the 10th arrondissement. There, upon the motion of the illustrious Berryer, they resolved that the act of Louis Bonaparte was a forfeiture of the Presidency, and they directed the judges of the Supreme Court to meet and proceed to the judgment of the President and his accomplices. These resolutions had just been voted, when a battalion of the Chasseurs de Vincennes entered the courtyard. . . . An aide-de-camp of General Magnau came with a written order directing the officer in command of the battalion to clear the hall, to do this if necessary by force, and to carry off to the prison of Mazas any Deputies offering resistance. . . . The number of Deputies present at this moment was 220. The whole Assembly declared that they resisted,

and would yield to nothing short of force. . . . They were carried off, some to the Fort of Mount Valerian, some to the fortress of Vincennes, and some to the prison of Mazas. . . . By the laws of the Republic, the duty of taking cognizance of offences against the Constitution was cast upon the Supreme Court. The Court was sitting, when an armed force entered the hall, and the judges were driven from the bench, but not until they had made a judicial order for the impeachment of the President."—A. W. Kinglake, *The Invasion of the Crimea*, v. 1, ch. 14.

ALSO IN: E. Ténot, *Paris in December, 1851*, ch. 1-4.—V. Hugo, *Napoleon the Little*.—M. de Maupas, *The Story of the Coup d'État*.—B. Jerrold, *Life of Napoleon III.*, bk. 8 (v. 3).

A. D. 1851.—The bloody Triumph of the Coup d'État.—Destruction of the Second Republic.—"The second part of the Coup d'État, which drenched the boulevards with innocent blood, has cast a shade of horror over the whole transaction that time has been unable to efface. Paris is never so reduced in a crisis, whether the cause be just or unjust, that she is bereft of hands to erect and defend barricades in her streets. In the Faubourg St. Antoine an incipient rising on the 2d was suppressed immediately by the troops. The volcanic district from the Hôtel de Ville northward to the boulevards also showed signs of uneasiness, and throughout the morning of the 3d the military were busy pulling down partially completed barricades and dispersing small bodies of insurgents. There seems to be little question that the army was embittered against the populace. If this were so, the proclamation circulated by the president through the ranks on the 2d was not calculated to appease it. He styled the soldiers as the 'flower of the nation.' He pointed out to them that his interests and theirs were the same, and that they had suffered together in the past from the course of the Assembly. He reminded them of the years 1830 and 1848, when the army had fought the people in the streets of Paris, and concluded by an allusion to the military grandeur of the Bonapartes. During the afternoon of the 3d and morning of the 4th the troops remained inactive, pending orders from the minister of war, and in this interval several strong barricades were erected in the restless quarters. On the afternoon of the 4th the boulevards, from the Madeleine to the Rue du Sentier, were occupied by a great body of troops awaiting orders to move east through the Boulevard Bonne Nouvelle upon the barricaded district. The soldiers stood at ease, and the officers lounged about, smoking their cigars. The sidewalks, windows, and balconies were crowded with men, women, and children, thoughtless onlookers of the great military display. Suddenly a single shot was heard. It was fired from a window near the Rue du Sentier. The troops at the head of the column faced sharply to the south, and commenced a deliberate fusillade upon the crowded walks and balconies. The battalions farther west caught the murderous contagion, until the line of fire extended into the Boulevard des Italiens. In a few moments the beautiful boulevards were converted into a bloody pandemonium. The sidewalks were strewn with corpses and stained with blood. The air was rent with shrieks and groans and the breaking of glass, while the steady, incessant rattling of the mus-

ketry was intensified by an occasional cannon-shot, that brought down with a crash the masonry from some fine façade. This continued for nearly twenty minutes, when a lack of people to kill seems to have restrained the mad volleys of the troops. If any attempt was made by officers to check their men, it was wholly unavailing, and in some cases miserable fugitives were followed into buildings and massacred. Later in the day the barricades were attacked, and their defenders easily overcome. By night-fall insurgent Paris was thoroughly cowed. These allegations, though conflicting with sworn statements of Republicans and Imperialists, can hardly be refuted. The efforts of the Napoleonic faction to portray the thoughtless crowd of the boulevards as desperate and bloody-minded rebels have never been successful, while the opposition so brilliantly represented by the author of 'Histoire d'un Crime' have been too fierce and immoderate in their accusations to win public credence. The questions as to who fired the first shot, and whether it was fired as a signal for, or a menace against the military, are points on which Frenchmen of different political parties still debate. It is charitable to accept M. Hugo's insinuation that the soldiery were drunk with the president's wine, even though the fact implies a low state of discipline in the service. To what extent was the president responsible for the boulevard horror? M. Victor Hugo and M. de Maupas do not agree upon this point, and it seems useless to discuss it. Certain facts are indisputable. We know the army bore small love toward the Parisians, and we know it was in the streets by order of the president. We know that the latter was in bad company, and playing a dangerous game. We may discard M. Victor Hugo's statement as to the orders issued by the president from the Elysée on the fatal day, but we cannot disguise the fact that the boulevard horror subdued Paris, and crowned his cause with success. In other words, Louis Napoleon was the gainer by the slaughter of unoffending men, women, and children, and in after-years, when referring to the 4th of December, he found it for his interest to distort facts, and make figures lie. . . . Louis Napoleon had expressly stated in the proclamation that astonished Paris on the 2d that he made the people judge between him and the Assembly. The citizens of France were called upon to vote on the 20th and 21st of December 'Yes' or 'No' to the question as to whether the president should be sustained in the measures he had taken, should be empowered to draw up a new constitution, and should retain the presidential chair for a period of ten years."—H. Murdock, *The Reconstruction of Europe*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: V. Hugo, *History of a Crime*.—E. Ténot, *Paris in December, 1851*, ch. 5-6.—M. de Maupas, *Story of the Coup d'État*, ch. 18-24 (v. 2).—Count H. de Viel Castel, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 4.

A. D. 1851-1852.—Transportation and exile of republicans.—The dictator's constitution for France.—Rapid progress of despotism.—The Second Empire ordained.—Elevation of Napoleon III. to the throne.—"The struggle was over: terror of the victors followed. Thirty-two departments were in a state of siege. More than 100,000 citizens were languishing in prison. Trial followed trial in rapid succession, the cases being classed under three heads: 1st, persons

found armed, or against whom serious charges existed; 2d, persons charged with minor offences; 3d, dangerous persons. The first class was judged at once by a council of war, the second sent to various tribunals, the third transported without trial. Many prisoners were not even questioned. Numbers were set free; but multitudes were still held. Under these conditions the date of the plébiscite, December 20 and 21, approached. Notices were posted to the effect that 'any person seeking to disturb the polls or to question the result of the ballot would be tried by a council of war.' All liberty of choice was taken from the electors, many of whom were arrested on suspicion of exciting others to vote against the president of the republic. When the lists were published it was found that the 'ayes' had carried the day, although many did not vote at all. Indubitably the figures were notably swelled by violence and fraud. . . . December 31, ex-Minister Baroche presented the result of the ballots to the prince-president,—a strange title now given to Louis Napoleon, for the time being, in lieu of another. . . . Next day, January 1, 1852, Archbishop Sibour celebrated a Te Deum in Notre Dame, the prince-president sitting under a canopy. . . . While the man of December 2 lodged in the palace of kings, the chief representatives of the republic were cast into exile. The executors of the plot treated the captive representatives very differently according as they were conservative or republican. When the prisoners were told that a distinction was to be made among them, they honorably refused to give their names, but they were betrayed by an usher of the Assembly. The republicans were then sent to Mazas, and treated like common thieves, M. Thiers alone being allowed a bed instead of the ordinary hammock. The other party were soon set free, with but few exceptions, and on the 8th of January the generals imprisoned at Ham, with their companion, Questor Baze, were sent to Belgium. Next day a series of proscriptions came out. All persons 'convicted of taking part in the recent insurrections' were to be transported, some to Guiana, some to Algiers. A second decree expelled from France, Algiers, and the French colonies, 'as a measure of public safety,' sixty representatives of the Left, including Victor Hugo and certain others, for whom it was reserved to aid in the foundation of a third republic. A third decree commanded the temporary absence from France and Algiers of eighteen other representatives, including the generals, with Thiers, De Rémusat, and several members of the Left, among them Edgar Quinet and Emile de Girardin. . . . The next step was to establish the famous 'mixed commissions' in every province. These commissions were to try the numerous prisoners still held captive. . . . The mixed commissions of 1852, as the historian of the coup d'état (M. Eugène Ténot) declares, 'decided, without legal proceedings, without hearing of witnesses, without public trial, the fate of thousands and thousands of republicans.' They have left the indelible memory of one of the most monstrous events known in history. An act equally extraordinary in another way was the promulgation of the new constitution framed by the dictator alone (January 14, 1852). . . . The constitution of 1852 began by a 'recognition, confirmation, and guarantee of the great principles proclaimed in 1789, which are the founda-

tion of the public rights and laws of France.' But it did not say one word about the freedom of the press, nor about freedom of clubs and association. . . . 'The government of the French republic is intrusted to Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte for the term of ten years.' In the preface Louis Napoleon threw aside the fiction of irresponsibility 'which deceives public sentiment'; the constitution therefore declares the leader of the state responsible to the French people, but omits to say how this responsibility may be realized; the French people have no resource save revolution. . . . The legislative body was to consist of 262 members (one for each 3,500 electors), chosen for five years by universal suffrage. This body would vote upon the laws and taxes. Louis Napoleon, having profited so largely by the repeal of the law of May 31, could scarcely refuse to retain direct universal suffrage, but he essentially altered its character by various modifications. He also so reduced the importance of the only great body still elective, that he had little or nothing to fear from it. Another assembly, the Senate, was to be composed of eighty members, which number might be increased to 150. The senators were irremovable, and were to be chosen by the president of the republic, with the exception of cardinals, marshals, and admirals, who were senators by right. The president might give each senator an income of 30,000 francs. The Senate was the guardian of the constitution and of 'the public liberty.' . . . The executive power chose all mayors, and was at liberty to select them outside the town council. In fact, the constitution of 1852 surpassed the constitution of the year VIII. as a piece of monarchic reaction. It entailed no consulate, but an empire,—dictatorship and total confiscation of public liberty. . . . Despotism spread daily in every direction. On the 17th of February the liberty of the press was notably reduced, and severe penalties were affixed to any infraction. In fact, the press was made dependent on the good-will of the president. Education was next attacked, a decree of March 9, 1852, stripping the professors of the University of all the pledges and principles granted by the First Empire. . . . The new power, in 1852, labored to turn all the forces of the country to material interests, while it stifled all moral interests. It suppressed education and the press, and constantly stimulated the financial and industrial movement. . . . Numberless railroad companies now sprang to life, and roads were rapidly built upon a grand scale. The government adopted the system of grants on a long term of years,—say ninety-nine,—plus the guarantee of a small rate of interest. In everything the cry was for instant success, at any cost. Great financial operations followed on the heels of the first grants to railroad companies. . . . This year's budget, like the constitution, was the work of a single man. The dictator settled it by a decree; then, having ordered the elections for his Chamber of Deputies, just before his constitution went into operation, he raised the universal state of siege (March 28). This was only a feint, for his government was a permanent state of siege. . . . The official candidates presented, or rather imposed, were generally elected; the republicans failed to vote throughout a great part of the country. . . . March 29, the prince-president proceeded to install the great state bodies at the

Tuileries. It was thought that he would hint in his speech that he expected the title of Emperor, but he left that point vague, and still talked of preserving the republic. . . . During the session a rumor was current that Louis Napoleon was to be proclaimed emperor on the 10th of May, after the distribution of eagles to the army; but this was not carried out. The dictator had no desire to be made emperor in this fashion. He meant to do it more artfully, and to make it seem that the nation forced the accomplishment of his wishes upon him. He therefore undertook a fresh journey through the provinces. . . . The watchword was everywhere given by the authorities and influential persons, whose example was imitated by the crowd, irreconcilable opponents keeping silent. . . . He returned to Paris, October 16, and was received in state at the Orleans station. The official bodies greeted him with shouts of 'Long live the Emperor!'. . . . Next day, the following paragraph appeared in the 'Moniteur': 'The tremendous desire for the restoration of the empire manifested throughout France, makes it incumbent upon the president to consult the Senate upon the subject.' The Senate and Legislature were convened November 4; the latter was to verify the votes, should the Senate decide that the people must be consulted in regard to a change in the form of government, which no one doubted would be the case. . . . The Senate . . . passed a decree for the submission of the restoration of the hereditary empire for popular acceptance (November 7); the senators then went in a body to St. Cloud to inform the prince-president of this decision. . . . The people were then called upon to vote for the plébiscite decreed by the Senate (November 20 and 21). Republican and legitimist protests were circulated in despite of the police, the government publishing them in the official organ, the 'Moniteur,' as if in defiance, thinking that the excessive violence of the republican proscriptions of London and Guernsey would alarm the peace-loving public. The result of the vote was even greater than that of December 20, 1851; the authenticity of the figures may indeed be doubted, but there is not a doubt that there was really a large majority in favor of the plébiscite. France abandoned the struggle! On the evening of December 1, the three great state bodies, the two Chambers and the State Council, went to St. Cloud, and the president of the Legislature presented the result of the ballot to the new emperor, who sat enthroned, between his uncle Jerome and his cousin Napoleon."—H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France, 1789-1878*, v. 3, ch. 15.

ALSO IN: H. C. Lockwood, *Const. Hist. of France*, ch. 6, and app. 9.

A. D. 1853-1856.—The Crimean war. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1853-1854, to 1854-1856.

A. D. 1855-1895. Acquisitions in Africa. See AFRICA: A. D. 1855, 1876-1880, and after.

A. D. 1857-1860.—Operations with England in China. See CHINA: A. D. 1856-1860.

A. D. 1858.—Orsini attempt to assassinate Napoleon III. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1858-1859.

A. D. 1858-1886.—Conquest of Tonkin and Cochinchina. See TONKIN.

A. D. 1859.—Alliance with Sardinia and war with Austria.—Acquisition of Savoy and Nice. See ITALY: A. D. 1856-1859, and 1859-1861.

A. D. 1860.—The Chevalier-Cobden commercial treaty with England. See *TARIFF LEGISLATION (FRANCE)*: A. D. 1853-1860.

A. D. 1860-1870.—Modifications of the imperial constitution. — "Originally . . . the power of the Legislative Body was limited to voting and rejecting as a whole the laws submitted to it by the Executive; there was no such thing as criticism or control of the general policy of the reign: but the year 1860 opened a period of development in the direction of liberty; by a decree of the November of that year the Emperor permitted the Deputies to draw up an address in answer to his speech, giving them thereby the opportunity to criticise his policy; by that of December 1861 he allowed them to vote the budget by sections, that is to say, to discuss and, if desirable, reject its items; by that of January 1867 he substituted for the Address the right of questioning the Ministers, who might be delegated to the Chamber by the Emperor to take part in certain definite discussions; lastly, by that of September 1869 he gave to the Legislative Body the right of initiating laws, removed the restrictions hitherto retained on the right of amendment and of questions, and made the Ministers responsible to the Chamber. Thus the Constitution was deliberately modified, by the initiative of the Emperor himself, from the form of imperial despotism to that of parliamentary monarchy: this modified Constitution was submitted to a plébiscite in May 1870, and once more the people ratified the Empire by over seven million votes against a million and a half."—G. L. Dickinson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France*, ch. 7, sect. 3.

A. D. 1861-1867.—Intervention in Mexico and its humiliating failure. See *MEXICO*: A. D. 1861-1867.

A. D. 1862.—Commercial treaty with Germany. See *TARIFF LEGISLATION (GERMANY)*: A. D. 1853-1892.

A. D. 1866.—Withdrawal of troops from Rome. See *ITALY*: A. D. 1862-1866.

A. D. 1866-1870.—Territorial concessions demanded from Germany.—The Luxemburg question.—War temporarily averted. See *GERMANY*: A. D. 1866-1870.

A. D. 1867.—Last defense of Papal sovereignty at Rome.—Defeat of Garibaldi at Mentana. See *ITALY*: A. D. 1867-1870.

A. D. 1870 (June-July).—"The Hohenzollern incident."—Unjustifiable declaration of war against Prussia.—"Towards the last of June, 1870, there arose what is known as the 'Hohenzollern incident,' which assumed so much importance, as it led up to the Franco-German War. In June, 1868, Queen Isabella had been chased from Spain, and had sought refuge in France. The Spanish Cortes, maintaining the monarchical form, offered the Crown of Spain to Prince Hohenzollern, a relation of the King of Prussia [see *SPAIN*: A. D. 1866-1873]. The French Minister at Madrid telegraphed that Prince Léopold Hohenzollern had been nominated to the throne of Spain, and had accepted. This produced the utmost excitement and indignation among the French people. The Paris press teemed with articles more or less violent, calling on the government to prevent this outrage, even at the cost of war. The journals of all shades were unanimous in the matter, contending that it was an insult and a peril to

France, and could not be tolerated. The Opposition in the Chamber made the incident an occasion for attacking the government, alleging that it was owing to its weak and vacillating policy that France was indebted to her fresh humiliation. The government journals, however, laid the whole blame upon the ambition of Count Bismarck, who had become to them a *bête noire*. . . . Both parties vied with each other in showing the extent of their dislike to the great Prussian Chancellor. Much pressure was soon brought to bear in the proper quarters; the result of this was the withdrawal of the Hohenzollern candidacy. Explanations were made, better counsels seemed to prevail, and all immediate trouble appeared averted. It seemed quite certain that all danger of a war between France and Germany was at an end, and all being quiet on the banks of the Seine, on the 3d of July I left Paris in pursuit of health and recreation at the healing waters of Carlsbad, of far-off Bohemia. I was in excellent relations with the Duke de Gramont, and everything appeared to be serene. I had hardly reached Carlsbad, when scanty news was received of a somewhat threatening character. I could hardly believe that anything very serious was likely to result; yet I was somewhat uneasy. Going to drink the water at one of the health-giving springs, early in the morning of July 15th, my Alsatian valet brought me the startling news, that a private telegram, received at midnight, gave the intelligence that France had declared war against Germany. The news fell upon the thousands of visitors and the people of Carlsbad, like a clap of thunder in a cloudless sky, and the most intense excitement prevailed. The nearest railroad station to Carlsbad, at that time, was Eger. . . . I rode all night from Carlsbad to Eger. Taking the railroad from Eger to Paris, and passing through Bavaria, Baden, Darmstadt and the valley of the Rhine, the excitement was something prodigious, recalling to me the days at home of the firing upon Sumter, in 1861. The troops were rushing to the depots; the trains were all blocked, and confusion everywhere reigned supreme. After great delays, and much discomfort, and a journey of fifty-two hours, I reached Paris at ten o'clock at night, July 18th. The great masses of people, naturally so excitable and turbulent, had been maddened by the false news so skilfully disseminated, that King William, at Ems, had insulted the French nation through its Ambassador. . . . It soon turned out that all the reports which had been spread over Paris, that King William had insulted the French Ambassador were utterly false, and had not the slightest foundation. The French Ambassador, M. Benedetti, denied that he had received the least indignity from the Emperor. . . . The exaggerations in Paris and France of this simple incident surpassed all bounds, and they were apparently made to inflame the people still more. It really appeared that the Government of France had determined to have war with Germany, coûte que coûte. The alleged causes growing out of the talk that Germany was to put a German prince on the throne of Spain were but a mere pretext. . . . After eighteen years of peace, the courtiers and adventurers who surrounded the Emperor seemed to think that it was about time to have a war."—E. B. Washburne, *Recollections of a Minister to France*, v. 1, ch. 2.—"It is a popular

fiction that the king turned his back on Benedetti, or that he answered that he 'had nothing more to say to him,' or that he out and out refused him an audience. An extra of the German papers of July 14th did indeed read to that effect: Bismarck himself had drawn up the notice for the papers. He had made no false additions, but here and there he had erased and omitted some of the words spoken at Ems, thus rendering possible at least the whole false conception of the matter. Bismarck ventured on such a step, having clearly counted the costs; the result showed how closely he had made his calculations. . . . It was the war of 1870 that fundamentally changed the relations of the chancellor to the mass of the people. After 1871 he was immensely popular. . . . People believed that he could do anything, that he could make possible what was impossible for other men. . . . Bismarck was very soon surrounded with an almost mythical halo."—W. Maurenbrecher, *Gründung des deutschen Reichs* (trans. from the German), pp. 13-258.

ALSO IN: W. Müller, *Political Hist. of Recent Times*, sect. 25.—G. B. Mallison, *The Refounding of the German Empire*, ch. 11.—W. Rüstow, *The War for the Rhine Frontier*, 1870, ch. 6 (v. 1).

A. D. 1870 (July—August).—Disastrous opening of the war.—Defeats at Wörth, Spichern and Gravelotte.—Bazaine's army shut up in Metz.—"July 23d Napoleon intrusted the regency to the empress for the period of his absence from Paris. . . . On the 28th, . . . accompanied by his son, [he] left for Metz, to assume command of the army. . . . The army consisted of eight corps. Of these, the 1st, under Marshal MacMahon, was stationed at Strasburg; the 2d, under General Frossard, at St. Avoird; the 3d, under Marshal Bazaine, at Metz; the 4th, under General Ladmirault, at Diedenhofen (Thionville); the 5th, under General Faily, at Bitsch; the 6th, under Marshal Canrobert, in the camp at Châlons; the 7th, under General Felix Douay, at Belfort; the 8th,—the Imperial Guard—under General Bourbaki, at Nancy. Accordingly, the French forces were divided into two groups, the larger stationed on the Moselle, and the smaller in Alsace. To the latter belonged the 1st and 7th corps, both of which were placed under the command of Marshal MacMahon, with orders to prevent the crown prince's army from entering Alsace. The larger group comprised the 2d, 3d, and 4th corps. . . . The 6th and 8th were to have formed the reserve; but the greatly superior numbers of Prince Frederic Charles and Steinmetz, who were advancing against this larger group, necessitated the immediate bringing of those corps to the front. The connection between the two groups was to be maintained by the 5th corps, stationed at Bitsch. Skirmishing of the advanced posts and collisions between reconnoitering parties began on the 19th of July. The most important of these minor engagements was that at Saarbrücken, on the 2d of August [the French claiming a victory]. . . . August 4th the crown prince crossed the French frontier and attacked the town of Weissenburg, on the little river Lauter. . . . Weissenburg was successfully carried by Prussian and Bavarian battalions combined, and the Geisberg by sixteen battalions of Prussians alone. . . . August 5th MacMahon with his corps took up his position at Wörth, fortifying the heights westward from Sauerbach, together with the villages of Frosch-

weiler and Elsasshausen, in the intention of meeting at that place the advancing columns of the crown prince, whose attack he expected on the 7th. To strengthen his army sufficiently for the task required of it he endeavored to bring up General Felix Douay's corps from Belfort and Mühlhausen, and that of General Faily from Bitsch; but only one division of the former arrived in time, and a division of the latter which was sent to his support did not reach the neighborhood of the battle-field until the evening of the 6th, in time to afford a partial protection on the retreat. Consequently, MacMahon was left with not more than 45,000 men to face the crown prince's whole army. . . . On the morning of the 6th the advance guard of the 5th corps became involved in a sharp action with the enemy," and "from a mere skirmish of the advance guard resulted the decisive battle of Wörth. . . . After Wörth itself had been carried, the fighting was most severe around the fortified village of Froschweiler. This was finally taken, and a desperate charge of the French cuirassiers repulsed. Thereupon MacMahon's army broke and fled in wild confusion, some toward the passes of the Vosges, others to Strasburg or Bitsch. . . . The trophies of victory were numerous and valuable: 200 officers and 9,000 men prisoners. . . . The French lost 6,000 dead and wounded; the German loss was 489 officers and 10,153 men—a loss greater than that of Sadowa. . . . MacMahon, with about 15,000 of his defeated troops, reached Zabern on the morning of the 7th, and set out thence for Châlons, whither Generals Douay and Faily were also directed to lead their forces. A new army was to be formed at that point, and northern Alsace was abandoned to the crown prince's victorious troops. The Badish division received orders to march against Strasburg, and by the 9th the whole corps was assembled before that city, Hagenau having been taken by the cavalry on the way. . . . Preparations for a siege were made, a regular siege corps being formed . . . and placed under the command of General Werder. With the remainder of the third army the crown prince left Wörth on the 8th of August, marched through the unguarded passes of the Vosges, and entered Nancy on the 16th. . . . Detachments were left behind to blockade Bitsch and Pfalzburg. At Nancy the prince rested for a few days and waited for decisive news from the Saar and Moselle. A second victory was won on the 6th of August at Spichern [or Forbach]. Like the battle of Wörth, this action was not the result of a strategical combination, but rather of a misunderstanding. . . . Frossard [whose corps was encountered at Spichern] fell back on Metz by way of Saargemünd. Bazaine, who, although not more than seven or eight miles from the field of battle, had made no attempt to come to Frossard's assistance, led his corps to the same place. In this battle, owing to the unfavorable nature of the ground, the losses of the conquerors were heavier than those of the conquered. The Germans had 223 officers and 4,648 men dead, wounded, and missing; while the French, according to their own reports, lost 249 officers and 3,829 men, 2,000 of whom were taken prisoners. August 7th the victors continued their forward march, capturing great stores of provisions in Forbach. On the 9th St. Avoird was taken, and foraging parties advanced almost to Metz. Marching through the Rhenish

Palatinate, part of Prince Frederic Charles's army directed its course toward Metz by way of Saarbrücken, and part through Saargemünd. . . . In the imperial head-quarters at Metz the greatest consternation prevailed. . . . It was [finally] decided to concentrate five army corps on the right bank of the Moselle, at Metz, and to form a second army, consisting of four corps, under MacMahon's command, in the camp at Châlons. The first line of defence on the Rhine and Saar had been abandoned, and France was to be defended on the Moselle. By this decision Alsace and Lorraine were surrendered to the foe at the very outset." On the 9th of August the French emperor transferred the chief command from himself to Marshal Bazaine, while Lebœuf at the same time withdrew from the direction of the staff. Simultaneously, at Paris, the Grammont-Ollivier ministry resigned, and was succeeded by a cabinet formed under the presidency of Count Palikao (General Montauban). "New levies were called into the field, comprising all unmarried men between the ages of 25 and 30 not already enrolled in the 'garde mobile.' . . . In the German head-quarters . . . it was resolved in some way to make Bazaine's army harmless, either by shutting him up in Metz or by pushing him northward to the Belgian frontier. . . . The task was a difficult one. . . . All depended upon what course Bazaine might conclude to pursue, and the energy with which he executed his plans. It was his purpose to leave Metz with the field army and join MacMahon at Châlons. There would then be 300,000 French at that place to block the German march to Paris. In that event the Germans would have to leave 60,000 men before Metz . . . and Diedenhofen, and would not have enough left to venture an attack on the united and well-intrenched armies at Châlons. Accordingly, the union of those two armies must be prevented at any price, and Bazaine be attacked before Metz. The execution of this plan led to the severe fighting near that city—the battle of Colombey-Neuilly (Borny), on the 14th, Vionville on the 16th, and Gravelotte on the 18th." The battle of Gravelotte was "the first battle in the war in which a pre-arranged plan [Moltke's] was actually carried out. . . . It was a brilliant victory, and followed by important results. Bazaine's army was shut up in the fortress and among the outlying forts, and rendered unavailable for further service in the field. The losses of the French amounted to about 13,000 men, including 600 officers; the German loss was 899 officers and 19,260 men, of whom 328 officers and 4,909 men were killed outright. The number of combatants on the side of the French was about 140,000, on the side of the Germans 178,818, the former having 550, and the latter 822 cannon. It must be remembered, however, that the French occupied a position very much of the nature of a fortress, which had to be carried by storm."—W. Müller, *Political History of Recent Times*, sect. 25.

ALSO IN: Count H. von Moltke, *The Franco-German War of 1870-71*, sect. 1.—Col. A. Borbstaedt and Maj. F. Dwyer, *The Franco-German War*, ch. 10-29.

A. D. 1870 (August—September).—Investment of Metz by the Germans.—Disastrous attempt of MacMahon to rescue Bazaine.—The catastrophe at Sedan.—"The huge, stubborn, vehement and bloody conflict waged in the

rural tract between the northern edges of the Bois de Vaux and the Forest of Jaumont, which the French Marshal called the 'Defence of the Lines of Amanvillers,' the French Army, 'the Battle of St. Privat,' and the Germans the battle of 'Gravelotte—St. Privat,' established the mastery of the latter over 'the Army of the Rhine.' Marshal Bazaine had not proved strong enough to extricate the Army he was suddenly appointed to command from the false position in which it had been placed by the errors and hesitations of the Emperor and Marshal Lebœuf. . . . The German leaders forthwith resolved, and acted on the resolve, to take the largest advantage of success. When the broadening day showed that the French were encamped under the guns of the fort, and that they did not betray the faintest symptom of fighting for egress on any side, the place was deliberately invested. . . . Soon the blockade was so far completed that only adventurous scouts were able at rare intervals to work their way through the German lines. As early as the forenoon of the 19th, the King had decided to form what came to be called the 'Army of the Meuse' out of the Corps which were not needed to uphold the investment of Metz, and thus place himself in a condition to assail the French Army collecting at Châlons. . . . This formidable force was put under the command of the Crown Prince of Saxony, who had shown himself to be an able soldier. Consequently, there remained behind to invest Bazaine, seven Corps d'Armée and a Division of Reserve under General von Kummer. . . . One Army had been literally imprisoned, another remained at large, and behind it were the vast resources of France. Three Marshals were cooped up in the cage on the Moselle; one, MacMahon, and the Emperor were still in the field; and upon the forces with them it was resolved to advance at once, because prudence required that they should be shattered before they could be completely organized, and while the moral effect of the resounding blows struck in Alsace and Lorraine had lost none of its terrible power. Therefore the King and General von Moltke started on the morrow of victory to march on Paris through the plains of Champagne."—G. Hooper, *The Campaign of Sedan*, ch. 10.—"While the German invasion had thus been rolling from Lorraine into the flats of Champagne, the shattered right wing of the army of the Rhine, with reinforcements sent off from Paris, had been drawn together in the well-known plains made memorable by the defeat of Attila. By 20 Aug. the first and fifth French corps marched rapidly from the Upper Moselle to the Marne, had been joined by the seventh corps from Belfort and by the twelfth formed in and despatched from Paris; and this force, numbering perhaps 130,000 men, with from 400 to 500 guns, had been concentrated round the great camp of Châlons. MacMahon was given the supreme command, and the first operations of the experienced chief showed that he understood the present state of affairs, and were in accord with the rules of strategy. Bazaine, he knew, was in peril near Metz, and certainly had not attained the Meuse; and he was at the head of the last army which France could assemble for the defence of her capital. In these circumstances, impressed perhaps by the grand memories of the campaign of 1814, he most properly resolved to fall back towards Paris; but as

Bazaine was possibly not far distant, and a position on the flank of the German advance might afford a favourable opportunity to strike, he withdrew northwards on the 21st to Rheims, in the double hope that he would approach his colleague and threaten the communications of the advancing enemy. This, we repeat, was following the art of war, and had MacMahon firmly adhered to his purpose, there would have been no Sedan and no treaty of Frankfort. Unhappily the marshal, a hero in the field, was deficient in real strength of character, and at this critical moment evil counsels and false information shook, and at last changed, a resolve that ought to have never faltered. A new administration had been formed in Paris, and Palikao, the minister of war, devoted to the Empire, and especially bent on satisfying the demands of the excited capital, which passionately insisted on the relief of Bazaine, had conceived a project by which he hoped that this great object would be effected and the 'dynasty' be restored in popular opinion. The army of the Meuse, he argued, was near that stream, round Verdun; the third army was far away to the south; there was a considerable interval between the two masses; and the army of Châlons, then at Rheims, was not far from the Upper Meuse. In those circumstances it was quite practicable, should MacMahon rapidly advance to the Meuse, to overpower with his largely superior force the army of the Meuse before support could be sent from the distant third army; and the enemy in his path being swept aside, the marshal could then descend on Metz, fall with the collected strength of the army of Châlons on the divided fragments of the investing force, and triumphantly effect his junction with Bazaine, having routed, perhaps, the first and second armies before the third could appear on the scene. The defiles and woods of the Argonne and the Ardennes, stretching between the French and the German armies, Palikao insisted, would form a screen to conceal the advance of the army of Châlons, and would greatly facilitate the proposed movement. This project reached MacMahon on 21 Aug., and may be pronounced one of the most reckless ever designed by a desperate gambler in war. . . . MacMahon at first refused to listen to what he condemned as a hopeless project; but bad advisers found their way to him, and his resolution was already yielding when a calamitous event fixed his shifting purpose. A despatch from Bazaine, obscure and untrue, announced that he was on his way northward. MacMahon inferred that his beleaguered colleague had left Metz and eluded his foes, and, thinking that he would reach Bazaine before long, in an evil hour for France and for himself, he consented to attempt the march to the Meuse." W. O'C. Morris, *The Campaign of Sedan* (*English Historical Rev.*, April, 1888).—"It was not until the afternoon of August 23 that MacMahon's army passed through Rheims. Anxious, and knowing that everything depended on speed, he addressed some columns as they toiled onwards, reminding them that French soldiers had marched thirty miles a day under the sun of Africa. The difference, however, was great between raids made by a few light regiments and the advance of a raw unwieldy mass; and though the marshal endeavoured to hurry them forward, he was confronted with almost insurmountable obstacles. Scarcely had the army made a march

towards establishing itself at Bethnville, on the Suippe, when commissariat difficulties obliged him to re-approach the line of the railway. He made a movement on his left, and reached Rethel on the 24th, in order to obtain for his troops several days' subsistence. This distribution occupied the whole of the 25th. . . . As the direction of the French movement could not now be concealed, at this point MacMahon made arrangements for marching with all possible rapidity. It may be doubted, however, whether Napoleon himself, at the head of the grand army could have made the haste which the marshal designed with his raw and partly demoralized troops. . . . His army was altogether unequal to forced marches, and moved at this critical moment with the sluggishness inherent in its defective organization. Encumbered with stragglers, badly pioneered, and checked by hindrances of every kind, it made hardly ten miles a day; and it was the 27th of August before its right column, still far from the Meuse, passed through Vouziers, and the left reached Le Chêne. . . . On the 27th it was openly boasted of in Paris that MacMahon had gained at least forty-eight hours' start of the Crown Prince, and his coming success was firmly counted on by the imperialist cabinet, whereas, in reality, the whole scheme was foiled beforehand by Von Moltke's and General Blumenthal's prompt combination. . . . If in fighting, in the boldness of their cavalry, the activity of their staff, the cool firing of their infantry, and the skilful tactical use of their guns, the superiority of the Germans to their antagonists had been already proved; it only required the contrast now presented between the movements of the two armies to show, that in no point had the difference of training and moral feeling told more in favour of the invaders than in that of the marching, on which the elder Napoleon so often relied for his advantage over these very Germans. . . . Between the 27th and the morning of the 29th, the right column of the French army had only its outposts at Buzancy, while the left, though its outposts touched Stenay, was only at Stonne and Beaumont, both columns spreading a long way backward; in other words, they were still a march from the Meuse, which they ought to have passed three days before, and their rearward divisions were yet distant. The German armies, from the 26th to the 29th, made astonishing exertions to close on MacMahon as he crossed towards the Meuse, and success was already within their grasp. The force of the Crown Prince of Saxony, in two columns, had reached the Meuse at Dun on the 27th, and was thus in a position to arrest and retard the vanguard of the French whenever it attempted to cross the river. Meanwhile the army of the Crown Prince of Prussia, hastening forward by Varennes and Grand Pré, and to the left by Senec and Suippe, had arrived close to the line of march of MacMahon's right column, and by the evening of the 28th had occupied it about Vouziers. A step farther, and this immense army would be upon the positions of the luckless French, who, assailed in flank and rear by superior numbers, could not fail to be involved in terrible disaster. . . . MacMahon [on the 27th], observing that the enemy so completely surrounded him, felt more than ever satisfied that it would be impossible to carry out the plan which had been prescribed to him at Paris; and to save, if possible,

the sole army which France had at her disposal, he accordingly resolved to turn back in a westerly direction. . . . The same evening he sent . . . [a] telegram to the Count Palikao, at Paris. . . . In reply to this, the government sent a telegram to the emperor at eleven o'clock the same night, telling him that if they abandoned Bazaine there would certainly be a revolution in Paris, and they would themselves be attacked by all the enemy's forces. . . . The emperor admits that he could unquestionably have set this order aside, but 'he was resolved not to oppose the decision of the regency, and had resigned himself to submit to the consequences of the fatality which attached itself to all the resolutions of the government.' As for MacMahon, he again bowed to the decision intimated to him from Paris, and once more turned towards Metz. These orders and counter-orders naturally occasioned further delay, and the French headquarters had reached no farther than Stonne on the 28th. . . . On Monday, August 29, De Failly occupied the country between Beaumont and Stonne, on the left bank of the Meuse; while the main body of the French army, under MacMahon in person, had crossed the river, and were encamped on the right bank at Vaux, between Mouzon and Carignan, and on the morning of the 30th the emperor telegraphed to Paris that a brilliant victory might be expected. MacMahon's position was in a sharp wedge of country formed by the confluence of the rivers Meuse and Chiers, and it was his intention to advance towards Montmédj. The other part of his army was close to the river on its left bank. . . . The battle—or rather series of battles, for the fighting extended over three days—which was to decide whether or not he would reach Metz and liberate Bazaine, began in earnest a little before noon on Tuesday, August 30.—H. M. Hozier, *The Franco-Prussian War*, v. 1, ch. 13.—“The retreating French were concentrated, or rather massed, under the walls of Sedan, in a valley commonly called the Sink of Givonne. The army consisted of twenty-nine brigades, fifteen divisions, and four corps d'armée, numbering ninety thousand men. 'It was there,' says Victor Hugo, 'no one could guess what for, without order, without discipline, a mere crowd of men, waiting, as it seemed, to be seized by an immensely powerful hand. It seemed to be under no particular anxiety. The men who composed it knew, or thought they knew, that the enemy was far away. Calculating four leagues as a day's march, they believed the Germans to be at three days' distance. The commanders, however, towards nightfall, made some preparations for safety. The whole army formed a sort of horse-shoe, its point turning towards Sedan. This disposition proved that its chiefs believed themselves in safety. The valley was one of those which the Emperor Napoleon used to call a "bowl," and which Admiral Van Tromp designated by a less polite name. No place could have been better calculated to shut in an army. Its very numbers were against it. Once in, if the way out were blocked, it could never leave it again. Some of the generals,—General Wimpfen among them—saw this, and were uneasy; but the little court around the emperor was confident of safety. "At worst," they said, "we can always reach the Belgian frontier." The commonest military precautions were neglected. The army slept soundly on

the night of August 31. At the worst they believed themselves to have a line of retreat open to Mézières, a town on the frontier of Belgium. No cavalry reconnaissance was made that night; the guards were not doubled. The French believed themselves more than forty miles from the German army. They behaved as if they thought that army unconcentrated and ill-informed, attempting vaguely several things at once, and incapable of converging on one point, namely, Sedan. They thought they knew that the column under the Prince of Saxony was marching upon Châlons, and that the Crown Prince of Prussia was marching upon Metz. But that night, while the French army, in fancied security, was sleeping at Sedan, this is what was passing among the enemy. By a quarter to two A. M. the army of the Prince of Saxony was on its march eastward with orders not to fire a shot till five o'clock, and to make as little noise as possible. They marched without baggage of any kind. At the same hour another division of the Prussian army marched, with equal noiselessness, from another direction on Sedan, while the Württembergers secured the road to Mézières, thereby cutting off the possibility of a retreat into Belgium. At the same moment, namely, five o'clock,—on all the hills around Sedan, at all points of the compass, appeared a dense dark mass of German troops, with their commanders and artillery. Not one sound had been heard by the French army, not even an order. Two hundred and fifty thousand men were in a circle on the heights round the Sink of Givonne. They had come as stealthily and as silently as serpents. They were there when the sun rose, and the French army were prisoners.' [Victor Hugo, *Choses Vues*].—The battle was one of artillery. The German guns commanded every part of the crowded valley. Indeed the fight was simply a massacre. There was no hope for the French, though they fought bravely. Their best troops, the Garde Impériale, were with Bazaine at Metz. Marshal MacMahon was wounded very early in the day. The command passed first to General Ducrot, who was also disabled, and afterwards to Wimpfen, a brave African general who had hurried from Algeria just in time to take part in this disastrous day. He told the emperor that the only hope was for the troops to cut their way out of the valley; but the army was too closely crowded, too disorganized, to make this practicable. One Zouave regiment accomplished this feat, and reached Belgium. That night—the night of September 1—an aide-de-camp of the Emperor Napoleon carried this note to the camp of the king of Prussia:—Monsieur Mon Frère,—Not having been able to die in midst of my troops, it only remains for me to place my sword in the hands of your Majesty. I am your Majesty's good brother, Napoleon. . . . With Napoleon III. fell not only his own reputation as a ruler, but the glory of his uncle and the prestige of his name. The fallen emperor and Bismarck met in a little house upon the banks of the Meuse. Chairs were brought out, and they talked in the open air. It was a glorious autumn morning. The emperor looked care-worn, as well he might. He wished to see the king of Prussia before the articles of capitulation were drawn up: but King William declined the interview. When the capitulation was signed, however, he drove over to visit the captive emperor at a château where the

latter had taken refuge. Their interview was private; only the two sovereigns were present. The French emperor afterwards expressed to the Crown Prince of Prussia his deep sense of the courtesy shown him. He was desirous of passing as unnoticed as possible through French territory, where, indeed, exasperation against him, as the first cause of the misfortunes of France, was so great that his life would have been in peril. The next day he proceeded to the beautiful palace at Cassel called Wilhelmshöhe, or William's [Height]. It had been built at ruinous expense by Jérôme Bonaparte while king of Westphalia, and was then called Napoleon's Rest. . . . Thus eighty thousand men capitulated at Sedan, and were marched as prisoners into Germany; one hundred and seventy-five thousand French soldiers remained shut up in Metz, besides a few thousand more in Strasbourg, Phalsbourg, Toul, and Belfort. But the road was open to Paris, and thither the various German armies marched, leaving the Landwehr, which could not be ordered to serve beyond the limits of Germany, to hold Alsace and Lorraine, already considered a part of the Fatherland."—E. W. Latimer, *France in the Nineteenth Century*, ch. 12.—"The German army had lost in the battle of Sedan about 460 officers and 8,500 men killed and wounded. On the French side the loss sustained in the battle and at the capitulation amounted according to their returns to the following: Killed 3,000 men; wounded 14,000; prisoners (in the battle) 21,000; prisoners (at the capitulation) 83,000; disarmed in Belgium 3,000; total 124,000."—*The Franco-German War: German Official Account*, pt. 1, v. 2, p. 408.

ALSO IN: Capt. G. Fitz-George, *Plan of the battle of Sedan, with Memoir*.—A. Forbes, *My Experiences of the War bet. France and Germany*, pt. 1, ch. 4 (v. 1).—Col. A. Borbstaedt and Maj. F. Dwyer, *The Franco-German War*, ch. 30–40.—G. B. Malleson, *The Refounding of the German Empire*, ch. 14.

A. D. 1870 (September).—Revolution at Paris.—Collapse of the empire.—Self-constitution of the Government of National Defense.—At Paris, the whole truth of the tremendous disaster at Sedan was but slowly learned. On the afternoon of Saturday, September 3, Count de Palikao intimated a little part of it, only, "in a statement to the Corps Législatif, announcing that Marshal Bazaine, after a vigorous sally, had been obliged to retire again under the walls of Metz, and that Macmahon, after a series of combats, attended by reverses and successes—having at the outset driven a part of the enemy's army into the Meuse—had been compelled to retreat to Sedan and Mézières, a portion of his army having taken refuge in Belgium. The junction of the two armies had therefore not been made. The situation was serious, calmly observed the Minister of War, but not hopeless. Not hopeless! when the truth was that one army was blockaded and the other prisoner, and that there were no reserves. . . . At a midnight sitting Count de Palikao, still determined to conceal a portion of the truth, intimated that part of Marshal Macmahon's army had been driven back into Sedan, that the remainder had capitulated, and that the Emperor had been made prisoner. M. Jules Favre met this announcement of fresh disasters by a motion, declaring the Emperor and his dynasty to have forfeited all rights conferred

by the Constitution, demanding the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee invested with the governing power, and having for its special mission the expulsion of the enemy from French territory, and further maintaining General Trochu in his post as Governor of Paris. The Chamber then adjourned till the morrow. But Paris had touched one of those crises when, as Pascal says, a grain of sand will give a turn to history and change the life of nations, and the morrow brought with it the downfall of the Ministry, of the dynasty, of the Empire, and of that bizarre constitutional edifice which had been kept waiting so long for its complemental crown. . . . It had been intimated that the Corps Législatif would reassemble at noon, before which time numerous groups collected on the Place de la Concorde, and eventually swelled to a considerable crowd. The bridge leading to the Palais Bourbon was guarded by a detachment of mounted gendarmes, and numerous sergents-de-ville. . . . Battalions of National Guards having, however, arrived, the gendarmes, after flourishing their swords, opened their ranks and allowed them to pass, followed by a considerable portion of the crowd, shouting 'Vive la République!' and singing the 'Chant du Départ.' The iron gates of the Palais Bourbon having been opened to admit a deputation of National Guards, the crowd precipitated itself forward, and in a few minutes the steps and courtyard were alike invaded. Cries of 'Vive la Garde Nationale!' 'Vive la Ligne!' 'Vive la République!' resounded on all sides, and the soldiers who occupied the court of the Palais Bourbon, after making a show of resistance, ended by hoisting the butt ends of their rifles in the air in sign of sympathy, joining at the same time in the shouts of the crowd, while the latter, encountering no further opposition, proceeded to invade the passages of the Chamber, at the moment Count de Kératry was attacking the Ministry for surrounding the Corps Législatif with troops and sergents-de-ville, contrary to the orders of General Trochu. Count de Palikao, having explained the relative positions of the Governor of Paris and the Minister of War, introduced a bill instituting a Council of Government and National Defence, composed of five members elected by the Legislative Body, the ministers to be appointed with the approval of the members of this Council, and he, Count de Palikao, to occupy the post of Lieutenant-General. M. Jules Favre having claimed priority for the motion which he had introduced the day before, M. Thiers, pleading the necessity for union, next moved that:—"In view of existing circumstances, the Chamber appoints a Commission of Government and National Defence. A Constituent Assembly will be convoked as soon as circumstances permit." The Chamber having declared in favour of their urgency, these several propositions were eventually referred to the Bureau, and the sitting was suspended. It was during this period that the crowd penetrated into the Salles des Quatre Colonnes and de la Paix. . . . At half-past two, when the sitting was resumed, the galleries were crowded and very noisy. The members of the Left only were in their places. It was in vain the President attempted to obtain silence, in vain the solemn huissiers commanded it. MM. Gambetta and Crémieux appeared together at the tribune, and the former begged of the people to remain quiet.

... A partial silence having been secured, Count de Palikao, followed by a few members of the majority, entered the Chamber, but did not essay to speak. ... A minute or two afterwards, the clamour arose again, and a noisy multitude commenced invading the floor of the hall. ... Nothing was left to the President but to put on his hat and retire, which he did, together with Count de Palikao and the members by whom the latter had been accompanied. By this time the Chamber was completely invaded by National and Mobile Guards, in company with an excited crowd, whose advance it was in vain now to attempt to repel. M. Jules Favre, having mounted the tribune, obtained a moment's silence. 'No scenes of violence,' cried he; 'let us reserve our arms for our enemies.' Finding it utterly impossible to obtain any further hearing inside the Chamber, M. Gambetta, accompanied by the members of the Left, proceeded to the steps of the peristyle, and there announced the dethronement of the Emperor to the people assembled outside. Accompanied by one section of the crowd, they now hurried to the Hôtel de Ville, and there installed themselves as a Provisional Government, whilst another section took possession of the Tuileries—whence the Empress had that morning taken flight—as national property. A select band of Republicans, mindful of what Count—now Citoyen—Henri Rochefort had done to bring Imperialism into disrepute, proceeded to the prison of Sainte Pélagie and conducted the author of the *Lanterne*, and other political prisoners, in triumph to the Hôtel de Ville. The deputies who quitted the Chamber when it was invaded by the mob, met that same afternoon at the President's residence, and sent a deputation to the Hôtel de Ville, with a proposal to act in common with the new Government. This proposition was, however, declined, on the score of the Republic having been already proclaimed and accepted by the population of Paris. At an evening meeting of nearly two hundred deputies, held under the presidency of M. Thiers, MM. Jules Favre and Simon attended on the part of the Provisional Government to explain that they were anxious to secure the support of the deputies, whom they hinted, however, could best serve their country in the departments. After this unequivocal rebuff, the deputies, who had in the meantime been apprised that seals had been placed on the doors of the Corps Législatif, saw that nothing remained to them but to protest, and protest they accordingly did against the events of the afternoon. ... Not one of the two hundred deputies present so much as dared suggest the breaking of the seals and the assembling in the Legislative Chamber. ... The Government which grasped the reins of power on the utter collapse of Imperial institutions was a mob-named one in the fullest sense of the term, the names having been chalked by the populace on the pillars of the portico of the Palais Bourbon during that invasion of the Chamber on the Sunday afternoon which resulted in the overthrow of the Imperial régime. The list appears to have been accepted by the principal members of the Left, who, although they would have preferred disassociating themselves from M. Rochefort, nevertheless felt that it was impossible to leave him out of the combination, and therefore adroitly—and not inappropriately, as the safety of Paris was especially in their keeping—

made it embrace all the deputies for Paris, save, as M. Jules Simon observed, the most illustrious—meaning M. Thiers, who refused to join it. ... The Government of National Defence, as it elected to style itself, on M. Rochefort's suggestion, was composed of the following members:—General Trochu, president; Jules Favre, Vice President and Minister for Foreign Affairs; Emanuel Arago, Crémieux, Minister of Justice; Jules Ferry, Secretary; Leon Gambetta, Minister of the Interior; Garnier-Pagès; Glais-Bizoin; Eugène Pelletan; Ernest Picard, Minister of Finance; Henri Rochefort; and Jules Simon, Minister of Public Instruction. Subsequently it associated with it General Le Flô, Minister of War; Admiral Fourichon, Minister of Marine; M. Dorian, Minister of Public Works; and M. Magnin, Minister of Agriculture and Commerce. These, with Count de Kératry, charged with the Prefecture of Police, M. Etienne Arago, appointed Mayor of Paris, composed altogether no less than eighteen members, upwards of two-thirds of whom were Bretons, advocates, or journalists. ... For some days the new Government was prodigal of proclamations and decrees. Its first acts were to close the doors of the Palais Bourbon and the Palais du Luxembourg, and dissolve the Corps Législatif and abolish the Senate as bouches inutiles politiques, to issue proclamations to the army, or rather the débris of one, justifying the Revolution and appealing to the troops to continue their heroic efforts for the defence of the country, and to the National Guard, thanking them for their past, and asking for their future patriotism. It released all functionaries from their oaths, dismissed the ambassadors at foreign courts, appointed prefects in all the departments, and new mayors in the twenty arrondissements of the capital, proclaimed the complete liberty of the press, ordered all Germans not provided with special permission to remain, to quit the departments of the Seine and Seine-et-Oise within four-and-twenty hours. ... It pressed forward the provisioning of the city and its works of defence, increased the herds of sheep and oxen and the stores of corn and flour, provisionally abolished all local customs and octroi dues, and fixed the price of butcher's meat, armed the outer forts and the enceinte, blew up or mined all the bridges and fired all the woods in the environs, razed thousands of houses to the ground, felled roadside trees, and constructed huge barricades with them; laid in fact all the beautiful suburbs in waste; listened to the thousand and one wild schemes put forth by patriotic madmen for exterminating the invaders, and launched a huge captive balloon, which hovered daily over Paris to give timely notice of their dreaded arrival."—H. Vizetelly, *ed. Paris in Peril*, ch. 1.

Also in: J. Favre, *The Gov't of the National Defence*, June—October.—W. Rüstow, *The War for the Rhine Frontier*, ch. 22 (v. 2).

A. D. 1870 (September—October).—Futile striving for allies and for peace without territorial sacrifices.—Investment of Paris.—Gambetta's organization of defense in the provinces.—Bazaine's surrender at Metz.—"The Government of National Defence ... imagined that the fall of the Empire would simplify the cruel position of France towards the enemy. The Dynasty which had declared war being reversed, and the men now in power having been throughout opposed to war and in favour

of German unity, and now demanding nothing but peace, what motive could the King of Prussia have to continue the invasion of France? It was further to be considered that free France would defend her integrity to the last drop of her blood; that she would voluntarily give up neither an inch of her territory nor a stone of her fortresses. Such were the ideas which the new Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Jules Favre, expressed on the 6th of September, in a circular addressed to the French agents in foreign countries. The Cabinet of Berlin was not slow in disabusing him of these convictions. Far from accepting the view that the Emperor Napoleon was the sole promoter of war, Count Bismarck, in two despatches, of the 13th and of the 16th of September, threw the responsibility of the conflict on the French nation. He stated that the vast majority of the Chambers had voted for war, and that the Emperor was justified in assuring the King that he had been forced into a war to which he was personally averse. . . . In order to be secure against future aggression, Germany would ask for guarantees from the French nation itself, and not from a transitory Government. . . . In any case, Germany would require Strasburg and Metz. Thus the accession to power of the Republican Government did not modify the reciprocal positions of the two belligerents. Nevertheless, hope was entertained in Paris that the friendly intervention of the great powers might induce the victor to soften his rigour; but intervention was declined by the Berlin Cabinet and not undertaken. "On the 19th of September the investment of Paris was completed. At the desire of the French Government, the English Cabinet applied to the German head-quarters, with the object of obtaining for M. Jules Favre an interview with Count Bismarck. This request having been granted, the two statesmen held conferences, on the 19th and 20th of September, at Ferrières, a castle of Baron Rothschild near Meaux. During these interviews the French Minister was sentimental and the German Minister coldly logical. They could not come to an agreement on any single point. . . . The Government of Paris . . . again proclaimed that France would not cede an inch of her territory. Meanwhile, in consequence of the investment of Paris, the Government of National Defence was divided into two parts; some of its Delegates withdrew to Tours, forming a delegation of the central Government which remained in Paris. The German armies had continued their onward march, as well as their operations against the fortresses. Toul capitulated on the 23rd and Strasburg on the 28th of September. On the 5th of October, King William had established his headquarters at Versailles." Meantime "the Government of National Defence made a last attempt to secure allies, or at least the help of powerful mediators. With this object M. Thiers, who had placed himself at the disposal of the Administration of the 4th of September, was sent on a mission to the European Courts. From the 12th of September till the 20th of October, the old statesman visited in succession London, Vienna, St. Petersburg, and Florence. In none of these cities were his measures attended with happy results." At St. Petersburg and at London he was told — and he was himself convinced — "that the King of Prussia was compelled to consider the public opinion of Germany, and that France would have to resign herself to territorial

sacrifices." He returned to France to advise, and to procure authority for, a conference with the German Chancellor. But events had already occurred which aggravated the forlorn condition of France. "The youngest and most enterprising member of the Government of Paris, M. Gambetta, had left the Capital on the 8th of October in a balloon for Tours. It was his intention to organise national defence in the Provinces. The day after his arrival at Tours, he issued a fiery Proclamation to the French people. . . . With an energy that called forth universal admiration, the Government of Tours, over which Gambetta presided as Dictator, organised resistance, formed a new army, and gathered together every possible resource for defence both in men and in materials. All these efforts could not arrest the progress of the invasion. From the 11th to the 31st of October, the Germans took successively Orleans, Soissons, Schlestadt and Dijon. Round Paris they repulsed the sallies of Malmaison, Champigny, and le Bourget. But all these defeats of heroic soldiers waned when compared to the appalling and decisive catastrophe of Metz. After the battle of Gravelotte, Marshal Bazaine had unsuccessfully attempted several sallies. . . . On the 7th of October, after an unfortunate battle at Woippy, lasting nine hours, Bazaine considered the situation desperate. His only thought was to obtain the most favourable conditions he could, and with this object he sent General Boyer to the headquarters at Versailles." After two weeks of negotiation, "on the 21st of October, the army encamped within the walls of Metz found itself without provisions. . . . Negotiations with Prince Frederick Charles, nephew of the King and Commander-in-chief of the besieging Army, were opened on the 25th, and terminated on the 27th of October. The conditions were identical with those of Sedan: capitulation of the town and its forts with all the material of war, all the army of the Rhine to be prisoners and the officers to be liberated on parole."—E. Simon, *The Emperor William and his Reign*, ch. 13 (v. 2).—"The French Army of the Rhine at the time of the surrender still numbered 173,000 men, inclusive of 6,000 officers and 20,000 men remaining temporarily in Metz as sick or convalescent."—*The Franco-German War: German Official Account*, pt. 2, v. 1, p. 201.

ALSO IN: A. Forbes, *My Experiences of the War between France and Germany*, pt. 2 (v. 1).

A. D. 1870-1871.—The war in the provinces. —Unsuccessful attempts to relieve the capital. —Distress in Paris.—Capitulation and armistice.—"The surrender of Metz and the release of the great army of Prince Frederick Charles by which it was besieged fatally changed the conditions of the French war of national defence. Two hundred thousand of the victorious troops of Germany under some of their ablest generals were set free to attack the still untrained levies on the Loire and in the north of France, which, with more time for organisation, might well have forced the Germans to raise the siege of Paris. The army once commanded by Steinmetz was now reconstituted, and despatched under General Manteuffel towards Amiens; Prince Frederick Charles moved with the remainder of his troops towards the Loire. Aware that his approach could not long be delayed, Gambetta insisted that Aurelle de Paladines should begin the march on Paris. The general attacked Tann at Coulmiers

on the 9th of November, defeated him, and re-occupied Orleans, the first real success that the French had gained in the war. There was great alarm at the German headquarters at Versailles; the possibility of a failure of the siege was discussed; and 40,000 troops were sent southwards in haste to the support of the Bavarian general. Aurelle, however, did not move upon the capital: his troops were still unfit for the enterprise; and he remained stationary on the north of Orleans, in order to improve his organisation, to await reinforcements, and to meet the attack of Frederick Charles in a strong position. In the third week of November the leading divisions of the army of Metz approached, and took post between Orleans and Paris. Gambetta now insisted that the effort should be made to relieve the capital. Aurelle resisted, but was forced to obey. The garrison of Paris had already made several unsuccessful attacks upon the lines of their besiegers, the most vigorous being that of Le Bourget on the 30th of October, in which bayonets were crossed. It was arranged that in the last days of November General Trochu should endeavour to break out on the southern side, and that simultaneously the army of the Loire should fall upon the enemy in front of it and endeavour to force its way to the capital. On the 28th the attack upon the Germans on the north of Orleans began. For several days the struggle was renewed by one division after another of the armies of Aurelle and Prince Frederick Charles. Victory remained at last with the Germans; the centre of the French position was carried; the right and left wings of the army were severed from one another and forced to retreat, the one up the Loire, the other towards the west. Orleans on the 5th of December passed back into the hands of the Germans. The sortie from Paris, which began with a successful attack by General Ducrot upon Champigny beyond the Marne, ended after some days of combat in the recovery by the Germans of the positions which they had lost, and in the retreat of Ducrot into Paris. In the same week Manteuffel, moving against the relieving army of the north, encountered it near Amiens, defeated it after a hard struggle, and gained possession of Amiens itself. After the fall of Amiens, Manteuffel moved upon Rouen. This city fell into his hands without resistance. . . . But the Republican armies, unlike those which the Germans had first encountered, were not to be crushed at a single blow. Under the energetic command of Faidherbe the army of the north advanced again upon Amiens. Goeben, who was left to defend the line of the Somme, went out to meet him, defeated him on the 23rd of December, and drove him back to Arras. But again, after a week's interval, Faidherbe pushed forward. On the 3rd of January he fell upon Goeben's weak division at Bapaume, and handled it so severely that the Germans would on the following day have abandoned their position, if the French had not themselves been the first to retire. Faidherbe, however, had only fallen back to receive reinforcements. After some days' rest he once more sought to gain the road to Paris, advancing this time by the eastward line through St. Quentin. In front of this town Goeben attacked him. The last battle of the army of the North was fought on the 19th of January. The French general endeavoured to disguise his defeat, but the German command-

der had won all that he desired. Faidherbe's army was compelled to retreat northwards in disorder; its part in the war was at an end. During the last three weeks of December there was a pause in the operations of the Germans on the Loire. . . . Gambetta . . . had . . . determined to throw the army of Bourbaki, strengthened by reinforcements from the south, upon Germany itself. The design was a daring one, and had the . . . French armies been capable of performing the work which Gambetta required of them, an inroad into Baden, or even the reconquest of Alsace, would most seriously have affected the position of the Germans before Paris. But Gambetta miscalculated the power of young, untrained troops, imperfectly armed, badly fed, against a veteran army. In a series of hard-fought struggles the army of the Loire under General Chanzy was driven back at the beginning of January from Vendôme to Le Mans. On the 12th, Chanzy took post before this city and fought his last battle. While he was making a vigorous resistance in the centre of the line, the Breton regiments stationed on his right gave way; the Germans pressed round him, and gained possession of the town. Chanzy retreated towards Laval, leaving thousands of prisoners in the hands of the enemy, and saving only the débris of an army. Bourbaki in the meantime, with a numerous but miserably equipped force, had almost reached Belfort. . . . Werder had evacuated Dijon and fallen back upon Vesoul; part of his army was still occupied in the siege of Belfort. As Bourbaki approached he fell back with the greater part of his troops in order to cover the besieging force, leaving one of his lieutenants to make a flank attack upon Bourbaki at Villersexel. This attack, one of the fiercest in the war, delayed the French for two days, and gave Werder time to occupy the strong positions that he had chosen about Montbéliard. Here, on the 15th of January, began a struggle which lasted for three days. The French, starving and perishing with cold, though far superior in number to their enemy, were led with little effect against the German entrenchments. On the 18th Bourbaki began his retreat. Werder was unable to follow him; Manteuffel with a weak force was still at some distance, and for a moment it seemed possible that Bourbaki, by a rapid movement westwards, might crush this isolated foe. Gambetta ordered Bourbaki to make the attempt: the commander refused to court further disaster with troops who were not fit to face an enemy, and retreated towards Pontarlier in the hope of making his way to Lyons. But Manteuffel now descended in front of him; divisions of Werder's army pressed down from the north; the retreat was cut off; and the unfortunate French general, whom a telegram from Gambetta removed from his command, attempted to take his own life. On the 1st of February, the wreck of his army, still numbering 85,000 men, but reduced to the extremity of weakness and misery, sought refuge beyond the Swiss frontier. The war was now over. Two days after Bourbaki's repulse at Montbéliard the last unsuccessful sortie was made from Paris. There now remained provisions only for another fortnight; above 40,000 of the inhabitants had succumbed to the privations of the siege; all hope of assistance from the relieving armies before actual famine should begin disappeared. On the 23rd of January Favre sought

the German Chancellor at Versailles in order to discuss the conditions of a general armistice and of the capitulation of Paris. The negotiations lasted for several days; on the 28th an armistice was signed with the declared object that elections might at once be freely held for a National Assembly, which should decide whether the war should be continued, or on what conditions peace should be made. The conditions of the armistice were that the forts of Paris and all their material of war should be handed over to the German army; that the artillery of the enceinte should be dismantled; and that the regular troops in Paris should, as prisoners of war, surrender their arms. The National Guard were permitted to retain their weapons and their artillery. Immediately upon the fulfilment of the first two conditions all facilities were to be given for the entry of supplies of food into Paris. The articles of the armistice were duly executed, and on the 30th of January the Prussian flag waved over the forts of the French capital."—C. A. Fyfe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 3, ch. 6.

Also in: H. Murdock, *The Reconstruction of Europe*, ch. 29-30.—*Daily News Corr. of the War*, ch. 13-21.—Cassell's *Hist. of the War*, v. 1, ch. 36, v. 2, ch. 1-18.—Comte d'Herrison, *Journal of a Staff Officer in Paris*.—E. B. Washburne, *Recollections of a Minister to France*, v. 1, ch. 5-10.—J. A. O'Shea, *An Iron-bound City*.—F. T. Marzials, *Life of Gambetta*, ch. 5.—H. von Moltke, *The Franco-German War of 1870-71*, sects. 3-7.—T. G. Bowles, *The Defence of Paris*.—W. Rüstow, *The War for the Rhine Frontier*, 1870, v. 3.

A. D. 1871 (January—May).—Preliminaries of Peace signed at Versailles.—The Treaty of Frankfort.—Cession of Alsace and one-fifth of Lorraine.—Five milliards of indemnity.—“On the afternoon of January 28 [1871] the capitulation of Paris was signed, and an armistice agreed upon to expire on February 19 at noon. The provinces occupied by the armies of Bourbaki and Manteuffel were alone excluded from this agreement. On January 29 the German troops quietly took possession of the Paris forts. The regulars and mobiles became prisoners of war, with the exception of 12,000 men who were left under arms to preserve order. At the earnest request of Favre the National Guard were allowed to retain their arms. If Favre urged this as a measure to counteract the imperialistic ideas supposed to be still cherished by the prisoners returning from Germany, it was a political crime as well as a military folly. The National Guard became the armed Commune. . . . While the armies withdrew to the lines stipulated in the armistice, the elections went quietly forward. The assembly convened at Bordeaux, and manifested a spirit that won for it universal respect. On February 17 M. Thiers was appointed chief of the executive power, and having named his ministry, he repaired to Versailles to arrange the preliminaries of peace. The conferences that followed with the German chancellor were perhaps the most trying ordeals to which the Frenchman had ever been subjected. No peace was possible save on the basis of the cession of miles of territory and the strongest of fortresses. France must also pay a war indemnity of no less than five milliards of francs. Bismarck, it is true, thought Thiers ‘too sentimental for business, . . . hardly fit indeed to buy or

sell a horse,’ but no diplomatist, however astute, could have made better terms for stricken France. So thought the assembly at Bordeaux; and when Thiers announced the result of his mission with a quivering lip, he had its sympathy and support. On the 2d of March the assembly formally ratified the peace preliminaries by a vote of 546 to 107. It had been stipulated in the armistice that the German troops should not occupy Paris. The extension of time granted by the Germans entitled them to some compensation, and the entry of Paris was the compensation claimed. The troops detailed for this purpose were not chosen at random. To the Frenchman who on the 1st day of March beheld them pass along the Avenue de Malakoff or the Champs Elysées it was an ominous pageant. It was a German and not a Prussian army that he beheld. . . . That night the Hessians smoked their pipes on the Trocadéro, and the Bavarians stacked their arms in the Place de la Concorde, while the lights blazing from the palace of the Elysée announced the German military headquarters. On the third day of the month, the Bordeaux Assembly having ratified the peace preliminaries, the German troops marched out, and Paris was left to herself again. The war was over. Beyond the Rhineland, in Bavaria and Württemberg as well as in the north, all was joy and enthusiasm over the return of the army that had answered before the world the question, ‘What is the German Fatherland?’ On the 10th of May the definite treaty of peace was signed at Frankfort by which France ceded Alsace and a portion of Lorraine, including the fortresses of Metz and Strasburg, to her conqueror.”—H. Murdock, *The Reconstruction of Europe*, ch. 30.—The following are the heads of the Preliminary Treaty concluded at Versailles, to which the final Treaty of Frankfort conformed: “1. France renounces in favour of the German Empire the following rights: the fifth part of Lorraine including Metz and Thionville, and Alsace less Belfort. 2. France will pay the sum of five milliards of francs, of which one milliard is to be paid in 1871 and the remaining four milliards by instalments extending over three years. 3. The German troops will begin to evacuate the French territory as soon as the Treaty is ratified. They will then evacuate the interior of Paris and some departments lying in the western region. The evacuation of the other departments will take place gradually after payment of the first milliard, and proportionately to the payment of the other four milliards. Interest at the rate of five per cent. per annum will be paid on the amount remaining due from the date of the ratification of the Treaty. 4. The German troops will not levy any requisitions in the departments occupied by them, but will be maintained at the cost of France. A delay will be granted to the inhabitants of the territories annexed to choose between the two nationalities. 5. Prisoners of war will be immediately set at liberty. 6. Negotiations for a definitive Treaty of Peace will be opened at Brussels after the ratification of this Treaty. 7. The administration of the departments occupied by the German troops will be entrusted to French officials, but under the control of the chiefs of the German Corps of occupation. 8. The present Treaty confers upon the Germans no rights whatever in the portions of territories not occupied. 9. This Treaty will have to be ratified by the

National Assembly of France."—C. Lowe, *Prince Bismarck*, v. 1, ch. 9.

Also in: E. Hertlet, *The Map of Europe by Treaty*, v. 3, nos. 438 and 446.

A. D. 1871 (March—May).—Insurrection of the Communists of Paris.—Second siege and reduction of the capital.—"On the 3d of March the German army of occupation—which had been in the assigned part of the city since the 1st—marched off through the Arc de Triomphe, and on the 7th the German headquarters were moved from Versailles. The great Franco-Prussian War was over . . . But before . . . peace could be attained, the country had yet to suffer from the so-called patriots of the Red Republicans worse outrage than it had endured at the hands of the German invaders. When the negotiations for the capitulation of Paris were in progress, Count Bismarck had warned M. Favre of the danger of allowing, as he proposed, the National Guard to retain their arms; and the members of the Government of National Defence might themselves have seen the risk they were incurring, had they calmly considered the various émeutes that had taken place during the siege, and in which the National Guard had always played such a conspicuous part on the side of disaffection. Now, in the full consciousness of their strength—somewhere about 100,000—and in their possession of a powerful artillery,—for during the German occupation they had, on the pretext of keeping them safe, got a large number of cannon into their hands,—they seemed determined to attempt the revival of the Reign of Terror. . . . The appointment of General d'Aurelle de Paladines as their commander gave great offence, and on the 9th March an attempt to place the tricolor on the column in the Place de la Bastille instead of the red flag of revolution led to an outbreak. A promise in the event of the cannon being given up, of the continuance of pay till 'ordinary work was resumed,' was disregarded, and the dismissal of D'Aurelle and the full recognition of the right of the National Guard to elect its own officers demanded. An effort of the government to seize the cannon in the Place des Vosges failed, and it was now clear enough that more energetic action than negotiations must take place. On the morning of the 18th March a large force of regular troops under Generals Vinoy and Lecomte proceeded to Montmartre and took possession of the guns; but the want of horses for their immediate removal gave time for the Reds to assemble and frustrate the effort, while, worst of all, a large number of the regular troops fraternized with the insurgents. General Lecomte and General Clément Thomas were taken prisoners and a most immediately shot. The outbreak, thus begun, spread rapidly; for, through some unaccountable timidity of the government, the government forces were withdrawn from the city, and the insurgents left free to act as they pleased. They seized General Chanzy at the Orleans railway station, took possession of the Ministry of Justice and the Hôtel de Ville, and threw up barricades round all the revolutionary quarters. The Central Committee of the National Guard, the leading man of which was Assi, . . . summoned the people of Paris to meet 'in their comitia for the communal elections,' and declared their intention of resigning their power into the hands of the Commune thus chosen. The National Assembly removed from Bordeaux and held its sittings at

Versailles; but bitter as was the feeling of the majority of the Deputies against the new turbulence, the position of affairs prevented any action from being taken against the insurgents. The removal of General d'Aurelle and the appointment of Admiral Saisset in his place was of no avail. A number of the inhabitants of Paris, styling themselves 'Men of Order,' attempted to influence affairs by a display of moral force, but they were fired on and dispersed. The Assembly was timid, and apparently quite unable to bring its troops into play. . . . Through Admiral Saisset concessions were offered, but the demands of the Communists increased with the prospect of obtaining anything. They now modestly demanded that they should supersede the Assembly wherever there was any prospect of collision of power, and be allowed to control the finances; and as a very natural consequence the negotiations were abandoned. This was on the 25th of March, and on the 26th the Commune was elected, the victory of the Reds being very easily gained, as hardly any of those opposed to them voted. Two days afterwards the Commune was proclaimed at the Hôtel de Ville, the members who had been elected being seated on a platform in red arm-chairs. The leading man of the new system was the honest but hot-headed and utopian Delescluze; Cluseret, a man of considerable military genius, who had led a life of a very wild nature in America, and who was the soul of the resistance when the actual fighting began, was Delegate of War; Grousset, of Foreign Affairs; and Rigault, of Public Safety. The new government applied itself vigorously to changes; conscription was abolished, and the authority of the Versailles government declared 'null and void.' Seeing that a desperate struggle must inevitably ensue, a very large number of the inhabitants of Paris quitted the city, and the German authorities allowed the prisoners from Metz and Sedan to return so as to swell the forces at the disposal of M. Thiers. They also intimated that, in view of the altered circumstances, it might again become necessary for them to occupy the forts they had already evacuated. The first shot in the second siege of Paris, in which Frenchmen were arrayed against Frenchmen, was fired on the 2d April, when a strong division of the Versailles army advanced against the National Guards posted at Courbevoie, and drove them into Paris across the Pont de Neuilly. During the ensuing night a large force of insurgents gathered, and were on the morning of the 3d led in three columns against Versailles. Great hopes had been placed on the sympathy of the regular troops, but they were doomed to disappointment. . . . The expedition . . . not only failed, but it . . . cost the Commune two of its leading men,—Duval, and that Flourens who had already made himself so conspicuous in connection with revolutionary outbreaks under the Empire and the Government of National Defence,—both of whom were taken and promptly shot by the Versailles authorities. The failure and the executions proved so exasperating that the 'Commune of Paris' issued a proclamation denouncing the Versailles soldiers as banditti. . . . They had ample means of gratifying their passion for revenge, for they had in their hands a number of leading men, including Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, and M. Bonjean, President of the Court of Cassation, and these—two hundred

in all—they proclaimed their intention of holding as hostages. M. Thiers was still hesitating, and waiting for a force sufficiently powerful to crush all opposition; and in this he was no doubt right, for any success of the Communists, even of the most temporary character, would have proved highly dangerous. The Germans had granted permission to the government to increase their original 30,000 troops to 150,000, and prisoners of Metz and Sedan had been pouring steadily back from Germany for this purpose. On the 8th April Marshal MacMahon took command of the forces at Versailles. A premature attack on the forts of Issy, Vanves, and Montrouge on the 11th failed, but on the 17th and 19th several of the insurgent positions were carried; on the 25th the bombardment of Issy and Vanves was begun, and from that time onwards operations against the city were carried on with the greatest activity, the insurgents being on all occasions put to the sword in a most merciless manner. Issy was taken on the 8th May, and Vanves on the 4th, and the enceinte laid bare. Inside Paris all this time there was nothing but jealousy. . . . First one leader, and then another, was tried, found wanting, and disgraced. . . . On the 21st May the defenders of the wall at the gate of St. Cloud were driven from their positions by the heavy artillery fire, and the besieging army, having become aware of the fact, pushed forward and secured this entrance to the city; and by the evening of the 22d there were 80,000 Versailles within the walls. Next day they gained fresh ground, and were ready to re-occupy the Tuileries and the Hôtel de Ville; but before this was possible the Communists, mad with despair, had resolved on that series of outrages against humanity that will make their names detested and their cause distrusted as long as the story of their crimes stands recorded in the annals of history. They had already perpetrated more than one act of vandalism. . . . On the 12th May, in accordance with a public decree, they had destroyed the private residence of M. Thiers with all its pictures and books; on the 16th the magnificent column erected in the Place Vendôme in memory of Napoleon I., and crowned by his statue, was undermined at one side and then pulled to the ground by means of ropes and utterly destroyed; and now on the 24th, in the last efforts of despairing rage, bands of men and women, still more frantic and eager for blood than were those of the Reign of Terror, rushed through the doomed city. Early in the morning the Tuileries, the Hôtel de Ville, the Ministry of Finance, the Palais d'Orsay, and other public and private buildings were seen to be on fire. The Louvre, too, with all its inestimable treasures, was in flames, and was saved with the greatest difficulty. If the Commune was to perish, it had clearly resolved that the city was to perish with it. Men and women marched about in bands with petroleum, and aided the spread of the conflagration by firing the city in different places. Heedless of the flames, the Versailles troops pressed on, eager, if possible, to save the lives of the 200 hostages, but, alas, in vain. A passion for blood had seized on the Commune, and its last expiring effort was to murder in cold blood, not only a large number of the hostages, but also batches of fresh victims, seized indiscriminately about the streets by bands of men and women, and dragged off to instant death. On the 26th Belleville was

captured, and on the 27th and 28th the Cemetery of Père la Chaise was the scene of the final struggle,—a struggle of such a desperate nature—for there was no quarter—that, for days after, the air of the district was literally fraught with pestilence. Many of the leaders of the Commune had fallen in the final contest, and all the others who were captured by the Versailles troops during the fighting were at once shot. Of the 30,000 prisoners who had fallen into the hands of the government, a large number, both men and women, were executed without mercy, and the rest distributed in various prisons to await trial, as also were Rossel, Assi, Grousset, and others, who were captured after the resistance was at an end. Cluseret succeeded in making good his escape. . . . Of the prisoners, about 10,000 were set free without trial, and the others were sentenced by various courts-martial during the following months and on through the coming year, either to death, transportation or imprisonment.”—H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France from the First Revolution*, v. 3, ch. 24.

ALSO IN: E. B. Washburne, *Recollections of a Minister to France*, v. 2, ch. 5-7.—P. Vésinier, *Hist. of the Commune of Paris*.—P. O. Lissagaray, *Hist. of the Commune of 1871*.—W. P. Fetridge, *Rise and Fall of the Paris Commune*.—J. Leighton, *Paris under the Commune*.

A. D. 1871 (April—May).—The government of the Commune in Paris.—“For the conduct of affairs the Communal Council divided itself into ten ‘commissions,’ of finance, war, public safety, external relations, education, justice, labour and exchange, provisions, the public service, and the general executive. Of these the most efficient appears to have been that of finance; by advances from the bank and by the revenues of the post, the telegraph, the octrois, &c., means were found to provide for the current expenditure. The other commissions were admittedly inefficient, and especially the one which was most important for the moment, that of war:—‘as to a general plan,’ says Lissagaray, ‘there never was one: the men were abandoned to themselves, being neither cared for nor controlled;’ ‘at the Ministry,’ says Gastyne, ‘no one is at his place. They pass their time in running after one another. The most insignificant Lieutenant will take orders from nobody, and wants to give them to everybody. They smoke, chat and chaff. They dispute with the contractors. They buy irresponsibly right and left because the dealers give commissions or have private relations with the officials;’ ‘in the army of Versailles,’ said a member of the Commune, ‘they don’t get drunk: in ours they are never sober;’ ‘the administration of war,’ said another, ‘is the organisation of disorganisation;’ ‘I feel myself,’ said Rossel, on resigning his command, ‘incapable of any longer bearing the responsibility of a command where every one deliberates and no one obeys. The central committee of artillery has deliberated and prescribed nothing. The Commune has deliberated and resolved upon nothing. The Central Committee deliberates and has not yet known how to act. . . . My predecessor committed the fault of struggling against this absurd situation. I retire, and have the honour to ask you for a cell at Mazas.’ The same incompetence, leading to the same result of anarchy, was displayed by the Executive Commission:—‘in less than a fortnight,’ said Grosset, ‘conflicts of every kind had

arisen; the Executive Commission gave orders which were not executed; each particular commission, thinking itself sovereign in its turn, gave orders too, so that the Executive Commission could have no real responsibility.' On April 20 the Executive Commission was replaced by a committee, composed of a delegate from each of the nine other commissions; still efficiency could not be secured, and at the end of the month it was proposed to establish a Committee of Public Safety. This proposition was prompted by the traditions of 1793, and brought into overt antagonism the two conflicting tendencies of the Commune: there were some of its members who were ready to save the movement by a despotism, to secure at every cost a strong administration, and impose the Commune, if need be by terror, upon Paris and the provinces. . . . On the other hand there was a strong minority which opposed the proposal, on the ground that it was tantamount to an abdication on the part of the Communal Council. . . . The appointment of the Committee was carried by forty-five votes to twenty-three; many of those who voted for it regarded it as merely another 'Executive Commission,' subordinate to, and at any moment subject to dismissal by, the Commune; and so, in effect, it proved; it was neither more terrible nor more efficient than the body to which it succeeded; it came into existence on the 1st of May, and on the 9th the complaint was already advanced that 'your Committee of Public Safety has not answered our expectations; it has been an obstacle, instead of a stimulus;' on the 10th a new committee was appointed, with similar results; all that the innovation achieved was to bring into clear relief the fact that there existed in the Commune a Jacobin element ready to recur to the traditions of 1793, and to make Paris the mistress of France by the guillotine or its modern equivalent."—G. L. Dickinson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France*, pp. 267-270.

A. D. 1871-1876.—The Assembly at Bordeaux.—Thiers elected Chief of the Executive Power.—The founding of the Republic.—The recovery of order and prosperity.—Resignation of Thiers.—Election of Marshal MacMahon.—Plans of the Monarchists defeated.—Adoption of the Constitution of 1875.—"The elections passed off more quietly than was to be expected, and the Assembly which came together at Bordeaux on the 18th of February exactly represented the sentiment of the nation at that particular moment. France being eager for peace, the Assembly was pacific. It was also somewhat unrepresentative, for the Republic had been represented in the provinces only by Gambetta, the promoter of war to the knife, who had sacrificed the interests of the Republic to what he conceived to be the interests of the national honor. Politics had, in truth, been little thought of, and Thiers was elected in 27 departments upon very diverse tickets, rather on account of his opposition to the war and his efforts in favor of peace than on account of his fame as a liberal orator and historian. Moved by the same impulse, the Assembly almost unanimously appointed him Chief of the Executive Power of the French Republic, and intrusted to him the double task of governing the country and of treating with the German Emperor. . . . It was apparently in the name of the Republic that peace was negotiated and the Gov-

ernment gradually reconstructed. . . . The Assembly, however, which was all-powerful, held that to change the form of government was one of its rights. It might have been urged that the electors had scarcely contemplated this, and that the Monarchists were in the majority simply because they represented peace, while in the provinces the Republic had meant nothing but war to the hilt. But these distinctions were not thought of in the press of more urgent business, namely, the treaty which was to check the shedding of blood, and the rudiments of administrative reconstruction. No monarchy would have been willing to assume the responsibility of this Treaty. . . . The Right accordingly consented to accept the name of Republic as a makeshift, provided it should be talked about as little as possible. Thiers had come to think, especially since the beginning of the war, that the Republic was the natural heir of Napoleon III. . . . He had, however, been struck with the circumstance that so many Legitimists had been elected to the Assembly, and he was no more eager than they to stop to discuss constitutions. . . . He was the more disposed to wait, inasmuch as he saw in the Chamber the very rapid formation and growth of a group in which he had great confidence. Of these deputies M. Jules Simon has given a better definition than they could themselves formulate,—for this political philosopher has written a masterly history of these years. . . . Here is what Simon says of this party in the Assembly: 'There were in this body some five-score firm spirits who were alike incapable either of forsaking the principles whereon all society rests, or of giving up freedom. Of all forms of government they would have preferred constitutional monarchy, had they found it established, or could they have restored it by a vote without resort to force. But they quickly perceived that neither the Legitimists nor the Bonapartists would consent to the constitutional form; that such a monarchy could obtain a majority neither in the Parliament nor among the people. . . . Some of these men entertained for the Republic a distrust which, at first, amounted to aversion. Being persuaded, however, that they must choose between the Republic and the Empire . . . they did not despair of forming a Republic at once liberal and conservative. In a word, they thrust aside the Legitimate Monarchy as chimerical, Republican and Cæsarian dictatorship as alike hateful. . . . Of this party M. Thiers was not merely the head, but the body also.' . . . But there was another party, which, although the least numerous in the Assembly and split into factions at that, was the most numerous in the country,—the Republican party."—P. de Rémusat, *Thiers*, ch. 6-7.—"In the wake of Thiers followed such men as Rémusat, Casimir Périer, Léon Say, and Lafayette. This added strength made the Republicans the almost equal rivals of the other parties combined. So great was Thiers' influence that, despite his conversion to Republicanism, he was still able to control the Monarchical Assembly. A threat of resignation, so great was the dread of what might follow it, and so jealous were the Monarchists of two shades and the Imperialists of each other, was enough to bring the majority to the President's terms. It was under such political conditions that the infant Republic, during its first year, undertook the tasks of preserving

peace, of maintaining internal order, of retrieving disaster, of tempting back prosperity and thrift to the desolated land, of relieving it of the burdens imposed by war, and, at the same time, of acquiring for itself greater security and permanency. The recovery of France was wonderfully rapid; her people began once more to taste sweet draughts of liberty; the indemnity was almost half diminished; and her industries, at the end of the year, were once more in full career. But the Republic was a long way from complete and unquestioned recognition. The second year of the Republic (1872-73) was passed amid constant conflicts between the rival parties. Thiers still maintained his ascendancy, and stoutly adhered to his defence of Republican institutions; but the Assembly was restive under him, and energetic attempts were made to bring about a fusion between the Legitimists and the Orleanists. These attempts were rendered futile by the obstinacy of the Count of Chambord, who would yield nothing, either of principle or even of symbol, to his cousin of Orleans. The want of harmony among the Monarchists postponed the consideration of what should be the permanent political constitution of France until November of the year 1872, when a committee of thirty was chosen to recommend constitutional articles. Against this the Republicans protested. They declared that the Assembly had only been elected to make peace with Germany; . . . that dissolution was the only further act that the Assembly was competent to perform. This indicated the confidence of the Republicans in their increased strength in the country; and the fact that the Monarchists refused to dissolve shows that they were not far from holding this opinion of their opponents. Despite the rivalries and bitterness of the factions, the Republic met with no serious blow from the time of its provisional establishment in February, 1871, until May, 1873. Up to the latter period two thirds of the enormous indemnity had been paid, and the German force of occupation had almost entirely retired from French territory. . . . But in May, 1873, a grave misfortune, alike to France and to the Republican institutions, occurred. At last the Monarchical reactionists of the Assembly had gathered courage to make open war upon President Thiers. Perceiving that his policy was having the effect of nourishing and adding ever new strength to the Republican cause, and that every month drifted them further from the opportunity and hope of restoring Monarchy or Empire . . . they now forgot their own differences, and resolved, at all hazards, to get rid of the Republic's most powerful protector. . . . The Duc de Broglie, the leader of the reactionary Monarchists, offered a resolution in the Assembly which was tantamount to a proposition of want of confidence in President Thiers. After an acrimonious debate, in which Thiers himself took part, De Broglie's motion was passed by a majority of fourteen. The President had no alternative but to resign; and thus the executive power, at a critical moment, passed out of Republican into Monarchical hands. Marshal MacMahon was at once chosen President. . . . MacMahon was strongly Catholic in religion; and so far as he was known to have any political opinions, they wavered between Legitimism and Imperialism—they were certainly as far as possible from Republicanism. Now was formed and matured a deliberate project to over-

throw the young Republic, and to set up Monarchy in its place. All circumstances combined to favor its success. The new President was found to be at least willing that the thing should, if it could, be done. His principal minister, De Broglie, entered warmly into the plot. The Orleanist princes agreed to waive their claims, and the Count of Paris was persuaded to pay a visit to the Count of Chambord at his retreat at Frohsdorf, to acknowledge the elder Bourbon's right to the throne, and to abandon his own pretensions. The Assembly was carefully canvassed, and it was found that a majority could be relied upon to proclaim, at the ripe moment, Chambord as king, with the title of Henry V. The Republic was now, in the early autumn of 1873, in the most serious and real peril. It needed but a word from the Bourbon pretender to overthrow it, and to replace it by the throne of the Capets and the Valois. Happily, the old heaven of Bourbon bigotry existed in 'Henry V.' He conceded the point of reigning with parliamentary institutions, but he would not accept the tricolor as the flag of the restored monarchy. He insisted upon returning to France under the white banner of his ancestors. To him the throne was not worth a piece of cloth. To his obstinacy in clinging to this trifle of symbolism the Republic owed its salvation. The scheme to restore the monarchy thus fell through. The result was that the two wings of Monarchists flew apart again, and the Republicans, being now united and patient under the splendid leadership of Gambetta, once more began to wax in strength. It only remained to the Conservatives to make the best of the situation—to proceed to the forming of a Constitution, and to at least postpone to as late a period as possible the permanent establishment of the Republic. The first step was to confirm MacMahon in the Presidency for a definite period; and 'the Septennate,' giving him a lease of power for seven years—that is, until the autumn of 1880—was voted. . . . It was not until late in the year 1875 that the Constitution which is now the organic law of France was finally adopted [see CONSTITUTION OF FRANCE]. The chief circumstance which impelled a majority of the Assembly to take this decisive step was the alarming revival of Imperialism in the country. This was shown in the success of Bonapartists in isolated elections to fill vacancies. Much as the Royalists distrusted a Republic, they dreaded yet more the restoration of the Empire; and the rapid progress made by the partisans of the Empire forced them to adopt what was really a moderate Republican Constitution. This Constitution provided that the President of the Republic should be elected by a joint convention of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies; that the Senate should consist of 300 members, of whom 75 were to be elected for life by the Assembly, and the remaining 225 by electoral colleges, composed of the deputies, the councillors-general, the members of the councils d'arrondissement, and delegates chosen from municipal councils; that the vacancies in the life senatorships should be filled by the Senate itself, while the term of the Senators elected by the colleges should be nine years, one third retiring every three years; that the Chamber of Deputies should consist of 533 members, and that the deputies should be chosen by single districts, instead of, as formerly, in groups by departments;

that the President could only dissolve the Chamber of Deputies with the consent of the Senate; that money bills should originate in the Lower Chamber, and that the President should have the right of veto. The 'Septennate' organized and the Constitution adopted, the Assembly, which had clung to power for about five years, had no reason for continued existence, and at last dissolved early in 1876, having provided that the first general election under the new order of things should take place in February. . . . The result of the elections proved three things—the remarkable growth of Republican sentiment; the great progress made, in spite of the memory of Sedan, by the Bonapartist propaganda; and the utter hopelessness of any attempt at a Royalist restoration."—G. M. Towle, *Modern France*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: J. Simon, *The Gov't of M. Thiers*, F. Le Goff, *Life of Thiers*, ch. 8-9.

A. D. 1872-1889.—Reform of Public Instruction. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—FRANCE: A. D. 1833-1889.

A. D. 1875-1889.—Stable settlements of the Republic.—Presidencies of MacMahon and Grévy.—Military operations in Tunis, Madagascar and Tonquin.—Revision of the constitution.—Expulsion of the princes.—Boulangism.—Election of M. Sadi Carnot to the presidency.—"The last day of the year 1875 saw a final prorogation of this monarchist assembly which had established the Republic. It had been in existence nearly five years. The elections to the Senate gave a small majority to the Republicans. Those to the Chamber of Deputies (February, 1876) gave about two-thirds of its 532 seats to Republicans, mostly moderate Republicans. The ministry to which the leadership of this assembly was soon confided, was therefore naturally a ministry of moderate Republicans. M. Dufaure was prime minister, and M. Léon Say minister of finance. . . . The Dufaure ministry was not long-lived, being succeeded before the year 1876 closed, by a ministry led by M. Jules Simon, a distinguished orator and writer. The tenure of French cabinets in general has been so little permanent under the Third Republic, that in the nineteen years which have elapsed since the fall of the Empire, twenty-five cabinets have had charge of the executive government. . . . Few events had marked the history of the Simon ministry when, suddenly, in May, 1877, the President of the Republic demanded its resignation. Much influenced of late by Monarchist advisers, he had concluded that the moderate Republican cabinets did not possess the confidence of the chambers, and, feeling that the responsibility of maintaining the repose and security of France rested upon him, had resolved, rather than allow the management of the affairs of the country to fall into the hands of M. Gambetta and the Radicals, to appoint a ministry of conservatives, trusting that the country would ratify the step. A ministry was organized under the Duke of Broglie, and the Chamber of Deputies was first prorogued, and then, with the consent of the Senate, dissolved. The death of M. Thiers in September caused a great national demonstration in honor of that patriotic statesman, 'the liberator of the territory.' The result of the ensuing elections was a complete victory for the Republicans, who secured nearly three-fourths of the seats in the new Chamber. The Marshal, appointing a ministry composed of ad-

herents of his policy who were not members of the Assembly, attempted to make head against the majority, but was forced in December to yield to the will of the people and of their representatives, and to recall M. Dufaure and the moderate Republicans to office. The year 1878 therefore passed off quietly, being especially distinguished by the great success of the universal exhibition held at Paris. . . . At the beginning of 1879 elections were held in pursuance of the provisions of the constitution, for the renewal of a portion of the Senate. . . . Elections were held for the filling of 82 seats. Of these the Republicans won 66, the Monarchist groups 16. This was a loss of 42 seats on the part of the latter, and assured to the Republicans a full control of the Senate. It had also the effect of definitively establishing the Republic as the permanent government of France. The Republican leaders therefore resolved to insist upon extensive changes in the personnel of the Council of State and the judiciary body. . . . When they also proposed to make extensive changes in other departments, Marshal MacMahon, who foresaw the impossibility of maintaining harmonious relations with the cabinets which the Republican majority would now demand, took these new measures as a pretext, and, on January 30, 1879, resigned the office of President of the Republic. On the same day the Senate and Chamber, united in National Assembly, elected as his successor, for the constitutional term of seven years, M. Jules Grévy, president of the Chamber of Deputies a moderate Republican who enjoyed general respect. M. Grévy was 71 years old. M. Gambetta was chosen to succeed him as president of the Chamber. The cabinet was remodelled, M. Dufaure resigning his office and being succeeded by M. Waddington. In the reorganized ministry one of the most prominent of the new members was M. Jules Ferry, its minister of education. He soon brought forward two measures which excited violent discussion: the one dealing with the regulation of superior education, the other with the constitution of the Supreme Council of Public Instruction. . . . In March, 1880, the Senate rejected the bill respecting universities. The ministry, now composed of members of the 'pure Left' (instead of a mixture of these and the Left Centre) under M. de Freycinet, resolved to enforce the existing laws against non-authorized congregations. The Jesuits were warned to close their establishments; the others, to apply for authorization. Failing to carry out these decrees, M. de Freycinet was forced to resign, and was succeeded as prime minister by M. Ferry, under whose orders the decrees were executed in October and November, establishments of the Jesuits and others, to the number of nearly 300, being forcibly closed and their inmates dispersed. Laws were also passed in the same year and in 1881 for the extension of public education, and a general amnesty proclaimed for persons engaged in the insurrection of the commune. In April and May, 1881, on pretext of chastising tribes on the Tunisian frontier of Algeria, who had committed depredations on the French territories in Northern Africa, a military force from Algeria entered Tunis, occupied the capital, and forced the Bey to sign a treaty by which he put himself and his country under the protectorate of France. . . . The elections, in August, resulted in a Chamber composed of 467 Republi-

cans, 47 Bonapartists, and 43 Royalists, whereas its predecessor had consisted of 387 Republicans, 81 Bonapartists, and 61 Royalists. In response to a general demand, M. Gambetta became prime minister on the meeting of the new Assembly in the autumn. . . . But his measures failed to receive the support of the Chamber, and he was forced to resign after having held the office of prime minister but two months and a half (January, 1882). On the last day of that year M. Gambetta, still the most eminent French statesman of the time, died at Paris, aged forty-four. . . . The death of Gambetta aroused the Monarchists to renewed activity. Prince Napoleon issued a violent manifesto, and was arrested. Bills were brought in which were designed to exclude from the soil of France and of French possessions all members of families formerly reigning in France. Finally, however, after a prolonged contest, a decree suspending the dukes of Aumale, Chartres, and Alençon from their functions in the army was signed by the President. Some months later, August, 1883, the Count of Chambord ('Henry V.') died at Frohsdorf; by this event the elder branch of the house of Bourbon became extinct and the claims urged by both Legitimists and Orleanists were united in the person of the Count of Paris. During the year 1882 alleged encroachments upon French privileges and interests in the northwestern portion of Madagascar had embroiled France in conflict with the Hovas, the leading tribe of that island. The French admiral commanding the squadron in the Indian Ocean demanded in 1883 the placing of the northwestern part of the island under a French protectorate, and the payment of a large indemnity. These terms being refused by the queen of the Hovas, Tamatave was bombarded and occupied, and desultory operations continued until the summer of 1883, when an expedition of the Hovas resulted in a signal defeat of the French. A treaty was then negotiated, in accordance with which the foreign relations of the island were put under the control of France, while the queen of Madagascar retained the control of internal affairs and paid certain claims. A treaty executed in 1874 between the emperor of Annam and the French had conceded to the latter a protectorate over that country. His failure completely to carry out his agreement, and the presence of Chinese troops in Tonquin, were regarded as threatening the security of the French colony of Cochin China. A small expedition sent out [1882] under Commander Rivière to enforce the provision of the treaty was destroyed at Hanoi. Reinforcements were sent out. But the situation was complicated by the presence of bands of 'Black Flags,' brigands said to be unauthorized by the Annam government, and by claims on the part of China to a suzerainty over Tonquin. A treaty was made with Annam in August, 1883, providing for the cession of a province to France, and the establishment of a French protectorate over Annam and Tonquin. This, however, did not by any means wholly conclude hostilities in that province. Sontay was taken from the Black Flags in December, and Bacninh occupied in March, 1884. The advance of the French into regions over which China claimed suzerainty, and which were occupied by Chinese troops, brought on hostilities with that empire. In August, 1884, Admiral Courbet destroyed the Chinese fleet and arsenal

at Foo-chow; in October he seized points on the northern end of the island of Formosa, and proclaimed a blockade of that portion of the island. On the frontier between Tonquin and China the French gained some successes, particularly in the capture of Lang-Sôn; yet the climate, and the numbers and determination of the Chinese troops, rendered it impossible for them to secure substantial results from victories. Finally, after a desultory and destructive war, a treaty was signed in June, 1885, which arranged that Formosa should be evacuated, that Annam should in future have no diplomatic relations except through France, and that France should have virtually complete control over both it and Tonquin, though the question of Chinese suzerainty was left unsettled. . . . It was not felt that the expeditions against Madagascar, Annam, and China had achieved brilliant success. They had, moreover, been a source of much expense to France; at first popular, they finally caused the downfall of the ministry which ordered them. That ministry, the ministry of M. Jules Ferry, . . . remained in power an unusual length of time,—a little more than two years. Its principal achievement in domestic affairs consisted in bringing about the revision of the constitution, which, framed by the Versailles Assembly in 1875, was felt by many to contain an excessive number of Monarchical elements. . . . In 1885, after the fall of the Ferry cabinet, a law was passed providing for scrutin de liste; each department being entitled to a number of deputies proportioned to the number of its citizens, the deputies for each were to be chosen on a general or departmental ticket. In the same year a law was passed declaring ineligible to the office of President of the Republic, senator or deputy, any prince of families formerly reigning in France. . . . In December the National Assembly re-elected M. Grévy President of the Republic. In the ministry led by M. de Freycinet, which held office during the year 1886, great prominence was attained by the minister of war, General Boulanger, whose management of his department and political conduct won him great popularity. . . . The increasing activity of the agents of the Monarchist party, the strength which that party had shown in the elections of the preceding year, and the demonstrations which attended the marriage of the daughter of the Count of Paris to the crown prince of Portugal, incited the Republican leaders to more stringent measures against the princes of houses formerly reigning in France. The government was intrusted by law with discretionary power to expel them all from France, and definitely charged to expel actual claimants of the throne and their direct heirs. The Count of Paris and his son the Duke of Orleans, Prince Napoleon and his son Prince Victor, were accordingly banished by presidential decree in June, 1886. General Boulanger struck off from the army-roll the names of all princes of the Bonaparte and Bourbon families. The Duke of Aumale, indignantly protesting, was also banished; in the spring of 1889 he was permitted to return. Meanwhile, within the Republican ranks, dissensions increased. The popularity of General Boulanger became more and more threatening to the cabinets of which he was a member. An agitation in his favor, conducted with much skill, caused fear lest he was aspiring to a military dictator

ship of France. . . . In the autumn of 1887, an inquiry into the conduct of General Caffarel, deputy to the commander-in-chief, accused of selling decorations, implicated M. Daniel Wilson, son-in-law of M. Grévy, who was alleged to have undertaken to obtain appointments to office and lucrative contracts in return for money. M. Grévy's unwise attempts to shield his son-in-law brought about his own fall. The chambers, determined to force his resignation, refused to accept any ministry proposed by him. After much resistance and irritating delays he submitted, and resigned the presidency of the Republic on December 2, 1887. On the next day the houses met in National Assembly at Versailles to choose the successor of M. Grévy. . . . The most prominent candidates for the Republicans were M. Ferry and M. de Freycinet; the former, however, was unpopular with the country. The followers of both, finding their election impossible, resolved to cast their votes for M. Sadi Carnot, a Republican of the highest integrity and universally respected. M. Carnot, a distinguished engineer, grandson of the Carnot who had, as minister of war, organized the victories of the armies of the Revolution, was accordingly elected President of the French Republic. . . . The chief difficulties encountered by the cabinet arose out of the active propagandism exercised in behalf of General Boulanger. . . . His name . . . became the rallying-point of those who were hostile to the parliamentary system, or to the Republican government in its present form. Alarmed both by his singular popularity and by his political intrigues, the government instituted a prosecution of him before the High Court of Justice; upon this he fled from the country, and the dangers of the agitation in his favor were, for the time at least, quieted. On May 5, 1889, the one-hundredth anniversary of the assembly of the States-General was held at Versailles. On the next day, President Carnot formally opened

FRANCE, BANK OF. See MONEY AND BANKING: 17TH-19TH CENTURIES.

FRANCE, ISLE OF. See MASCARENE ISLANDS.

FRANCHE COMTÉ.—In the dissolution of the last kingdom of Burgundy (see BURGUNDY, THE LAST KINGDOM: A. D. 1032), its northern part maintained a connection with the Empire, which had then become Germanic, much longer than the southern. It became divided into two chief states—the County Palatine of Burgundy, known afterwards as Franche Comté, or the "free county," and Lesser Burgundy, which embraced western Switzerland and northern Savoy. "The County Palatine of Burgundy often passed from one dynasty to another, and it is remarkable for the number of times that it was held as a separate state by several of the great princes of Europe. . . . But, through all these changes of dynasty, it remained an acknowledged fief of the Empire, till its annexation to France under Lewis the Fourteenth. The capital of this county, it must be remembered, was Dole. The ecclesiastical metropolis of Besançon, though surrounded by the county, remained a free city of the Empire from the days of Frederick Barbarossa [A. D. 1152-1190] to those of Ferdinand the Third [A. D. 1637-1657]. It was then merged in the county, and along with the county it

the Universal Exhibition at Paris."—V. Duruy, *Hist. of France*, pp. 666-677.

ALSO IN: H. C. Lockwood, *Const. Hist. of France*, ch. 7, and app. 10.—F. T. Marzials, *Life of Gambetta*.—*Annals of the Amer. Academy of Political and Social Science*, March, 1893, supplement.

A. D. 1877-1882.—Anglo-French control of Egyptian finances. See EGYPT: A. D. 1875-1882; and 1882-1883.

A. D. 1881-1895.—Territorial claims and acquisitions in Africa. See AFRICA: A. D. 1881-1887, and after.

A. D. 1892.—New Protective Tariff. See TARIFF LEGISLATION: A. D. 1871-1892.

A. D. 1892-1893.—The Panama Canal scandal. See PANAMA CANAL.

A. D. 1894-1895.—Assassination of President Carnot.—Election and resignation of M. Casimir-Périer.—Election of M. Faure to the Presidency.—The most startling of all the deeds in the recent revival of anarchistic activity was the assassination of M. Carnot, President of the French Republic, on the 24th of June. While driving through the streets of Lyons, he was mortally stabbed by an Italian Anarchist named Santo Caserio. A joint convention of the two chambers of the legislature was immediately summoned for a presidential election. The convention met at Versailles, June 27, and on the first ballot chose M. Casimir-Périer by 451 out of a total of 851 votes. On the 15th of January, 1895, M. Casimir-Périer astonished the world and threw France into consternation, almost, by suddenly and peremptorily resigning the Presidency. The reason given was the intolerable powerlessness and practical inutility of the President under the existing constitution. The exciting crisis which this resignation produced was passed through without disorder, and on the 17th the National Assembly elected M. François Felix Faure to the office of President.

passed to France."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geography of Europe*, ch. 8, sect. 5.

A. D. 1512.—Included in the Circle of Burgundy. See GERMANY: A. D. 1493-1519.

A. D. 1648.—Still held to form a part of the Empire. See GERMANY: A. D. 1648.

A. D. 1659.—Secured to Spain. See FRANCE: A. D. 1659-1661.

A. D. 1674.—Final conquest by Louis XIV. and incorporation with France. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674-1678; also, NIMEGUEN, PEACE OF.

FRANCHISE, Elective, in England. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1884-1885.

FRANCIA, Doctor, The Dictatorship of. See PARAGUAY: A. D. 1868-1873.

FRANCIA. See FRANCE: 9TH CENTURY; also, GERMANY: A. D. 843-962.

FRANCIS (called Phœbus), King of Navarre, A. D. 1479-1503. . . . Francis I. (of Lorraine), Germanic Emperor, 1745-1765. . . . Francis I., King of France, 1515-1547. . . . Francis I., King of Naples or the Two Sicilies, 1825-1830. . . . Francis II., Germanic Emperor, 1792-1806; Emperor of Austria, 1806-1835; King of Hungary and Bohemia, 1792-1835. . . . Francis II., King of France, 1559-1560. . . . Francis II., King of Naples or the Two Sicilies, A. D. 1859-1861. . . . Francis Joseph I., Emperor of

Austria, 1848; King of Hungary and Bohemia, 1848-.

FRANCISCANS. See MENDICANT ORDERS, also, BEGUINES, ETC.

FRANCO-GERMAN, OR FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JUNE—JULY), to 1870-1871.

FRANCONIA: The Duchy and the Circle.—"Among the great duchies [of the old Germanic kingdom or empire of the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries], that of Eastern Francia, Franken, or Franconia is of much less importance in European history than that of Saxony. It gave the ducal title to the bishops of Würzburg; but it cannot be said to be in any sense continued in any modern state. Its name gradually retreated, and the circle of Franken or Franconia [see GERMANY: A. D. 1493-1519] took in only the most eastern part of the ancient duchy. The western and northern part of the duchy, together with a good deal of territory which was strictly Lotharingian, became part of the two Rhenish circles. Thus Fulda, the greatest of German abbeys, passed away from the Frankish name. In north-eastern Francia, the Hessian principalities grew up to the north-west. Within the Franconian circle lay Würzburg, the see of the bishops who bore the ducal title, the other great bishopric of Bamberg, together with the free city of Nürnberg, and various smaller principalities. In the Rhenish lands, both within and without the old Francia, one chief characteristic is the predominance of the ecclesiastical principalities, Mainz, Köln, Worms, Speyer, and Strassburg. The chief temporal power which arose in this region was the Palatinate of the Rhine, a power which, like others, went through many unions and divisions, and spread into four circles, those of Upper and Lower Rhine, Westphalia, and Bavaria. This last district, though united with the Palatine Electorate, was, from the early part of the fourteenth century, distinguished from the Palatinate of the Rhine as the Oberpfalz or Upper Palatinate."—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, ch. 8, sect. 1.—See, also, ALEMANNI: A. D. 496-504.

FRANCONIA, The Electorate of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1125-1152.

FRANCONIAN OR SALIC IMPERIAL HOUSE.—The emperors, Conrad II., Henry III., Henry IV., and Henry V., who reigned from 1024 until 1125, over the Germanic-Roman or Holy Roman Empire, were of the Salic or Franconian house. See GERMANY: A. D. 973-1122.

FRANKALMOIGN. See FEUDAL TENURES.

FRANKFORT, Treaty of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1871 (JANUARY—MAY).

FRANKFORT ON THE MAIN, Origin of. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 496-504.

A. D. 1287.—Declared an imperial city. See CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, OF GERMANY.

A. D. 1525.—Formal establishment of the Reformed Religion. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522-1525.

A. D. 1744.—The "Union" formed by Frederick the Great. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1743-1744.

A. D. 1759.—Surprised by the French. See GERMANY: A. D. 1759 (APRIL—AUGUST).

A. D. 1801-1803.—One of six free cities which survived the Peace of Luneville. See GERMANY: A. D. 1801-1803.

A. D. 1806.—Loss of municipal freedom.—Transfer, as a grand duchy, to the ancient Elector of Mayence. See GERMANY: A. D. 1805-1806.

A. D. 1810.—Erected into a grand duchy by Napoleon. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810 (FEBRUARY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1810-1815.—Loss and recovery of autonomy as a "free city." See CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, OF GERMANY; and VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1848-1849.—Meeting of the German National Assembly.—Its work, its failure, and its end.—Riotous outbreak in the city. See GERMANY: A. D. 1848 (MARCH—SEPTEMBER); and 1848-1850.

A. D. 1866.—Absorption by Prussia. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.

FRANKLIN, Benjamin, and the Press. See PRINTING: A. D. 1704-1729. . . . **Electrical Discovery.** See ELECTRICAL DISCOVERY: A. D. 1745-1747. . . . **Plan of Union in 1754.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1754. . . . **Colonial Representative in England.—Examination before Parliament.** See PENNSYLVANIA: A. D. 1757-1762; and UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765-1768, 1766. . . . **Signing of the Declaration.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (JULY). . . . **Mission to France.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776-1778, 1778 (FEBRUARY), 1782 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER). . . . **Framing of the Constitution.** See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787.

FRANKLIN, Sir John. See POLAR EXPLORATION: A. D. 1819-1822, and after.

FRANKLIN, The ephemeral state of. See TENNESSEE: A. D. 1785; and 1785-1796.

FRANKLIN, Tenn., Battles at and near. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: TENNESSEE), and 1864 (NOVEMBER: TENNESSEE).

FRANKLIN, OR FRANKLEYN, The.—"There is scarce a small village," says Sir John Fortescue [15th century] 'in which you may not find a knight, an esquire, or some substantial householder (paterfamilias) commonly called a frankleyn, possessed of considerable estate; besides others who are called freeholders, and many yeomen of estate sufficient to make a substantial jury.' . . . By a frankleyn in this place we are to understand what we call a country squire, like the frankleyn of Chaucer; for the word esquire in Fortescue's time was only used in its limited sense, for the sons of peers and knights, or such as had obtained the title."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 8, pt. 3, with note (v. 3).

FRANKPLEDGE.—An old English law required all men to combine in associations of ten, and to become standing sureties for one another, —which was called "frankpledge."

FRANKS: Origin and earliest history.—

"It is well known that the name of 'Frank' is not to be found in the long list of German tribes preserved to us in the 'Germania' of Tacitus. Little or nothing is heard of them before the reign of Gordian III. In A. D. 240 Aurelian, then a tribune of the sixth legion stationed on the Rhine, encountered a body of marauding Franks near Mayence, and drove them back into their marshes. The word 'Francia' is also found at a still earlier date, in the old Roman chart

called the 'Charta Peutingeria,' and occupies on the map the right bank of the Rhine from opposite Coblenz to the sea. The origin of the Franks has been the subject of frequent debate, to which French patriotism has occasionally lent some asperity. . . . At the present day, however, historians of every nation, including the French, are unanimous in considering the Franks as a powerful confederacy of German tribes, who in the time of Tacitus inhabited the north-western parts of Germany bordering on the Rhine. And this theory is so well supported by many scattered notices, slight in themselves, but powerful when combined, that we can only wonder that it should ever have been called in question. Nor was this aggregation of tribes under the new name of Franks a singular instance; the same took place in the case of the Alemanni and Saxons. . . . The etymology of the name adopted by the new confederacy is also uncertain. The conjecture which has most probability in its favour is that adopted long ago by Gibbon, and confirmed in recent times by the authority of Grimm, which connects it with the German word Frank (free). . . . Tacitus speaks of nearly all the tribes, whose various appellations were afterwards merged in that of Frank, as living in the neighbourhood of the Rhine. Of these the principal were the Sicambri (the chief people of the old Iscævonian tribe), who, as there is reason to believe, were identical with the Salian Franks. The confederation further comprised the Brueteri, the Chamavi, Ansibarii, Tubantes, Marsi, and Chasuarii, of whom the five last had formerly belonged to the celebrated Cheruscan league, which, under the hero Arminius, destroyed three Roman legions in the Teutoburgian Forest. The strongest evidence of the identity of these tribes with the Franks, is the fact that, long after their settlement in Gaul, the distinctive names of the original people were still occasionally used as synonymous with that of the confederation. . . . The Franks advanced upon Gaul from two different directions, and under the different names of Salians, and Ripuarians, the former of whom we have reason to connect more particularly with the Sicambrian tribe. The origin of the words Salian and Ripuarian, which are first used respectively by Ammianus Marcellinus and Jordanes, is very obscure, and has served to exercise the ingenuity of ethnographers. There are, however, no sufficient grounds for a decided opinion. At the same time it is by no means improbable that the river Yssel, Isala or Sal (for it has borne all these appellations), may have given its name to that portion of the Franks who lived along its course. With still greater probability may the name Ripuarii, or Riparii, be derived from 'Ripa,' a term used by the Romans to signify the Rhine. 'These dwellers on 'the Bank' were those that remained in their ancient settlements while their Salian kinsmen were advancing into the heart of Gaul.'—W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 3, ch. 9 and 11.—T. Smith, *Arminius*, pt. 2, ch. 3.

A. D. 253.—First appearance in the Roman world.—"When in the year 253 the different generals of Rome were once more fighting each other for the imperial dignity, and the Rhine-legions marched to Italy to fight out the cause of their emperor Valerianus against . . . Aemilianus of

the Danube-army, this seems to have been the signal for the Germans pushing forward, especially towards the lower Rhine. These Germans were the Franks, who appear here for the first time, perhaps new opponents only in name; for, although the identification of them, already to be met with in later antiquity, with tribes formerly named on the lower Rhine—partly, the Chamavi settled beside the Brueteri, partly the Sugambri formerly mentioned subject to the Romans—is uncertain and at least inadequate, there is here greater probability than in the case of the Alamanni that the Germans hitherto dependent on Rome, on the right bank of the Rhine, and the Germanic tribes previously dislodged from the Rhine, took at that time—under the collective name of the 'Free'—the offensive in concert against the Romans."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 4.

A. D. 277.—Repulse from Gaul, by Probus. See GAUL: A. D. 277.

A. D. 279.—Escape from Pontus. See SYRACUSE: A. D. 279.

A. D. 295-297.—In Britain. See BRITAIN: A. D. 288-297.

A. D. 306.—Defeat by Constantine.—Constantine the Great, A. D. 306, fought and defeated the Salian Franks in a great battle and "carried off a large number of captives to Treves, the chief residence of the emperor, and a rival of Rome itself in the splendour of its public buildings. It was in the circus of this city, and in the presence of Constantine, that the notorious 'Ludi Francici' were celebrated; at which several thousand Franks, including their kings Regaisus and Ascaricus, were compelled to fight with wild beasts, to the inexpressible delight of the Christian spectators."—W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 2.

A. D. 355.—Settlement in Toxandria. See GAUL: A. D. 355-361; also, TOXANDRIA.

5th-10th Centuries.—Barbarities of the conquest of Gaul.—State of society under the rule of the conquerors.—Evolution of Feudalism. See GAUL: 5TH-8TH, and 5TH-10TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 406-409.—Defense of Roman Gaul. See GAUL: A. D. 406-409.

A. D. 410-420.—The Franks join in the attack on Gaul.—After vainly opposing the entrance of Vandals, Burgundians and Sueves into Gaul, A. D. 406, "the Franks, the valiant and faithful allies of the Roman republic, were soon [about A. D. 410-420] tempted to imitate the invaders whom they had so bravely resisted. Treves, the capital of Gaul, was pillaged by their lawless bands; and the humble colony which they so long maintained in the district of Toxandria, in Brabant, insensibly multiplied along the banks of the Meuse and Scheldt, till their independent power filled the whole extent of the Second, or Lower, Germany. . . . The ruin of the opulent provinces of Gaul may be dated from the establishment of these barbarians, whose alliance was dangerous and oppressive, and who were capriciously impelled, by interest or passion, to violate the public peace."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 31.—"They [the Franks] resisted the great invasion of the Vandals in the time of Stilicho, but did not scruple to take part in the subsequent ravages. Among the confusions of that disastrous period, indeed, it is not improbable that they seized the cities of Spire, Strasburg, Amiens, Arras,

Therouane and Tournai, and by their assaults on Trèves compelled the removal of the præfectural government to Arles. Chroniclers who flourished two centuries later refer to the year 418 large and permanent conquests in Gaul by a visionary king called Pharamund, from whom the French monarchy is usually dated. But history seeks in vain for any authentic marks of his performances."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 3, ch. 11, sect. 5.

A. D. 448-456.—Origin of the Merovingian dynasty.—The royal dynasty of the kingdom of the Franks as founded by Clovis is called the Merovingian. "It is thought that the kings of the different Frankish people were all of the same family, of which the primitive ancestor was Meroveus (Meer-wig, warrior of the sea). After him those princes were called Merovingians (Meer-wings); they were distinguished by their long hair, which they never cut. A Meroveus, grandfather of Clovis, reigned, it is said, over the Franks between 448 and 456; but only his name remains, in some ancient historians, and we know absolutely nothing more either of his family, his power, or of the tribe which obeyed him: so that we see no reason why his descendants had taken his name. . . . The Franks appear in history for the first time in the year 241. Some great captain only could, at this period, unite twenty different people in a new confederation; this chief was, apparently, the Meroveus, whose name appeared for such a long time as a title of glory for his descendants, although tradition has not preserved any trace of his victories."—J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *The French under the Merovingians*, ch. 3.

A. D. 451.—At the battle of Châlons. See HUNS: A. D. 451.

A. D. 481-511.—The kingdom of Clovis.—"The Salian Franks had . . . associated a Roman or a Romanized Gaul, Aegidius, with their native chief in the leadership of the tribe. But, in the year 481, the native leadership passed into the hands of a chief who would not endure a Roman colleague, or the narrow limits within which, in the general turmoil of the world, his tribe was cramped. He is known to history by the name of Clovis, or Chlodwig, which through many transformations, became the later Ludwig and Louis. Clovis soon made himself feared as the most ambitious, the most unscrupulous, and the most energetic of the new Teutonic founders of states. Ten years after the fall of the Western empire [which was in 476], seven years before the rise of the Gothic kingdom of Theoderic, Clovis challenged the Roman patrician, Syagrius of Soissons, who had succeeded to Aegidius, defeated him in a pitched field, at Nogent, near Soissons (486), and finally crushed Latin rivalry in northern Gaul. Ten years later (496), in another famous battle, Tolbiac (Zülpich), near Cologne, he also crushed Teutonic rivalry, and established his supremacy over the kindred Alamanni of the Upper Rhine. Then he turned himself with bitter hostility against the Gothic power in Gaul. The Franks hated the Goths, as the ruder and fiercer of the same stock hate those who are a degree above them in the arts of peace, and are supposed to be below them in courage and the pursuits of war. There was another cause of antipathy. The Goths were zealous Arians; and Clovis, under the influence of his wife Clotildis, the niece of the Burgundian Gundobad, and in consequence, it is said, of a vow made in battle

at Tolbiac, had received Catholic baptism from St. Remigius of Rheims [see CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 496-800]. The Frank king threw his sword into the scale against the Arian cause, and became the champion and hope of the Catholic population all over Gaul. Clovis was victorious. He crippled the Burgundian kingdom (500), which was finally destroyed by his sons (534). In a battle near Poitiers, he broke the power of the West Goths in Gaul; he drove them out of Aquitaine, leaving them but a narrow slip of coast, to seek their last settlement and resting-place in Spain; and, when he died, he was recognized by all the world, by Theoderic, by the Eastern emperor, who honoured him with the title of the consulship, as the master of Gaul. Nor was his a temporary conquest. The kingdom of the West Goths and the Burgundians had become the kingdom of the Franks. The invaders had at length arrived who were to remain. It was decided that the Franks, and not the Goths, were to direct the future destinies of Gaul and Germany, and that the Catholic faith, and not Arianism, was to be the religion of these great realms."—R. W. Church, *Beginning of the Middle Ages*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 2.—J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *The French under the Merovingians*, trans. by Bellingham, ch. 4-5.—See, also, GOTHES (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 507-509.

A. D. 481-768.—Supremacy in Germany, before Charlemagne. See GERMANY: A. D. 481-768.

A. D. 496.—Conversion to Christianity.—See above: A. D. 481-511; also, ALEMANNI: A. D. 496-504.

A. D. 496-504.—Overthrow of the Alemanni. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 496-504; also, SUEVI: A. D. 460-500.

A. D. 511-752.—The house of Clovis.—Ascendancy of the Austrasian Mayors of the Palace.—On the death of Clovis, his dominion, or, speaking more strictly, the kingly office in his dominion, was divided among his four sons, who were lads, then, ranging in age from twelve to eighteen. The eldest reigned in Metz, the second at Orleans, the third in Paris, and the youngest at Soissons. These princes extended the conquests of their father, subduing the Thuringians (A. D. 515-528), overthrowing the kingdom of the Burgundians (A. D. 523-534), diminishing the possessions of the Visigoths in Gaul (A. D. 531-532), acquiring Provence from the Ostrogoths of Italy and securing from the Emperor Justinian a clear Roman-imperial title to the whole of Gaul. The last survivor of the four brother-kings, Clotaire I., reunited the whole Frank empire under his own sceptre, and on his death, A. D. 561, it was again divided among his four sons. Six years later, on the death of the elder, it was redivided among the three survivors. Neustria fell to Chilperic, whose capital was at Soissons, Austrasia to Sigebert, who reigned at Metz, and Burgundia to Guntram, who had his seat of government at Orleans. Each of the kings took additionally a third of Aquitaine, and Provence was shared between Sigebert and Guntram. "It was agreed on this occasion that Paris, which was rising into great importance, should be held in common by all, but visited by none of the three kings without the consent of the others." The reign of these three brothers and their sons, from 561 to 613, was one long revolting tragedy of civil war,

murder, lust, and treachery, made horribly interesting by the rival careers of the evil Fredegunda and the great unfortunate Brunhilda, queens of Neustria and Austrasia, respectively. In 613 a second Clotaire surviving his royal kin, united the Frank monarchy once more under a single crown. But power was fast slipping from the hands of the feeble creature who wore the crown, and passing to that one of his ministers who succeeded in making himself the representative of royalty—namely, the Mayor of the Palace. There was a little stir of energy in his son, Dagobert, but from generation to generation, after him, the Merovingian kings sank lower into that character which gave them the name of the fainéant kings (“rois fainéants”)—the slothful or lazy kings—while the mayors of the palace ruled vigorously in their name and tumbled them, at last, from the throne. “While the Merovingian race in its decline is notorious in history as having produced an unexampled number of imbecile monarchs, the family which was destined to supplant them was no less wonderfully prolific in warriors and statesmen of the highest class. It is not often that great endowments are transmitted even from father to son, but the line from which Charlemagne sprang presents to our admiring gaze an almost uninterrupted succession of five remarkable men, within little more than a single century. Of these the first three held the mayoralty of Austrasia [Pepin of Landen, Pepin of Heristal, and Carl, or Charles Martel, the Hammer]; and it was they who prevented the permanent establishment of absolute power on the Roman model, and secured to the German population of Austrasia an abiding victory over that amalgam of degraded Romans and corrupted Gauls which threatened to leaven the European world. To them, under Providence, we owe it that the centre of Europe is at this day German, and not Gallo-Latin.” Pepin of Heristal, Mayor in Austrasia, broke the power of a rival Neustrian family in a decisive battle fought near the village of Testri, A. D. 687, and gathered the reins of the three kingdoms (Burgundy included) into his own hands. His still more vigorous son, Charles Martel, won the same ascendancy for himself afresh, after a struggle which was signalized by three sanguinary battles, at Amblève (A. D. 716), at Vinci, near Cambrai (717) and at Soissons (718). When firm in power at home, he turned his arms against the Frisians and the Bavarians, whom he subdued, and against the obstinate Saxons, whose country he harried six times without bringing them to submission. His great exploit in war, however, was the repulse of the invading Arabs and Moors, on the memorable battle-field of Tours (A. D. 732), where the wave of Mahommedan invasion was rolled back in western Europe, never to advance beyond the Pyrenees again. Karl died in 741, leaving three sons, among whom his power was, in the Frank fashion, divided. But one of them resigned, in a few years, his sovereignty, to become a monk; another was deposed, and the third, Pepin, surnamed “The Little,” or “The Short,” became supreme. He contented himself, as his father, his grandfather, and his great grandfather had done, with the title of Mayor of the Palace, until 752, when, with the approval of the Pope and by the act of a great assembly of leudes and bishops at Soissons, he was lifted on the shield and crowned and an-

nointed king of the Franks, while the last of the Merovingians was shorn of his long royal locks and placed in a monastery. The friendliness of the Pope in this matter was the result and the cementation of an alliance which bore important fruits. As the champion of the church, Pepin made war on the Lombards and conquered for the Papacy the first of its temporal dominions in Italy. In his own realm, he completed the expulsion of the Moors from Septimania, crushed an obstinate revolt in Aquitaine, and gave a firm footing to the two thrones which, when he died in 768, he left to his sons, Carl and Carloman, and which became in a few years the single throne of one vast empire, under Carl—Carl the Great—Charlemagne.—W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 3-6.

ALSO IN: P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, ch. 12-15.—J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *The French under the Merovingians*, ch. 6-13.—See, also, AUSTRASIA AND NEUSTRIA, and MAYOR OF THE PALACE.

A. D. 528.—Conquest of Thuringia. See THURINGIANS, THE.

A. D. 539-553.—Invasion of Italy.—Formal relinquishment of Gaul to them.—During the Gothic war in Italy,—when Belisarius was reconquering the cradle of the Roman Empire for the Eastern Empire which still called itself Roman, although its seat was at Constantinople,—both sides solicited the help of the Franks. Theudebert, who reigned at Metz, promised his aid to both, and kept his word. “He advanced [A. D. 539, with 100,000 men] toward Pavia, where the Greeks and Goths were met, about to encounter, and, with an unexpected impartiality, attacked the astonished Goths, whom he drove to Ravenna, and then, while the Greeks were yet rejoicing over his performance, fell upon them with merciless fury, and dispersed them through Tuscany.” Theudebert now became fired with an ambition to conquer all Italy; but his savage army destroyed everything in its path so recklessly, and pursued so unbridled a course, that famine and pestilence soon compelled a retreat and only one-third of its original number recrossed the Alps. Notwithstanding this treachery, the emperor Justinian renewed his offers of alliance with the Franks (A. D. 540), and “pledged to them, as the price of their fidelity to his cause, besides the usual subsidies, the relinquishment of every lingering claim, real or pretended, which the empire might assert to the sovereignty of the Gauls. The Franks accepted the terms, and ‘from that time,’ say the Byzantine authorities, ‘the German chiefs presided at the games of the circus, and struck money no longer, as usual, with the effigy of the emperors, but with their own image and superscription. Theudebert, who was the principal agent of these transactions, if he ratified the provisions of the treaty, did not fulfill them in person, but satisfied himself with sending a few tributaries to the aid of his ally. But his first example proved to be more powerful than his later, and large swarms of Germans took advantage of the troubles in Italy to overrun the country and plunder and slay at will. For twelve years, under various leaders, but chiefly under two brothers of the Alemans, Lutherr and Bukhelin, they continued to harass the unhappy object of all barbaric resentments, till the sword of Narses finally exterminated them [A. D. 553].”—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 3, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 41.

A. D. 547.—Subjugation of Bavarians and Alemanni. See BAVARIA: A. D. 547.

A. D. 768-814.—Charlemagne, Emperor of the Romans.—As a crowned dynasty, the Carolingians or Carolingians or Carlings begin their history with Pepin the Short. As an established sovereign house, they find their founder in King Pepin's father, the great palace mayor, Carl, or Charles Martel, if not in his grandfather, Pepin Heristal. But the imperial splendor of the house came to it from the second of its kings, whom the French call 'Charlemagne,' but whom English readers ought to know as Charles the Great. The French form of the name has been always tending to represent 'Charlemagne' as a king of France, and modern historians object to it for that reason. "France, as it was to be and as we know it, had not come into existence in his [Charlemagne's] days. What was to be the France of history was then but one province of the Frank kingdom, and one with which Charles was personally least connected. . . . Charles, king of the Franks, was, above all things, a German. . . . It is entirely to mistake his place and his work to consider him in the light of a specially 'French' king, a predecessor of the kings who reigned at Paris and brought glory upon France. . . . Charles did nothing to make modern France. The Frank power on which he rose to the empire was in those days still mainly German; and his characteristic work was to lay the foundations of modern and civilized Germany, and, indirectly, of the new commonwealth of nations, which was to arise in the West of Europe."—R. W. Church, *The Beginnings of the Middle Ages*, ch. 7.—"At the death of King Pipin the kingdom of the Franks was divided into two parts, or rather . . . the government over the kingdom was divided, for some large parts of the territory seem to have been in the hands of the two brothers together. The fact is, that we know next to nothing about this division, and hardly more about the joint reign of the brothers. The only thing really clear is, that they did not get along very well together, that Karl was distinctly the more active and capable of the two, and that after four years the younger brother, Karlmann, died, leaving two sons. Here was a chance for the old miseries of division to begin again; but fortunately the Franks seem by this time to have had enough of that, and to have seen that their greatest hope for the future lay in a united government. The widow and children of Karlmann went to the court of the Lombard king Desiderius and were cared for by him. The whole Frankish people acknowledged Charlemagne as their king. Of course he was not yet called Charlemagne, but simply Karl, and he was yet to show himself worthy of the addition 'Magnus.' . . . The settlement of Saxony went on, with occasional military episodes, by the slower, but more certain, processes of education and religious conversion. It appears to us to be anything but wise to force a religion upon a people at the point of the sword; but the singular fact is, that in two generations there was no more truly devout Christian people, according to the standards of the time, than just these same Saxons. A little more than a hundred years from the time when Charlemagne had thrashed the nation into unwilling acceptance of

Frankish control, the crown of the Empire he founded was set upon the head of a Saxon prince. The progress in friendly relations between the two peoples is seen in the second of the great ordinances by which Saxon affairs were regulated. This edict, called the 'Capitulum Saxonicum,' was published after a great diet at Aachen, in 797, at which, we are told, there came together not only Franks, but also Saxon leaders from all parts of their country, who gave their approval to the new legislation. The general drift of these new laws is in the direction of moderation. . . . The object of this legislation was, now that the armed resistance seemed to be broken, to give the Saxons a government which should be as nearly as possible like that of the Franks. The absolute respect and subjection to the Christian Church is here, as it was formerly, kept always in sight. The churches and monasteries are still to be the centres from which every effort at civilization is to go out. There can be no doubt that the real agency in this whole process was the organized Church. The fruit of the great alliance between Frankish kingdom and Roman papacy was beginning to be seen. The papacy was ready to sanction any act of her ally for the fair promise of winning the great territory of North Germany to its spiritual allegiance. The most solid result of the campaigns of Charlemagne was the founding of the great bishoprics of Minden, Paderborn, Verden, Bremen, Osnabrück, and Halberstadt. . . . About these bishoprics, as, on the whole, the safest places, men came to settle. Roads were built to connect them; markets sprang up in their neighborhood; and thus gradually, during a development of centuries, great cities grew up, which came to be the homes of powerful and wealthy traders, and gave shape to the whole politics of the North. Saxony was become a part of the Frankish Empire, and all the more thoroughly so, because there was no royal or ducal line there which had to be kept in place."—E. Emerton, *Introd. to the Study of the Middle Ages*, ch. 13.—Between 768 and 800 Charlemagne extinguished the Lombard kingdom and made himself master of Italy, as the ally and patron of the Pope, bearing the old Roman title of Patrician; he crossed the Pyrenees, drove the Saracens southward to the Ebro, and added a "Spanish March" to his empire (see SPAIN: A. D. 778); he broke the obstinate turbulence of the Saxons, in a series of bloody campaigns which (see SAXONS: A. D. 772-804) consumed a generation; he extirpated the troublesome Avars, still entrenched along the Danube, and he held with an always firm hand the whole dominion that came to him by inheritance from his father. "He had won his victories with Frankish arms, and he had taken possession of the conquered countries in the name of the Frankish people. Every step which he had taken had been with the advice and consent of the nation assembled in the great meetings of the spring-time, and his public documents carefully express the share of the nation in his great achievements. Saxony, Bavaria, Lombardy, Aquitaine, the Spanish Mark, all these great countries, lying outside the territory of Frankland proper, had been made a part of its possession by the might of his arm and the wisdom of his counsel. But when this had all been done, the question arose, by what right he should hold all this power, and secure it so that it should not fall apart as soon

as he should be gone. As king of the Franks it was impossible that he should not seem to the conquered peoples, however mild and beneficent his rule might be, a foreign prince; and though he might be able to force them to follow his banner in war, and submit to his judgment in peace, there was still wanting the one common interest which should bind all these peoples, strangers to the Franks and to each other, into one united nation. About the year 800 this problem seems to have been very much before the mind of Charlemagne. If we look at the boundaries of his kingdom, reaching from the Eider in the north to the Ebro and the Garigliano in the south, and from the ocean in the west to the Elbe and the Enns in the east, we shall say as the people of his own time did, 'this power is Imperial.' That word may mean little to us, but in fact it has often in history been used to describe just the kind of power which Charlemagne in the year 800 really had. . . . The idea of empire includes under this one term, kingdoms, duchies, or whatever powers might be in existence; all, however, subject to some one higher force, which they feel to be necessary for their support. . . . But where was the model upon which Charlemagne might build his new empire? Surely nowhere but in that great Roman Empire whose western representative had been finally allowed to disappear by Odoacer the Herulian in the year 476. . . . After Odoacer the Eastern Empire, with its capital at Constantinople, still lived on, and claimed for itself all the rights which had belonged to both parts. That Eastern Empire was still alive at the time of Charlemagne. We have met with it once or twice in our study of the Franks. Even Clovis had been tickled with the present of the title of Consul, sent him by the Eastern Emperor; and from time to time, as the Franks had meddled with the affairs of Italy, they had been reminded that Italy was in name still a part of the Imperial lands. . . . But now, when Charlemagne himself was thinking of taking the title of Emperor, he found himself forced to meet squarely the question, whether there could be two independent Christian Emperors at the same time. . . . On Christmas Day, in the year 800, Charlemagne was at Rome. He had gone thither at the request of the Pope Leo, who had been accused of dreadful crimes by his enemies in the city, and had been for a time deprived of his office. Charlemagne had acted as judge in the case, and had decided in favor of Leo. According to good Teutonic custom, the pope had purified himself of his charges by a tremendous oath on the Holy Trinity, and had again assumed the duties of the papacy. The Christmas service was held in great state at St. Peter's. While Charlemagne was kneeling in prayer at the grave of the Apostle, the pope suddenly approached him, and, in the presence of all the people, placed upon his head a golden crown. As he did so, the people cried out with one voice, 'Long life and victory to Charles Augustus, the mighty Emperor, the Peace-bringer, crowned by God!' Einhard, who ought to have known, assures us that Charles was totally surprised by the coronation, and often said afterward that if he had known of the plan he would not have gone into the church, even upon so high a festival. It is altogether probable that the king had not meant to be crowned at just that moment and in just that way; but

that he had never thought of such a possibility seems utterly incredible. By this act Charlemagne was presented to the world as the successor of the ancient Roman Emperors of the West, and so far as power was concerned, he was that. But he was more. His power rested, not upon any inherited ideas, but upon two great facts: first, he was the head of the Germanic Race; and second, he was the temporal head of the Christian Church. The new empire which he founded rested on these two foundations."—E. Emerton, *Introd. to the Study of the Middle Ages*, ch. 14.—The great empire which Charles labored, during all the remainder of his life, to organize in this Roman imperial character, was vast in its extent. "As an organized mass of provinces, regularly governed by imperial officers, it seems to have been nearly bounded, in Germany, by the Elbe, the Saale, the Bohemian mountains, and a line drawn from thence crossing the Danube above Vienna, and prolonged to the Gulf of Istria. Part of Dalmatia was comprised in the duchy of Friuli. In Italy the empire extended not much beyond the modern frontier of Naples, if we exclude, as was the fact, the duchy of Benevento from anything more than a titular subjection. The Spanish boundary . . . was the Ebro."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 1, pt. 1.—"The centre of his realm was the Rhine; his capitals Aachen [or Aix-la-Chapelle] and Engileneheim [or Ingelheim]; his army Frankish; his sympathies as they are shewn in the gathering of the old hero-lays, the composition of a German grammar, . . . were all for the race from which he sprang. . . . There were in his Empire, as in his own mind, two elements; those two from the union and mutual action and reaction of which modern civilization has arisen. These vast domains, reaching from the Ebro to the Carpathian mountains, from the Eyder to the Liris, were all the conquests of the Frankish sword, and were still governed almost exclusively by viceroys and officers of Frankish blood. But the conception of the Empire, that which made it a State and not a mere mass of subject tribes, . . . was inherited from an older and a grander system, was not Teutonic but Roman—Roman in its ordered rule, in its uniformity and precision, in its endeavour to subject the individual to the system—Roman in its effort to realize a certain limited and human perfection, whose very completeness shall exclude the hope of further progress." With the death of Charles in 814 the territorial disruption of his great empire began. "The returning wave of anarchy and barbarism swept up violent as ever, yet it could not wholly obliterate the past: the Empire, maimed and shattered though it was, had struck its roots too deep to be overthrown by force." The Teutonic part and the Romanized or Latinized part of the empire were broken in two, never to unite again; but, in another century, it was on the German and not the Gallo-Latin side of the line of its disruption that the imperial ideas and the imperial titles of Charlemagne came to life again, and his Teutonic Roman Empire—the "Holy Roman Empire," as it came to be called—was resurrected by Otto the Great, and established for eight centuries and a half of enduring influence in the politics of the world.—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 5.—"Gibbon has remarked, that of all the heroes to whom the title of 'The Great' has been given,

Charlemagne alone has retained it as a permanent addition to his name. The reason may perhaps be, that in no other man were ever united, in so large a measure, and in such perfect harmony, the qualities which, in their combination, constitute the heroic character, such as energy, or the love of action; ambition, or the love of power; curiosity, or the love of knowledge; and sensibility, or the love of pleasure—not, indeed, the love of forbidden, of unhallowed, or of enervating pleasure, but the keen relish for those blameless delights by which the burdened mind and jaded spirits recruit and renovate their powers. . . . For the charms of social intercourse, the play of a buoyant fancy, the exhilaration of honest mirth, and even the refreshment of athletic exercises, require for their perfect enjoyment that robust and absolute health of body and of mind which none but the noblest natures possess, and in the possession of which Charlemagne exceeded all other men. His lofty stature, his open countenance, his large and brilliant eyes, and the dome-like structure of his head, imparted, as we learn from Eginhard, to all his attitudes the dignity which becomes a king, relieved by the graceful activity of a practiced warrior. . . . Whether he was engaged in a frolic or a chase—composed verses or listened to homilies—fought or negotiated—cast down thrones or built them up—studied, conversed, or legislated, it seemed as if he, and he alone, were the one wakeful and really living agent in the midst of an inert, visionary, and somnolent generation. The rank held by Charlemagne among great commanders was achieved far more by this strange and almost superhuman activity than by any pre-eminent proficiency in the art or science of war. He was seldom engaged in any general action, and never undertook any considerable siege, excepting that of Pavia, which, in fact, was little more than a protracted blockade. But, during forty-six years of almost unintermitted warfare, he swept over the whole surface of Europe, from the Ebro to the Oder, from Bretagne to Hungary, from Denmark to Capua, with such a velocity of movement, and such a decision of purpose, that no power, civilized or barbarous, ever provoked his resentment without rapidly sinking beneath his prompt and irresistible blows. And though it be true, as Gibbon has observed, that he seldom, if ever, encountered in the field a really formidable antagonist, it is not less true that, but for his military skill, animated by his sleepless energy, the countless assailants by whom he was encompassed must rapidly have become too formidable for resistance. For to Charlemagne is due the introduction into modern warfare of the art by which a general compensates for the numerical inferiority of his own forces to that of his antagonists—the art of moving detached bodies of men along remote but converging lines with such mutual concert as to throw their united forces at the same moment on any meditated point of attack. Neither the Alpine marches of Hannibal nor those of Napoleon were combined with greater foresight, or executed with greater precision, than the simultaneous passages of Charlemagne and Count Bernard across the same mountain ranges, and their ultimate union in the vicinity of their Lombard enemies.”—Sir J. Stephen, *Lect's on the Hist. of France*, lect. 3.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 49.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 800.

A. D. 814-962.—**Dissolution of the Carolingian Empire.**—Charlemagne, at his death, was succeeded by his son Ludwig, or Louis the Pious—the single survivor of three sons among whom he had intended that his great empire should be shared. Mild in temper, conscientious in character, Louis reigned with success for sixteen years, and then lost all power of control, through the turbulence of his family and the disorders of his times. He “tried in vain to satisfy his sons (Lothar, Lewis, and Charles) by dividing and re-dividing; they rebelled; he was deposed, and forced by the bishops to do penance, again restored, but without power, a tool in the hands of contending factions. On his death the sons flew to arms, and the first of the dynastic quarrels of modern Europe was fought out on the field of Fontenay. In the partition treaty of Verdun [A. D. 843] which followed, the Teutonic principle of equal division among heirs triumphed over the Roman one of the transmission of an indivisible Empire: the practical sovereignty of all three brothers was admitted in their respective territories, a barren precedence only reserved to Lothar, with the imperial title which he, as the eldest, already enjoyed. A more important result was the separation of the Gaulish and German nationalities. . . . Modern Germany proclaims the era of A. D. 843 the beginning of her national existence and celebrated its thousandth anniversary [in 1843]. To Charles the Bald was given *Francia Occidentalis*, that is to say, Neustria and Aquitaine; to Lothar, who as Emperor must possess the two capitals, Rome and Aachen, a long and narrow kingdom stretching from the North Sea to the Mediterranean, and including the northern half of Italy; Lewis (surnamed, from his kingdom, the German) received all east of the Rhine, Franks, Saxons, Bavarians, Austria, Carinthia, with possible supremacies over Czechs and Moravians beyond. Throughout these regions German was spoken; through Charles's kingdom a corrupt tongue, equally removed from Latin and from modern French. Lothar's, being mixed and having no national basis, was the weakest of the three, and soon dissolved into the separate sovereignties of Italy, Burgundy and Lotharingia, or, as we call it, Lorraine. On the tangled history of the period that follows it is not possible to do more than touch. After passing from one branch of the Carolingian line to another, the imperial sceptre was at last possessed and disgraced by Charles the Fat, who united all the dominions of his great-grandfather. This unworthy heir could not avail himself of recovered territory to strengthen or defend the expiring monarchy. He was driven out of Italy in A. D. 887 and his death in 888 has been usually taken as the date of the extinction of the Carolingian Empire of the West. . . . From all sides the torrent of barbarism which Charles the Great had stemmed was rushing down upon his empire. . . . Under such strokes the already loosened fabric swiftly dissolved. No one thought of common defence or wide organization: the strong built castles, the weak became their bondsmen, or took shelter under the cowl: the governor—count, abbot, or bishop—tightened his grasp, turned a delegated into an independent, a personal into a territorial authority, and hardly owned a distant and feeble suzerain. . . . In Germany, the greatness of the evil worked at last its cure. When the male line of the eastern



branch of the Carolingians had ended in Lewis (surnamed the Child), son of Arnulf [A. D. 911], the chieftains chose and the people accepted Conrad the Franconian, and after him Henry the Saxon duke, both representing the female line of Charles. Henry laid the foundations of a firm monarchy, driving back the Magyars and Wends, recovering Lotharingia, founding towns to be centres of orderly life and strongholds against Hungarian irruptions. He had meant to claim at Rome his kingdom's rights, rights which Conrad's weakness had at least asserted by the demand of tribute; but death overtook him, and the plan was left to be fulfilled by Otto his son."

—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 6.—"The division of 888 was really the beginning of the modern states and the modern divisions of Europe. The Carolingian Empire was broken up into four separate kingdoms: the Western Kingdom, answering roughly to France, the Eastern Kingdom or Germany, Italy, and Burgundy. Of these, the three first remain as the greatest nations of the Continent: Burgundy, by that name, has vanished; but its place as a European power is occupied, far more worthily than by any King or Cæsar, by the noble confederation of Switzerland."—E. A. Freeman, *The Franks and the Gauls*. (*Historical Essays*, 1st series, no. 7.)

ALSO IN: E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Docs. of the Middle Ages*, bk. 2, no. 3.—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, ch. 18.—R. W. Church, *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*, ch. 8.—F. Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization*, lect. 24.—Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and France*, v. 1-2.—See, also, GERMANY: A. D. 843-962; and FRANCE: A. D. 843, and after.

A. D. 843-962.—Kingdom of the East Franks. See GERMANY: A. D. 843-962.

FRATRES MINORES. See MENDICANT ORDERS.

FRATRICELLI, The. See BEGUINES, ETC.

FRAZIER'S FARM, OR GLENDALE, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—JULY: VIRGINIA).

FREDERICIA, Battle of (1849). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK): A. D. 1848-1862. Siege of (1864). See GERMANY: A. D. 1861-1866.

FREDERICK I. (called Barbarossa), Emperor, A. D. 1155-1190; King of Germany, 1152-1190; King of Italy, 1155-1190.... Frederick I., King of Denmark and Norway, 1523-1533.... Frederick I., King of Prussia, 1701-1713; III., Elector of Brandenburg, 1688-1713.... Frederick I., Elector of Brandenburg, 1417-1440.... Frederick II., Emperor, 1220-1250; King of Germany, 1212-1250. See ITALY: A. D. 1183-1250; and GERMANY: A. D. 1188-1268.... Frederick II., King of Denmark and Norway, 1558-1588.... Frederick II., King of Naples, 1496-1503.... Frederick II. (called The Great), King of Prussia, 1740-1786.... Frederick II., King of Sicily, 1295-1337.... Frederick II., Elector of Brandenburg, 1440-1470.... Frederick III., Emperor, and King of Germany, 1440-1493.... Frederick III., German Emperor and King of Prussia, 1888, March—June.... Frederick III., King of Denmark and Norway, 1648-1670.... Frederick III., King of Sicily, 1355-1377.... Frederick

IV., King of Denmark and Norway, 1699-1730.... Frederick V., King of Denmark and Norway, 1746-1766.... Frederick V., Elector of the Palatinate (and King-elect of Bohemia), and the Thirty Years' War. See GERMANY: A. D. 1618-1620, 1620, 1621-1623, 1631-1632, and 1648.... Frederick VI., King of Denmark and Norway, 1808-1814; King of Denmark, 1814-1839.... Frederick VII., King of Denmark, 1848-1863.... Frederick Augustus I., Elector of Saxony, 1694-1733; King of Poland, 1697-1704 (deposed), and 1709-1733.... Frederick Augustus II., Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, 1733-1763.... Frederick Henry, Stadtholder of the United Provinces, 1625-1647.... Frederick William (called The Great Elector), Elector of Brandenburg, 1640-1688.... Frederick William I., King of Prussia, 1713-1740.... Frederick William II., King of Prussia, 1786-1797.... Frederick William III., King of Prussia, 1797-1840.... Frederick William IV., King of Prussia, 1840-1861.

FREDERICKSBURG, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER: VIRGINIA).

Sedgwick's demonstration against. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1863 (APRIL—MAY: VIRGINIA).

FREDERICKSHALL.—Siege by the Swedes.—Death of Charles XII. (1718). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707-1718.

FREDERICKSHAMN, Peace of (1809). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1807-1810.

FREDLINGEN, Battle of (1703). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702-1704.

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. See SCOTLAND: A. D. 1843.

FREE CITIES. See CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, OF GERMANY; also, ITALY: A. D. 1056-1152, and after; and HANSA TOWNS.

FREE COMPANIES, The. See ITALY: A. D. 1343-1393; and FRANCE: A. D. 1360-1380.

FREE LANCES. See LANCES, FREE.

FREE MASONS.—"The fall of the Knights Templars has been connected with the origin of the Freemasons, and the idea has prevailed that the only secret purpose of the latter was the re-establishment of the suppressed order. Jacques de Molai, while a prisoner in Paris, is said to have created four new lodges, and the day after his execution, eight knights, disguised as masons, are said to have gone to gather up the ashes of their late Grand Master. To conceal their designs, the new Templars assumed the symbols of the trade, but took, it is said, the name of Francs 'Maçons' to distinguish themselves from ordinary craftsmen, and also in memory of the general appellation given to them in Palestine. Even the allegories of Freemasonry, and the ceremonies of its initiations, have been explained by a reference to the history of the persecutions of the Templars. The Abbé Barruel says, that 'every thing—the signs, the language, the names of grand master, of knight, of temple—all, in a word, betray the Freemasons as descendants of the proscribed knights.' Lessing, in Germany, gave some authority to this opinion, by asserting positively that 'the lodges of the Templars were in the very highest repute in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and that out of such a lodge, which had

been constantly kept up in London, was established the society of Freemasons, in the seventeenth century, by Sir Christopher Wren.' Lessing is of opinion that the name Mason has nothing to do with the English meaning of the word, but comes from Massonney, a 'lodge' of the Knights Templars. This idea may have caused the Freemasons to amalgamate the external ritual of the Templars with their own, and to found the higher French degrees which have given colour to the very hypothesis which gave rise to their introduction. But the whole story appears to be most improbable, and only rests upon the slight foundation of fancied or accidental analogies. Attempts have also been made to show that the Freemasons are only a continuation of the fraternities of architects which are supposed to have originated at the time of the building of Solomon's Temple. The Egyptian priests are supposed to have taught those who were initiated a secret and sacred system of architecture; this is said to have been transmitted to the Dionysiac architects, of whom the first historical traces are to be found in Asia Minor, where they were organized into a secret fraternity. . . . It is, however, a mere matter of speculation whether the Jewish and Dionysiac architects were closely connected, but there is some analogy between the latter and the Roman guilds, which Numa is said to have first introduced, and which were probably the prototypes of the later associations of masons which flourished until the end of the Roman Empire. The hordes of barbarians which then ruthlessly swept away whatever bore the semblance of luxury and elegance, did not spare the noblest specimens of art, and it was only when they became converted to Christianity, that the guilds were re-established. During the Lombard rule they became numerous in Italy. . . . As their numbers increased, Lombardy no longer sufficed for the exercise of their art, and they travelled into all the countries where Christianity, only recently established, required religious buildings. . . . These associations, however, became nearly crushed by the power of the monastic institutions, so that in the early part of the Middle Ages the words artist and priest became nearly synonymous; but in the twelfth century they emancipated themselves, and sprang into new life. The names of the authors of the great architectural creations of this period are almost all unknown; for these were not the work of individuals, but of fraternities. . . . In England guilds of masons are said to have existed in the year 926, but this tradition is not supported by history; in Scotland similar associations were established towards the end of the fifteenth century. The Abbé Grandier regards Freemasonry as nothing more than a servile imitation of the ancient and useful fraternity of true masons established during the building of the Cathedral of Strasburg, one of the masterpieces of Gothic architecture, and which caused the fame of its builders to spread throughout Europe. In many towns similar fraternities were established. . . . The origin of the Freemasons of the present day is not to be attributed to these fraternities, but to the Rosicrucians [see ROSICRUCIANS] who first appeared at the beginning of the seventeenth century."—A. P. Marras, *Secret Fraternities of the Middle Ages*, ch. 7-8.

ALSO IN: J. G. Findel, *Hist. of Freemasonry*.—C. W. Heckethorn, *Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries*, bk. 8 (v. 1).

FREE-SOIL PARTY, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1848.

FREE SPIRIT, Brethren and Sisters of the. See BEGUINES.

FREE TRADE IN ENGLAND. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (ENGLAND): A. D. 1836-1839; 1842; 1845-1846; and 1846-1879.

FREEDMEN OF THE SOUTH.—The emancipated slaves of the United States.

FREEDMEN'S BUREAU, The. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865-1866.

FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE. See TOLERATION, RELIGIOUS.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS: A. D. 1695.—Expiration of the Censorship law in England. See PRINTING: A. D. 1695.

A. D. 1734.—Zenger's trial at New York.—See NEW YORK: A. D. 1720-1734.

A. D. 1755.—Liberty attained in Massachusetts. See PRINTING: A. D. 1535-1709.

A. D. 1762-1764.—Prosecution of John Wilkes. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1762-1764.

A. D. 1771.—Last contest of the British Parliament with the Press. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1771.

A. D. 1817.—The trials of William Hone. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1816-1820.

FREEHOLD. See FEUDAL TENURES.

FREEMAN'S FARM, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER).

FREGELLÆ.—Fregellæ, a Latin colony, founded by the Romans, B. C. 329, in the Volscian territory, on the Liris, revolted in B. C. 125, and was totally destroyed. A Roman colony, named Fabrateria, was founded near the site.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 1, ch. 17.

FREIBURG (in the Breisgau).—Freiburg became a free city in 1120, but lost its freedom a century later, and passed, in 1368, under the domination of the Hapsburgs.

A. D. 1638.—Capture by Duke Bernhard. See GERMANY: A. D. 1634-1639.

A. D. 1644.—Siege and capture by the Imperialists.—Attempted recovery by Condé and Turenne.—The three days battle. See GERMANY: A. D. 1643-1644.

A. D. 1677.—Taken by the French. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1674-1678.

A. D. 1679.—Retained by France. See NIMEGUEN, THE PEACE OF.

A. D. 1697.—Restored to Germany. See FRANCE: A. D. 1697.

A. D. 1713-1714.—Taken and given up by the French. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712-1714.

A. D. 1744-1748.—Taken by the French and restored to Germany. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1744-1745; and AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: THE CONGRESS.

FREJUS, Origin of. See FORUM JULII.

FREMONT, General John C., and the conquest of California. See CALIFORNIA: A. D. 1846-1847. . . . Defeat in Presidential election. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1856. . . . Command in the west.—Proclamation of Freedom.—Removal. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JULY—SEPTEMBER: MISSOURI), and (AUGUST—OCTOBER: MISSOURI). . . . Command in West Virginia. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA).

FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR.—The four intercolonial wars of the 17th and 18th centuries, in America, commonly known, respectively, as "King William's War," "Queen Anne's War," "King George's War," and the French and Indian War, were all of them conflicts with the French and Indians of Canada, or New France; but the last of the series (coincident with the "Seven Years War" in Europe) became especially characterized in the colonies by that designation. Its causes and chief events are to be found related under the following headings: CANADA: A. D. 1750-1753, 1755, 1756, 1756-1757, 1758, 1759, 1760; NOVA SCOTIA: A. D. 1749-1755, 1755; OHIO (VALLEY): A. D. 1748-1754, 1754, 1755; CAPE BRETON ISLAND: A. D. 1758-1760; also, for an account of the accompanying Cherokee War, SOUTH CAROLINA: A. D. 1759-1761.

FRENCH FURY, The. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1581-1584.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1800.

FRENCHTOWN (now Monroe, Mich.), Battle at. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1812-1813. HARRISON'S CAMPAIGN.

FRENTANIANS, The. See SABINES.

FRIARS.—"Carmelite Friars," "White Friars." See CARMELITE FRIARS.—Austin Friars. See AUSTIN CANONS.—"Preaching Friars," "Begging Friars," "Minor Friars," "Black Friars," "Grey Friars." See MENDICANT ORDERS.

FRIEDLAND, Battle of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1807 (FEBRUARY—JUNE).

FRIEDLINGEN, Battle of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1702.

FRIENDLY ISLANDS. See TONGA.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES. See INSURANCE.

FRIENDS, The Society of. See QUAKERS.

FRIENDS OF THE PEOPLE, The Society of the. See FRANCE: A. D. 1830-1840.

FRIESLAND.—See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1417-1430.

FRIGIDUS, Battle of the (A. D. 394). See ROME: A. D. 379-395.

FRILING, The. See LÆTI.

FRIMAIRE, The month. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER).

FRISIANS, The.—"Beyond the Batavians, upon the north, dwelt the great Frisian family, occupying the regions between the Rhine and Ems. The Zuyder Zee and the Dollart, both caused by the terrific inundations of the 13th century, and not existing at this period [the early Roman Empire], did not then interpose boundaries between kindred tribes."—J. L. Motley, *Rise of the Dutch Republic, introd., sect. 2.*—"The Frisians, adjoining [the Batavi] . . . in the coast district that is still named after them, as far as the lower Ems, submitted to Drusus and obtained a position similar to that of the Batavi. There was imposed on them instead of tribute simply the delivery of a number of bullocks' hides for the wants of the army; on the other hand they had to furnish comparatively large numbers of men for the Roman service. They were the most faithful allies of Drusus as afterwards of Germanicus."—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome, bk. 8, ch. 4.*

A. D. 528-729.—Struggles against the Frank dominion, before Charlemagne. See GERMANY: A. D. 481-768.

FRITH-GUILDS. See GUILDS, MEDÆVAL.
FROEBEL AND THE KINDERGARTEN. See EDUCATION, MODERN: REFORMS &c.: 1816-1892.

FROG'S POINT, Battle At. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (SEPTEMBER—NOVEMBER).

FRONDE, FRONDEURS, The. See FRANCE: A. D. 1647-1648, 1649, 1650-1651, 1651-1653; and BORDEAUX: A. D. 1652-1653.

FRONT ROYAL, Stonewall Jackson's capture of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (MAY—JUNE: VIRGINIA).

FRONTENAC, Count, in New France. See CANADA: A. D. 1669-1687, to 1696.

FRONTENAC, Fort. See KINGSTON, CANADA.

FRUCTIDOR, The Month. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER).

The Coup d'État of the Eighteenth of. See FRANCE: A. D. 1797 (SEPTEMBER).

FRUELA I., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 757-768. . . . Fruela II., King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 923-925.

FRUMENTARIAN LAW, The First. See ROME: B. C. 133-121.

FUEGIANS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PATAGONIANS.

FUENTES D'ONORO, Battle of (1811). See SPAIN: A. D. 1810-1812.

FUFIAN LAW, The. See ÆLIAN AND FUFIAN LAWS.

FUGGERS, The.—"Hans Fugger was the founder of the Fugger family, whose members still possess extensive estates and authority as princes and counts in Bavaria and Wurtemberg. He came to Augsburg in 1365 as a poor but energetic weaver's apprentice, acquired citizenship by marrying a burgher's daughter, and, after completing an excellent masterpiece, was admitted into the guild of weavers. . . . Hans Fugger died in 1409, leaving behind him a fortune of 3,000 florins, which he had made by his skill and diligence. This was a considerable sum in those days, for the gold mines of the New World had not yet been opened up, and the necessities of life sold for very low prices. The sons carried on their father's business, and with so much skill and success that they were always called the rich Fuggers. The importance and wealth of the family increased every day. By the year 1500 it was not easy to find a frequented route by sea or land where Fugger's wares were not to be seen. On one occasion the powerful Hanseatic league seized twenty of their ships, which were sailing with a cargo of Hungarian copper, down the Vistula to Cracow and Dantzic. Below ground the miner worked for Fugger, above it the artisan. In 1448 they lent 150,000 florins to the then Archdukes of Austria, the Emperor Frederick the Third (father of Maximilian) and his brother Albert. In 1509 a century had passed since the weaver Hans Fugger had died leaving his fortune of 3,000 florins, acquired by his laborious industry. His grandchildren were now the richest merchants in Europe; without the aid of their money the mightiest princes of the continent could not complete any important enterprise, and their family was connected with the noblest houses by the

ties of relationship. They were raised to the rank of noblemen and endowed with honourable privileges by the Emperor Maximilian the First."—A. W. Grube, *Heroes of History and Legend*, ch. 13.

FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW, AND ITS REPEAL. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1793, 1850, and 1864 (JUNE).

FULAHS, The. See AFRICA: THE INHABITING RACES.

FULFORD, Battle of. See ENGLAND: A. D. 1066 (SEPTEMBER).

FULTON'S FIRST STEAMBOAT. See STEAM NAVIGATION: THE BEGINNINGS.

FUNDAMENTAL AGREEMENT OF NEW HAVEN. See CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1639.

FUNDAMENTAL ORDERS OF CONNECTICUT. See CONNECTICUT: A. D. 1636-1639.

FUORUSCITI.—In Italy, during the Guelf and Ghibelline contests of the 13th and 14th centuries (see ITALY: A. D. 1215-1293), "almost every city had its body of 'fuorusciti';—literally, 'those who had gone out';—proscript and exiles, in fact, who represented the minorities . . . in the different communities;—Ghibelline fuorusciti from Guelf cities, and Guelf fuorusciti from Ghibelline cities."—T. A. Trollope, *Hist. of the Commonwealth of Florence*, v. 1, p. 380.

GA, The. See GAU.

GABELLE, The.—"In the spring of the year 1343, the king [Philip de Valois, king of France] published an ordinance by which no one was allowed to sell salt in France unless he bought it from the store-houses of the crown, which gave him the power of committing any degree of extortion in an article that was of the utmost necessity to his subjects. This obnoxious tax, which at a subsequent period became one of the chief sources of the revenue of the crown of France, was termed a gabelle, a word of Frankish or Teutonic origin, which had been in use from the earliest period to signify a tax in general, but which was from this time almost restricted to the extraordinary duty on salt. . . . This word gabelle is the same as the Anglo-Saxon word 'gafol,' a tax."—T. Wright, *Hist. of France*, v. 1, p. 364, and foot-note.—See, also, TAILLE and GABELLE.

GABINIAN LAW, The. See ROME: B. C. 69-63.

GACHUPINES AND GUADALUPES.—In the last days of Spanish rule in Mexico, the Spanish official party bore the name of Gachupines, while the native party, which prepared for revolution, were called Guadalupe.—E. J. Payne, *Hist. of European Colonies*, p. 303.—The name of the Guadalupe was adopted by the Mexicans "in honour of 'Our Lady of Guadalupe,' the tutelar protectress of Mexico;" while that of the Gachupines "was a sobriquet gratuitously bestowed upon the Spanish faction."—W. H. Chynoweth, *The Fall of Maximilian*, p. 3.

GADEBUSCH, Battle of (1712). See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1707-1718.

GADENI, The. See BRITAIN, CELTIC TRIBES.

GADES (Modern Cadiz), Ancient commerce of.—"At this period [early in the last century

FÜRST.—Prince; the equivalent German title. See GERMANY: A. D. 1125-1272.

FURY, The French. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1581-1584.

FURY, The Spanish. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1575-1577.

FUSILLADES. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793-1794 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

FUTTEH ALI SHAH, Shah of Persia, A. D. 1798-1834.

FUTTEHPORE, Battle of (1857). See INDIA: A. D. 1857-1858 (JULY—JUNE).

FYLFOT-CROSS, The. See TRI-SKELION.

FYRD, The.—"The one national army [in Saxon England, before the Norman Conquest] was the fyrd, a force which had already received in the Karolingian legislation the name of landwehr by which the German knows it still. The fyrd was in fact composed of the whole mass of free landowners who formed the folk: and to the last it could only be summoned by the voice of the folk-moot. In theory therefore such a host represented the whole available force of the country. But in actual warfare its attendance at the king's war-call was limited by practical difficulties. Arms were costly; and the greater part of the fyrd came equipped with bludgeons and hedge-stakes, which could do little to meet the spear and battleaxe of the invader."—J. R. Green, *The Conquest of England*, p. 133.

G.

before Christ] Gades was undoubtedly one of the most important emporiums of trade in the world: her citizens having absorbed a large part of the commerce that had previously belonged to Carthage. In the time of Strabo they still retained almost the whole trade with the Outer Sea, or Atlantic coasts."—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 18, sect. 6 (v. 2).—See, also, UTICA.

GADSDEN PURCHASE, The. See ARIZONA: A. D. 1853.

GAEL. See CELTS.

GAETA: A. D. 1805-1806.—Siege and Capture by the French. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805-1806 (DECEMBER—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1848.—The refuge of Pope Pius IX. See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849.

GAFOL.—A payment in money, or kind, or work, rendered in the way of rent by a villein-tenant to his lord, among the Saxons and early English. The word signified tribute.—F. Seebohm, *English Village Community*, ch. 2 and 5.

GAG, The Atherton. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1836.

GAGE, General Thomas, in the command and government at Boston. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1774 (MARCH—APRIL); 1775 (APRIL), (APRIL—MAY), and (JUNE).

GAI SABER, El. See PROVENCE: A. D. 1179-1207.

GAINAS, The. See ENGLAND: A. D. 547-633.

GAINES' MILL, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JUNE—JULY: VIRGINIA).

GALATA, The Genoese colony. See GENOA: A. D. 1261-1299; also CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 1261-1453, and 1348-1355.

GALATÆ, The. See GAULS.

GALATIA.—GALATIANS.—In 280 B. C. a body of Gauls, or Celts, invaded Greece, under Brennus, and in the following year three tribes of them crossed into Asia Minor. There, as in Greece, they committed terrible ravages, and were a desolating scourge to the land, sometimes employed as mercenaries by one and another of the princes who fought over the fragments of Alexander's Empire, and sometimes roaming for plunder on their own account. Antiochus, son of Seleucus, of Syria, is said to have won a great victory over them; but it was not until 239 B. C. that they were seriously checked by Attalus, King of Pergamus, who defeated them in a great battle and forced them to settle in the part of ancient Phrygia which afterwards took its name from them, being called Galatia, or Gallo-Græcia, or Eastern Gaul. When the Romans subjugated Asia Minor they found the Galatæ among their most formidable enemies. The latter were permitted for a time to retain a certain degree of independence, under tetrarchs, and afterwards under kings of their own. But finally Galatia became a Roman province. "When St. Paul preached among them, they seemed fused into the Hellenistic world, speaking Greek like the rest of Asia; yet the Celtic language long lingered among them and St. Jerome says he found the country people still using it in his day (fourth cent. A. D.)."—J. P. Mahaffy, *Story of Alexander's Empire*, ch. 8.—See, also, GAULS: B. C. 280-279. INVASION OF GREECE.

GALBA, Roman Emperor, A. D. 68-69.

GALEN, and Ancient Medical Science. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 2D CENTURY.

GALERIUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 305-311.

GALICIA (Spain), Settlement of Sueves and Vandals in. See SPAIN: A. D. 409-414.

GALILEE.—The Hebrew name Galil, applied originally to a little section of country, became in the Roman age, as Galilæa, the name of the whole region in Palestine north of Samaria and west of the river Jordan and the Sea of Galilee. Ewald interprets the name as meaning the "march" or frontier land; but in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" it is said to signify a "circle" or "circuit." It had many heathen inhabitants and was called Galilee of the Gentiles.—H. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, bk. 5, sect. 1.

GALLAS, The. See AFRICA: THE INHABITING RACES; and ABYSSINIA: 15th-19th CENTURIES.

GALLATIN, Albert, Negotiation of the Treaty of Ghent. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1814 (DECEMBER).

GALLDACHT. See PALE, THE ENGLISH.

GALLEON OR GALEON.—GALERA.—GALEAZA.—GALEASSES. See CARAVELS; also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1588; also, PERU: A. D. 1550-1816.

GALLI, The. See GAULS.

GALLIA. See GAUL.

GALLIA BRACCATA, COMATA AND TOGATA.—"The ancient historians make some allusion to another division of Gaul, perhaps introduced by the soldiers, for it was founded solely upon the costume of the inhabitants. Gallia Togata, near the Rhone, comprehended the Gauls who had adopted the toga and the Roman manners. In Gallia Comata, to the north of the Loire, the inhabitants wore long plaited hair, which we find

to this day among the Bas Britons. Gallia Braccata, to the south of the Loire, wore, for the national costume, trousers reaching from the hips to the ancles, called 'braccæ.'"—J. C. L. S. de Sismondi, *The French under the Merovingians*, trans. by Bellingham, ch. 2, note.

GALLIA CISALPINA. See ROME: B. C. 390-347.

GALLICAN CHURCH: A. D. 1268.—The Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis. See FRANCE: A. D. 1268.

A. D. 1438.—The Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII., affirming some of the decrees of the reforming Council of Basel. See FRANCE: A. D. 1438.

A. D. 1515-1518.—Abrogation of the Pragmatic Sanction.—The Concordat of Bologna. See FRANCE: A. D. 1515-1518.

A. D. 1653-1713.—The conflict of Jesuits and Jansenists.—Persecution of the latter.—The Bull Unigenitus and its tyrannical enforcement. See PORT ROYAL AND THE JANSENISTS.

A. D. 1791-1792.—The civil constitution of the clergy.—The oath prescribed by the National Assembly. See FRANCE: A. D. 1789-1791; 1790-1791; and 1791-1792.

A. D. 1793.—Suppression of Christian worship in Paris and other parts of France.—The worship of Reason. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798 (NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1802.—The Concordat of Napoleon.—Its Ultramontane influence. See FRANCE: A. D. 1801-1804.

A. D. 1833-1880.—The Church and the Schools. See EDUCATION, MODERN: FRANCE: A. D. 1833-1880.

GALLICIA, The kingdom of. See SPAIN: A. D. 713-737.

GALLIENUS, Roman Emperor, A. D. 253-268.

GALLOGLASSES.—The heavy-armed foot-soldiers of the Irish in their battles with the English during the 14th century. See, also, RAPPAREE.

GALLS. See IRELAND: 9TH-10TH CENTURIES.

GALVANI. See ELECTRICAL DISCOVERY: A. D. 1786-1800.

GAMA, Voyage of Vasco da. See PORTUGAL: A. D. 1463-1498.

GAMBETTA AND THE DEFENSE OF FRANCE. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER), and 1870-1871.

GAMMADION, The. See TRI-SKELION.

GAMORI. See GEOMORI.

GANAWESE OR KANAWHAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: ALGONQUIAN FAMILY.

GANDARIANS, The. See GEDROSIANS.

GANDASTOGUÉS, OR CONESTOGAS, The. See AMERICAN ABORIGINES: SUSQUEHANNAS.

GANGANI, The. See IRELAND, TRIBES OF EARLY CELTIC INHABITANTS.

GANGWAY, The.—On the floor of the English House of Commons, "the long lines of seats rise gradually on each side of the chair—those to the Speaker's right being occupied by the upholders of the Government, and those to the left accommodating the Opposition. One length of seating runs in an unbroken line beneath each

of the side galleries, and these are known as the 'back benches.' The other lengths are divided into two nearly equal parts by an unseated gap of about a yard wide. This is 'the gangway.' Though nothing more than a convenient means of access for members, this space has come to be regarded as the barrier that separates the thick and thin supporters of the rival leaders from their less fettered colleagues—that is to say, the steady men from the Radicals, Nationalists, and free-lances generally."—*Popular Acc't of Parliamentary Procedure*, p. 6.

GAON.—THE GAONATE. See JEWS: 7th CENTURY.

GARAMANTES, The.—The ancient inhabitants of the north African region now called Fezzan, were known as the Garamantes.—E. H. Bunbury, *Hist. of Ancient Geog.*, ch. 8, sect. 1.

GARCIA, King of Leon and the Asturias, or Oviedo, A. D. 910-914.... Garcia I., King of Navarre, 885-891.... Garcia II., King of Spain, 925-970.... Garcia III., King of Navarre, 1035-1054.... Garcia IV., King of Navarre, 1134-1150.

GARFIELD, General James A.—Campaign in Kentucky. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY: KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE).... Presidential election.—Administration.—Assassination. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1880, and 1881.

GARIBALDI, King of the Lombards, A. D. 672-673.

GARIBALDI'S ITALIAN CAMPAIGNS. See ITALY: A. D. 1848-1849; 1856-1859; 1859-1861; 1862-1866; and 1867-1870.

GARIGLIANO, Battle of the (1503). See ITALY: A. D. 1501-1504.

GARITIES, The. See AQUITAINE: THE ANCIENT TRIBES.

GARRISON, William Lloyd, and the American Abolitionists. See SLAVERY, NEGRO: A. D. 1828-1832.

GARTER, Knights of the Order of the.—"About this time [A. D. 1343] the king of England [Edward III.] resolved to rebuild and embellish the great castle of Windsor, which king Arthur had first founded in time past, and where he had erected and established that noble round table from whence so many gallant knights had issued forth, and displayed the valiant prowess of their deeds at arms over the world. King Edward, therefore, determined to establish an order of knighthood, consisting of himself, his children, and the most gallant knights in Christendom, to the number of forty. He ordered it to be denominated 'knights of the blue garter,' and that the feast should be celebrated every year at Windsor, upon St. George's day. He summoned, therefore, all the earls, barons, and knights of his realm, to inform them of his intentions; they heard it with great pleasure; for it appeared to them highly honourable, and capable of increasing love and friendship. Forty knights were then elected, according to report and estimation the bravest in Christendom, who sealed, and swore to maintain and keep the feast and the statutes which had been made. The king founded a chapel at Windsor, in honour of St. George, and established canons, there to serve God, with a handsome endowment. He then issued his proclamation for this feast by his heralds, whom he sent to France, Scotland, Burgundy, Hainault, Flanders, Brabant, and the empire of Germany,

and offered to all knights and squires, that might come to this ceremony, passports to last for fifteen days after it was over. The celebration of this order was fixed for St. George's day next ensuing, to be held at Windsor, 1344."—Froissart (Johnes), *Chronicles*, bk. 1, ch. 100.—"The popular tradition, derived from Polydore Vergil, is that, having a festival at Court, a lady chanced to drop her garter, when it was picked up by the King. Observing that the incident made the bystanders smile significantly, Edward exclaimed in a tone of rebuke, 'Honi soit qui mal y pense'—'Dishonoured be he who thinks evil of it': and to prevent any further innuendos, he tied the garter round his own knee. This anecdote, it is true, has been characterized by some as an improbable fable: why, we know not. . . . Be the origin of the institution, however, what it may, no Order in Europe is so ancient, none so illustrious, for 'it exceeds in majesty, honour and fame all chivalrous fraternities in the world.' . . . By a Statute passed on the 17th January, 1805, the Order is to consist of the Sovereign and twenty-five Knights Companions, together with such lineal descendants of George III. as may be elected, always excepting the Prince of Wales, who is a constituent part of the original institution. Special Statutes have since, at different times, been proclaimed for the admission of Sovereigns and extra Knights."—Sir B. Burke, *Book of Orders of Knighthood*, p. 98.

ALSO IN: J. Buswell, *Hist. Acc't of the Knights of the Garter*.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from Eng. Hist.*, 2d series, c. 3.

GARUMNI, The Tribe of the. See AQUITAINE: THE ANCIENT TRIBES.

GASCONY.—GASCONS: Origin. See AQUITAINE: A. D. 681-768.

A. D. 778.—The ambushade at Roncesvalles. See SPAIN: A. D. 778.

A. D. 781.—Embraced in Aquitaine. See AQUITAINE: A. D. 781.

11th Century.—The Founding of the Dukedom. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1032.

GASIND, The. See COMITATUS.

GASPE, The burning of the. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1772.

GASTEIN, Convention of (1865). See GERMANY: A. D. 1861-1866.

GATES, General Horatio, and the American Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1775 (MAY—AUGUST); 1777 (JULY—OCTOBER); 1777-1778; 1780 (FEBRUARY—AUGUST); 1780-1781.

GATH. See PHILISTINES.

GATHAS, The. See ZOROASTRIANS.

GAU, OR GA, The.—"Next [after the Mark, in the settlements of the Germanic peoples] in order of constitution, if not of time, is the union of two, three, or more Marks in a federal bond for purposes of a religious, judicial, or even political character. The technical name for such a union is in Germany a Gau or Bant; in England the ancient name Ga has been almost universally superseded by that of Scir or Shire. For the most part the natural divisions of the country are the divisions also of the Ga; and the size of this depends upon such accidental limits as well as upon the character and dispositions of the several collective bodies which we have called Marks. The Ga is the second and final form of

unsevered possession; for every larger aggregate is but the result of a gradual reduction of such districts, under a higher political or administrative unity, different only in degree and not in kind from what prevailed individually in each. The kingdom is only a larger Ga than ordinary; indeed the Ga itself was the original kingdom. . . . Some of the modern shire-divisions of England in all probability have remained unchanged from the earliest times; so that here and there a now existent Shire may be identical in territory with an ancient Ga. But it may be doubted whether this observation can be very extensively applied."—J. M. Kemble, *The Saxons in England*, bk. 1, ch. 3.

GAUGAMELA, OR ARBELA, Battle of (B. C. 331). See MACEDONIA: B. C. 334-330.

GAUL: described by Cæsar.—"Gallia, in the widest sense of the term, is divided into three parts, one part occupied by the Belgæ, a second by the Aquitani, and a third by a people whom the Romans name Galli, but in their own tongue they are named Celtae. These three people differ in language and social institutions. The Garumna (Garonne) is the boundary between the Aquitani and the Celtae: the rivers Matrona (Marne, a branch of the Seine) and the Sequana (Seine) separate the Celtae from the Belgæ. . . . That part of Gallia which is occupied by the Celtae begins at the river Rhone: it is bounded by the Garonne, the Ocean and the territory of the Belgæ; on the side of the Sequani and the Helvetii it also extends to the Rhine. It looks to the north. The territory of the Belgæ begins where that of the Celtae ends: it extends to the lower part of the Rhine; it looks towards the north and the rising sun. Aquitania extends from the Garonne to the Pyrenean mountains and that part of the Ocean which borders on Spain. It looks in a direction between the setting sun and the north."—Julius Cæsar, *Gallie Wars*, bk. 1, ch. 1; trans. by G. Long (*Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 3, ch. 22).

B. C. 125-121.—First Roman conquests. See SALYES; ALLOBROGES; and ÆDUI.

B. C. 58-51.—Cæsar's conquest.—Cæsar was consul for the year 695 A. U. (B. C. 59). At the expiration of his consulship he secured, by vote of the people, the government of the two Gauls (see ROME: B. C. 63-58), not for one year, which was the customary term, but for five years—afterwards extended to ten. Cisalpine Gaul (northern Italy) had been fully subjugated and was tranquil; Transalpine Gaul (Gaul west and north of the Alps, or modern France, Switzerland and Belgium) was troubled and threatening. In Transalpine Gaul the Romans had made no conquests beyond the Rhone, as yet, except along the coast at the south. The country between the Alps and the Rhone, excepting certain territories of Massilia (Marseilles) which still continued to be a free city, in alliance with Rome, had been fully appropriated and organized as a province—the Provence of later times. The territory between the Rhone and the Cevennes mountains was less fully occupied and controlled. Cæsar's first proceeding as proconsul in Gaul was to arrest the migration of the Helvetii, who had determined to abandon their Swiss valleys and to seize some new territory in Gaul. He blocked their passage through Roman Gaul, then followed them in their movement eastward of the Rhone,

attacked and defeated them with great slaughter, and forced the small remnant to return to their deserted mountain homes. The same year (B. C. 58) he drove out of Gaul a formidable body of Suevic Germans who had crossed the Rhine some years before under their king, Ariovistus. They were almost annihilated. The next year (B. C. 57) he reduced to submission the powerful tribes of the Belgian region, who had provoked attack by leaguering themselves against the Roman intrusion in Gaul. The most obstinate of those tribes—the Nervii—were destroyed. In the following year (B. C. 56) Cæsar attacked and nearly exterminated the Veneti, a remarkable maritime people, who occupied part of Armorica (modern Brittany); he also reduced the coast tribes northwards to submission, while one of his lieutenants, Crassus, made a conquest of Aquitania. The conquest of Gaul was now apparently complete, and next year (B. C. 55), after routing and cutting to pieces another horde of Germanic invaders—the Usipetes and Tenctheri—who had ventured across the lower Rhine, Cæsar traversed the channel and invaded Britain. This first invasion, which had been little more than a reconnaissance, was repeated the year following (B. C. 54), with a larger force. It was an expedition having small results, and Cæsar returned from it in the early autumn to find his power in Gaul undermined everywhere by rebellious conspiracies. The first outbreak occurred among the Belgæ, and found its vigorous leader in a young chief of the Eburones, Ambiorix by name. Two legions, stationed in the midst of the Eburones, were cut to pieces while attempting to retreat. But the effect of this great disaster was broken by the bold energy of Cæsar, who led two legions, numbering barely 7,000 men, to the rescue of his lieutenant Cicero (brother of the orator) whose single legion, camped in the Nervian territory, was surrounded and besieged by 60,000 of the enemy. Cæsar and his 7,000 veterans sufficed to rout the 60,000 Belgians. Proceeding with similar vigor to further operations, and raising new legions to increase his force, the proconsul had stamped the rebellion out before the close of the year 53 B. C., and the Eburones, who led in it, had ceased to exist. But the next year (B. C. 52) brought upon him a still more serious rising, of the Gallic tribes in central Gaul, leagued with the Belgians. Its leader was Vercingetorix, a gallant and able young chief of the Arverni. It was begun by the Carnutes, who massacred the Roman settlers in their town of Genabum (probably modern Orleans, but some say Gien, farther up the Loire). Cæsar was on the Italian side of the Alps when the news reached him, and the Gauls expected to be able to prevent his joining the scattered Roman forces in their country. But his energy baffled them, as it had baffled them many times before. He was across the Alps, across the Rhone, over the Cevennes—through six feet of snow in the passes—and in their midst, with such troops as he could gather in the Province, before they dreamed of lying in wait for him. Then, leaving most of these forces with Decimus Brutus, in a strong position, he stole away secretly, recrossed the Cevennes, put himself at the head of a small body of cavalry at Vienne on the Rhone, and rode straight through the country of the insurgents to join his veteran legions, first at Langres and afterwards at Sens. In a few weeks he was at the head of a strong

army, had taken the guilty town of Genabum and had given it up to fire and the sword. A little later the capital of the Bituriges, Avaricum (modern Bourges), suffered the same fate. Next, attempting to reduce the Arvernian town of Gergovia, he met with a check and was placed in a serious strait. But with the able help of his lieutenant Labienus, who defeated a powerful combination of the Gauls near Lutetia (modern Paris), he broke the toils, reunited his army, which he had divided, routed Vercingetorix in a great battle fought in the valley of the Vingeanne, and shut him up, with 80,000 men, in the city of Alesia. The siege of Alesia (modern Alise-Sainte-Reine, west of Dijon) which followed, was the most extraordinary of Cæsar's military exploits in Gaul. Holding his circumvallation of the town, against 80,000 within its walls and thrice as many swarming outside of it, he scattered the latter and forced the surrender of the former. His triumph was his greatest shame. Like a very savage, he dragged the knightly Vercingetorix in his captive train, exhibited him at a subsequent "triumph" in Rome, and then sent him to be put to death in the ghastly Tullianum. The fall of Alesia practically ended the revolt; although even the next year found some fighting to be done, and one stronghold of the Cadurci, Uxellodunum (modern Puy-d'Issolu, near Vayrac), held out with great obstinacy. It was taken by tapping with a tunnel the spring which supplied the besieged with water, and Cæsar punished the obstinacy of the garrison by cutting off their hands. Gaul was then deemed to be conquered and pacified, and Cæsar was prepared for the final contest with his rivals and enemies at Rome.—Cæsar, *Gallie War*.

ALSO IN: G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 4.—Napoleon III., *History of Cæsar*.—T. A. Dodge, *Cæsar*, ch. 4-25.

2d-3d Century.—Introduction of Christianity. See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 100-312 (GAUL).
2d-7th Century.—Ancient Commerce. See TRADE.

A. D. 277.—The invaders driven back by Probus.—"The most important service which Probus [Roman Emperor, A. D. 276-282] rendered to the republic was the deliverance of Gaul, and the recovery of seventy flourishing cities oppressed by the barbarians of Germany, who, since the death of Aurelian, had ravaged that great province with impunity. Among the various multitude of those fierce invaders, we may distinguish, with some degree of clearness, three great armies, or rather nations, successively vanquished by the valour of Probus. He drove back the Franks into their morasses; a descriptive circumstance from whence we may infer that the confederacy known by the manly appellation of 'Free' already occupied the flat maritime country, intersected and almost overflowed by the stagnating waters of the Rhine, and that several tribes of the Frisians and Batavians had acceded to their alliance. He vanquished the Burgundians [and the Lygians]. . . . The deliverance of Gaul is reported to have cost the lives of 400,000 of the invaders—a work of labour to the Romans, and of expense to the emperor, who gave a piece of gold for the head of every barbarian."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 12.—See, also, LYGIANS.

A. D. 287.—Insurrection of the Bagauds. See BAGAUDS; also, DEDITITUS.

A. D. 355-361.—Julian's recovery of the province from the barbarians.—During the civil wars and religious quarrels which followed the death of Constantine the Great—more especially in the three years of the usurpation of Magnentius, in the west (A. D. 350-353), Gaul was not only abandoned, for the most part, to the barbarians of Germany, but Franks and Alemanni were invited by Constantius to enter it. "In a little while a large part of the north and east of Gaul were in their almost undisputed possession. The Alamans seized upon the countries which are now called Alsace and Lorraine; the Franks secured for themselves Batavia and Toxandria: forty-five flourishing cities, among them Cologne, Trèves, Spire, Worms, and Strasburg, were ravaged; and, in short, from the sources of the Rhine to its mouth, forty miles inland, there remained no safety for the population but in the strongly fortified towns." In this condition of the Gallic provinces, Julian, the young nephew of the emperor, was raised to the rank of Cæsar and sent thither with a trifling force of men to take the command. "During an administration of six years [A. D. 355-361] this latest Cæsar revived in Gaul the memory of the indefatigable exploits and the vigorous rule of the first Cæsar. Insufficient and ill-disciplined as his forces were, and baffled and betrayed as he was by those who should have been his aids, he drove the fierce and powerful tribes of the Alamans, who were now the hydra of the western provinces, beyond the Upper Rhine; the Chamaves, another warlike tribe, he pursued into the heart of their native forests; while the still fiercer and more warlike Franks were dislodged from their habitations on the Meuse, to accept of conditions from his hands. . . . A part of these, called the Salians, and destined to figure hereafter, were allowed to settle in permanence in Toxandria, between the Meuse and the Scheld, near the modern Tongres. . . . By three successful expeditions beyond the Rhine [he] restored to their friends a multitude of Roman captives, recovered the broken and down-trodden lines of the empire, humiliated many of the proud chiefs of the Germans, and impressed a salutary awe and respect upon their truculent followers. . . . He spent the intervals of peace which his valor procured in recuperating the wasted energies of the inhabitants. Their dilapidated cities were repaired, the excesses of taxation retrenched, the deficient harvests compensated by large importations of corn from Britain, and the resources of suspended industry stimulated into new action. Once more, says Libanius, the Gauls ascended from the tombs to marry, to travel, to enjoy the festivals, and to celebrate the public games."—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 2, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 19.

A. D. 365-367.—Expulsion of the Alemanni by Valentinian. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 365-367.

A. D. 378.—Invasion of the Alemanni.—Their destruction by Gratian. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 378.

A. D. 406-409.—The breaking of the Rhine barrier.—The same year (A. D. 406) in which Radagaisus, with his motley barbaric horde, invaded Italy and was destroyed by Stilicho, a more fatal assault was made upon Gaul. Two armies, in which were gathered up a vast multitude of Suevi, Vandals, Alans and Burgundians,

passed the Rhine. The Franks opposed them as faithful allies of the Roman power, and defeated a Vandal army in one great battle, where 20,000 of the invaders were slain; but the Alans came opportunely to the rescue of their friends and forced the Frank defenders of Gaul to give way. "The victorious confederates pursued their march, and on the last day of the year, in a season when the waters of the Rhine were most probably frozen, they entered without opposition the defenceless provinces of Gaul. This memorable passage of the Suevi, the Vandals, the Alani, and the Burgundians, who never afterwards retreated, may be considered as the fall of the Roman empire in the countries beyond the Alps; and the barriers which had so long separated the savage and the civilized nations of the earth were, from that fatal moment, levelled with the ground. . . . The flourishing city of Mentz was surprised and destroyed, and many thousand Christians were inhumanly massacred in the church. Worms perished after a long and obstinate siege; Strasburg, Spire, Rheims, Tournay, Arras, Amiens, experienced the cruel oppression of the German yoke; and the consuming flames of war spread from the banks of the Rhine over the greatest part of the seventeen provinces of Gaul. That rich and extensive country, as far as the ocean, the Alps, and the Pyrenees, was delivered to the barbarians, who drove before them in a promiscuous crowd the bishop, the senator, and the virgin, laden with the spoils of their houses and altars."—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 30.

A. D. 407-411.—Reign of the usurper Constantine. See BRITAIN: A. D. 407.

A. D. 410-419.—Establishment of the Visigoths in the kingdom of Toulouse. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 410-419.

A. D. 410-420.—The Franks join in the attack on Gaul.—See FRANKS: A. D. 410-420.

5th-8th Centuries.—Barbarities of the Frank conquest.—The conquests of the Franks in Gaul, under Clovis, began in 486 and ended with his death in 511 (see FRANKS: A. D. 481-511). "In the year 532, Theoderik, one of the sons and successors of Chlodowig, said to those Frankish warriors whom he commanded: 'Follow me as far as Auvergne, and I will make you enter a country where you will take as much gold and silver as you possibly can desire; where you can carry away in abundance flocks, slaves, and garments.' The Franks took up arms and once more crossing the Loire, they advanced on the territory of the Bituriges and Arvernes. These paid with interest for the resistance they had dared to the first invasion. Everything amongst them was devastated; the churches and monasteries were razed to their foundations. The young men and women were dragged, their hands bound, after the luggage to be sold as slaves. The inhabitants of this unfortunate country perished in large numbers or were ruined by the pillage. Nothing was left them of what they had possessed, says an ancient chronicle, except the land, which the barbarians could not carry away. Such were the neighbourly relations kept up by the Franks with the Gallic populations which had remained beyond their limits. Their conduct with respect to the natives of the northern provinces was hardly less hostile. When Hilperik, the son of Chlothar, wished, in the year 584, to send his daughter in marriage to

the king of the West Goths, or Visigoths, settled in Spain, he came to Paris and carried away from the houses belonging to the 'fisc' a great number of men and women, who were heaped up in chariots to accompany and serve the bride elect. Those who refused to depart, and wept, were put in prison: several strangled themselves in despair. Many people of the best families enlisted by force into this procession, made their will, and gave their property to the churches. 'The son,' says a contemporary, 'was separated from his father, the mother from her daughter; they departed sobbing, and pronouncing deep curses; so many persons in Paris were in tears that it might be compared to the desolation of Egypt.' In their domestic misfortunes the kings of the Franks sometimes felt remorse, and trembled at the evil they had done. . . . But this momentary repentance soon yielded to the love of riches, the most violent passion of the Franks. Their incursions into the south of Gaul recommenced as soon as that country, recovered from its terrors and defeats, no longer admitted their garrisons nor tax collectors. Karle, to whom the fear of his arms gave the surname of Marteau, made an inroad as far as Marseilles; he took possession of Lyons, Arles, and Vienne, and carried off an immense booty to the territory of the Franks. When this same Karle, to insure his frontiers, went to fight the Saracens in Aquitania, he put the whole country to fire and sword; he burnt Bérigiers, Agde, and Nîmes; the arenas of the latter city still bear traces of the fire. At death of Karle, his two sons, Karlemann and Peppin, continued the great enterprise of replacing the inhabitants of the south, to whom the name of Romans was still given, under the yoke of the Franks. . . . Southern Gaul was to the sons of the Franks what entire Gaul had been to their fathers; a country, the riches and climate of which attracted them incessantly, and saw them return as enemies, as soon as it did not purchase peace of them."—A. Thierry, *Narratives of the Merovingian Era*, *Historical Essays*, etc., essay 24.

5th-10th Centuries.—The conquerors and the conquered.—State of society under the barbarian rule.—The evolution of Feudalism.—"After the conclusion of the great struggles which took place in the fourth and fifth centuries, whether between the German conquerors and the last forces of the empire, or between the nations which had occupied different portions of Gaul, until the Franks remained sole masters of the country, two races, two populations, which had nothing in common but religion, appear forcibly brought together, and, as it were, face to face with each other, in one political community. The Gallo-Roman population presents under the same law very different and very unequal conditions; the barbarian population comprises, together with its own peculiar classifications of ranks and conditions, distinct laws and nationalities. In the first we find citizens absolutely free, coloni, or husbandmen belonging to the lands of a proprietor, and domestic slaves deprived of all civil rights; in the second, we see the Frankish race divided into two tribes, each having its own peculiar law [the law of the Salic Franks or Salic law, and the law of the Riparian Franks or Riparian law]; the Burgundians, the Goths, and the rest of the Teutonic races, who became subjected, either of their own accord or by force, to

the Frankish empire, governed by other and entirely different laws; but among them all, as well as among the Franks, we find at least three social conditions—two degrees of liberty, and slavery. Among these incongruous states of existence, the criminal law of the dominant race established, by means of the scale of damages for crime or personal injury, a kind of hierarchy—the starting-point of that movement towards an assimilation and gradual transformation, which, after the lapse of four centuries, from the fifth to the tenth, gave rise to the society of the feudal times. The first rank in the civil order belonged to the man of Frankish origin, and to the Barbarian who lived under the law of the Franks; in the second rank was placed the Barbarian, who lived under the law of his own country; next came the native freeman and proprietor, the Roman possessor, and, in the same degree, the *Lidus* or German *colonus*; after them, the Roman tributary—i. e., the native *colonus*; and, last of all, the slave, without distinction of origin. These various classes, separated on the one hand by distance of rank, on the other by difference of laws, manners, and language, were far from being equally distributed between the cities and the rural districts. All that was elevated in the Gallo-Roman population, of whatever character it might be, was found in the cities, where its noble, rich, and industrious families dwelt, surrounded by their domestic slaves; and, among the people of that race, the only constant residents in the country were the half-servile *coloni* and the agricultural slaves. On the contrary, the superior class of the German population established itself in the country, where each family, independent and proprietary, was maintained on its own domain by the labour of the *Lidi* whom it had brought thither, or of the old race of *coloni* who belonged to the soil. The only Germans who resided in the cities were a small number of officers in the service of the Crown, and of individuals without family and patrimony, who, in spite of their original habits, sought a livelihood by following some employment. The social superiority of the dominant race rooted itself firmly in the localities inhabited by them, and passed, as has been already remarked, from the cities to the rural districts. By degrees, also, it came to pass that the latter drew off from the former the upper portion of their population, who, in order to raise themselves still higher, and to mix with the conquerors, imitated, as far as they were able, their mode of life. . . . While Barbarism was thus occupying or usurping all the vantage points of the social state, and civil life in the intermediate classes was arrested in its progress, and sinking gradually to the lowest condition, even to that of personal servitude, an ameliorating movement already commenced before the fall of the empire, still continued, and declared itself more and more loudly. The dogma of a common brotherhood in the eyes of God, and of one sole redemption for all mankind, preached by the Church to the faithful of every race, touched the heart and awakened the mind in favour of the slave, and, in consequence, enfranchisements became more frequent, or a treatment more humane was adopted on the part of the masters, whether Gauls or Germans by origin. The latter, moreover, had imported from their country, where the mode of life was simple and without luxury, usages favourable to a modified

slavery. The rich barbarian was waited upon by free persons—by the children of his relatives, his clients and his friends; the tendency of his national manners, different from that of the Roman, induced him to send the slave out of his house, and to establish him as a labourer or artisan on some portion of land to which he then became permanently attached, and the destination of which he followed, whether it were inherited or sold. . . . Domestic slavery made the man a chattel, a mere piece of moveable property. The slave, settled on a spot of land, from that time entered into the category of real property. At the same time that this last class, which properly bore the name of serfs, was increased at the expense of the first, the classes of the *coloni* and *Lidi* would naturally multiply simultaneously, by the very casualties of ruin and adverse circumstances which, at a period of incessant commotions, injured the condition of the freemen. . . . In the very heart of the Barbarian society, the class of small proprietors, which had originally formed its strength and glory, decreased, and finally became extinct by sinking into vassalage, or a state of still more ignoble dependence, which partook more or less of the character of actual servitude. . . . The freemen depressed towards servitude met the slave who had reached a sort of half liberty. Thus, through the whole extent of Gaul, was formed a vast body of agricultural labourers and rural artisans, whose lot, though never uniform, was brought more and more to a level of equality; and the creative wants of society produced a new sphere of industry in the country, while the cities remained stationary, or sank more and more into decay. . . . On every large estate where improvement flourished, the cabins of those employed, *Lidi*, *coloni* or slaves, grouped as necessity or convenience suggested, were multiplied and peopled more numerous, till they assumed the form of a hamlet. When these hamlets were situated in a favourable position . . . they continued to increase till they became villages. . . . The building of a church soon raised the village to the rank of a parish; and, as a consequence, the new parish took its place among the rural circumscriptions. . . . Thence sprung, altogether spontaneously, under the sanction of the intendant, joined to that of the priest, rude outlines of a municipal organization, in which the church became the depository of the acts which, in accordance with the Roman law, were inscribed on the registers of the city. It is in this way that beyond the towns, the cities, and the boroughs, where the remains of the old social condition lingered in an increasing state of degradation, elements of future improvement were formed. . . . This modification, already considerably advanced in the ninth century, was completed in the course of the tenth. At that period, the last class of the Gallo-Frankish society disappeared—viz., that of persons held as chattels, bought, exchanged, transferred from one place to another, like any other kind of moveable goods. The slave now belonged to the soil rather than to the person; his service, hitherto arbitrary, was changed into customary dues and regulated employment; he had a settled abode, and, in consequence, a right of possession in the soil on which he was dependent. This is the earliest form in which we distinctly trace the first impress of the modern world upon the civil state. The word

serf henceforward took its definite meaning; it became the generic name of a mixed condition of servitude and freedom, in which we find blended together the states of the colonus and *Lidus*—two names which occur less and less frequently in the tenth century, till they entirely disappear. This century, the point to which all the social efforts of the four preceding ones which had elapsed since the Frankish conquest had been tending, saw the intestine struggle between the Roman and German manners brought to a conclusion by an important revolution. The latter definitively prevailed, and from their triumph arose the feudal system; that is to say, a new form of the state, a new constitution of property and domestic life, a parcelling out of the sovereignty and jurisdiction, all the public powers transformed into demesne privileges, the idea of nobility devoted to the profession of arms, and that of ignobility to industry and labour. By a remarkable coincidence, the complete establishment of this system is the epoch when the distinction of races terminates in Frankish Gaul—when all the legal consequences of diversity of origin between Barbarians and Romans, conquerors and subjects, disappear. The law ceases to be personal, and becomes local; the German codes and the Roman code itself are replaced by custom; it is the territory and not the descent which distinguishes the inhabitant of the Gallic soil; finally, instead of national distinctions, one mixed population appears, to which the historian is able henceforward to give the name of French.”

—A. Thierry, *Formation and Progress of the Tiers État in France*, v. 1, ch. 1.

A. D. 412-453.—The mixed administration, Roman and barbarian.—“A prætorian prefect still resided at Trèves; a vicar of the seventeen Gallic provinces at Arles; each of these provinces had its Roman duke; each of the hundred and fifteen cities of Gaul had its count; each city its curia, or municipality. But, collaterally with this Roman organisation, the barbarians, assembled in their ‘*mallum*,’ of which their kings were presidents, decided on peace and war, made laws, or administered justice. Each division of the army had its Graf Jarl, or Count; each subdivision its centenary, or hundred-man; and all these fractions of the free population had the same right of deciding by suffrage in their own *mallums*, or peculiar courts, all their common affairs. In cases of opposition between the barbarian and the Roman jurisdiction, the overbearing arrogance of the one, and the abject baseness of the other, soon decided the question of supremacy. In some provinces the two powers were not concurrent: there were no barbarians between the Loire and the Meuse, nor between the Alps and the Rhone; but the feebleness of the Roman government was only the more conspicuous. A few great proprietors cultivated a part of the province with the aid of slaves; the rest was desert, or only inhabited by *Bagaudæ*, runaway slaves, who lived by robbery. Some towns still maintained a show of opulence, but not one gave the slightest sign of strength; not one enrolled its militia, nor repaired its fortifications. . . . Honorius wished to confer on the cities of southern Gaul a diet, at which they might have deliberated on public affairs: he did not even find public spirit enough to accept the offered privilege.”—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 7 (v. 1).

A. D. 451.—Attila’s invasion. See HUNS: A. D. 451.

A. D. 453-484.—Extension of the Visigothic kingdom. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 453-484.

A. D. 457-486.—The last Roman sovereignty.—The last definite survival of Roman sovereignty in Gaul lingered until 486 in a district north of the Seine, between the Marne and the Oise, which had Soissons for its capital. It was maintained there, in the first instance, by Ægidius, a Gallic noble whom Marjorian, one of the last of the emperors at Rome, made Master-General of Gaul. The respect commanded by Ægidius among the surrounding barbarians was so great that the Salian Franks invited him to rule over them, in place of a licentious young king, Childeric, whom they had driven into exile. He was king of these Franks, according to Gregory of Tours, for eight years (457-464), until he died. Childeric then returned, was reinstated in his kingdom and became the father of Clovis (or Chlodwig), the founder of the great Frank monarchy. But a son of Ægidius, named Syagrius, was still the inheritor of a kingdom, known as the “Kingdom of Syagrius,” embracing, as has been said, the country around Soissons, between the Seine, the Marne and the Oise, and also including, in the opinion of some writers, Troyes and Auxerre. The first exploit of Clovis—the beginning of his career of conquest—was the overthrow of this “king of the Romans,” as Syagrius was called, in a decisive battle fought at Soissons, A. D. 486, and the incorporation of his kingdom into the Frank dominions. Syagrius escaped to Toulouse, but was surrendered to Clovis and put to death.—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, bk. 3, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 2.

A. D. 474.—Invasion of Ostrogoths. See GOTHS (OSTROGOTHS): A. D. 473-474.

A. D. 507-509.—Expulsion of the Visigoths. See GOTHS (VISIGOTHS): A. D. 507-509.

A. D. 540.—Formal relinquishment of the country to the Franks by Justinian. See FRANKS: A. D. 539-553.

GAULS.—“The Gauls, properly so called, the *Galatæ* of the Greeks, the *Galli* of the Romans, and the Gael of modern history, formed the van of the great Celtic migration which had poured westward at various intervals during many hundred years. . . . Having overrun the south of Gaul and penetrated into Spain, they lost a part of the territory thus acquired, and the restoration of the Iberian fugitives to Aquitania placed a barrier between the Celts in Spain and their brethren whom they had left behind them in the north. In the time of the Romans the *Galli* were found established in the centre and east of the country denominated Gaul, forming for the most part a great confederation, at the head of which stood the *Arverni*. It was the policy of the Romans to raise the *Ædui* into competition with this dominant tribe. . . . The *Arverni*, whose name is retained in the modern appellation of Auvergne, occupied a large district in the middle and south of Gaul, and were surrounded by tributary or dependent clans. The *Ædui* lay more to the north and east, and the centre of their possessions is marked by the position of their capital *Bibracte*, the modern Autun, situated in the highlands which separate the waters of the Loire, the Seine

and the Saone. . . . Other Gallic tribes stretched beyond the Saone: the Sequani, who afterwards made an attempt to usurp this coveted preëminence (the valley of the Doubs formed the centre of the Sequanese territory, which reached to the Jura and the Rhine); the Helvetii and other mountain races, whose scanty pastures extended to the sources of the Rhine; the Allobroges, who dwelt upon the Isère and Rhone, and who were the first of their race to meet and the first to succumb before the prowess of the Roman legions. According to the classification both of Cæsar and Strabo, the Turones, Pictones and Santones must be comprised under the same general denomination."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 5 (v. 1).—See, also, CELTS.

B. C. 390-347.—Invasions of Italy.—Destruction of Rome. See **ROME**: B. C. 390-347.

B. C. 295-191.—Roman conquest of the Cisalpine tribes. See **ROME**: B. C. 295-191.

B. C. 280-279.—Invasion of Greece.—In the year 280 B. C. the Gauls, who had long before passed from northern Italy around the Adriatic to its eastern coast, made their first appearance in Macedonia and northern Greece. The Macedonian throne was occupied at the time by the infamous usurper, Ptolemy Ceraunus (see **MACEDONIA**: B. C. 297-280), and the Celtic savages did one good service to Greece by slaying him, in the single battle that was fought. The whole open country was abandoned to them, for a time, and they swept it, as far southward as the valley of the Peneus, in Thessaly; but the walled cities were safe. After ravaging the country for some months the Gauls appear to have retired; but it was only to return again the next year in more formidable numbers and under a chief, Brennus, of more vigor and capability. On this occasion the country suffered fearfully from the barbaric swarm, but defended itself with something like the spirit of the Greece of two centuries before. The Ætolians were conspicuous in the struggle; the Peloponnesian states gave little assistance. The policy of defense was much the same as at the time of the Persian invasion, and the enemy was confronted in force at the pass of Thermopylæ. Brennus made a more desperate attempt to force the pass than Xerxes had done and was beaten back with a tremendous slaughter of his Gauls. But he found traitors, as Xerxes had done, to guide him over the mountains, and the Greeks at Thermopylæ, surrounded by the enemy, could only escape by sea. The Gauls marched on Delphi, eager for the plunder of the great temple, and there they met with some fatal disaster. Precisely what occurred is not known. According to the Greeks, the god protected his sanctuary, and the accounts they have left are full of miracles and prodigies—of earthquakes, lightnings, tempests, and disease. The only clear facts seem to be that Delphi was successfully defended; that the Gauls retreated in disorder and were destroyed in vast numbers before the remnant of them got away from the country. Brennus is said to have killed himself to escape the wrath of his people for the failure of the expedition. One large body of the great army had separated from the rest and gone eastward into Thrace, before the catastrophe occurred. These subsequently passed over to Asia and pursued there an adventurous career, leaving a historic name in the country—see **GALATIA**.—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 60.

GAULS, Præfect of the. See **PRÆTORIAN PRÆFECTS**.

GAUSARAPOS, OR GUUCHIES, The. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES: PAMPAS TRIBES**.

GAVELKIND, Irish.—"The Irish law of succession in landed property, known as that of Irish gavelkind, was a logical consequence of the theory of tribal ownership. If a member of the tribe died, his piece of land did not descend by right to his eldest son, or even to all his children equally. Originally, it reverted to its sole absolute owner, the tribe, every member of which had a right to use proportionate to his tribal status. This was undoubtedly the essential principle of inheritance by gavelkind."—S. Bryant, *Celtic Ireland*, ch. 6.

ALSO IN: Sir H. Maine, *Early Hist. of Institutions*, lect. 7.

GAVELKIND, Kentish. See **FEUDAL TENURES**.

GAVEREN, Battle of (1453). See **GHEENT**: A. D. 1451-1453.

GAZA: Early history. See **PHILISTINES**.

B. C. 332.—Siege by Alexander.—In his march from Phenicia to Egypt (see **MACEDONIA**, &c.: B. C. 334-330), Alexander the Great was compelled to pause for several months and lay siege to the ancient Philistine city of Gaza. It was defended for the Persian king by a brave eunuch named Batis. In the course of the siege, Alexander received a severe wound in the shoulder, which irritated his savage temper. When the town was at length taken by storm, he gave no quarter. Its male inhabitants were put to the sword and the women and children sold to slavery. The eunuch Batis, being captured alive, but wounded, was dragged by the feet at the tail of a chariot, driven at full speed by Alexander himself. The "greatest of conquerors" proved himself often enough, in this way, to be the greatest of barbarians—in his age.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 93.

B. C. 312.—Battle between Ptolemy and Demetrius. See **MACEDONIA**: B. C. 315-310.

B. C. 100.—Destruction by Alexander Jannæus.—Gaza having sided with the Egyptian king, in a war between Alexander Jannæus, one of the Asmonean kings of the Jews, and Ptolemy Lathyrus of Egypt and Cyprus, the former laid siege to the city, about 100 B. C., and acquired possession of it after several months, through treachery. He took his revenge by massacring the inhabitants and reducing the city to ruins. It was rebuilt not long afterwards by the Romans.—G. Long, *Decline of the Roman Republic*, v. 3, ch. 9.

A. D. 1516.—Defeat of the Mamelukes by the Turks. See **TURKS**: A. D. 1481-1520.

GAZACA. See **ECBATANA**.

GAZARI, The. See **CATHARISTS**.

GAZNEVIDES, OR GHAZNEVIDES. See **TURKS**: A. D. 999-1183.

GEARY ACT, The. See **UNITED STATES OF AM.**: A. D. 1892.

GEDDES, Jenny, and her stool. See **SCOTLAND**: A. D. 1637.

GEDROSAINS, The.—"Close to the Indus, and beyond the bare, hot, treeless shores of the ocean, the southern part of the plain [of eastern Iran] consists of sandy flats, in which nothing grows but prickly herbs and a few palms. The

springs are a day's journey from each other, and often more. This region was possessed by a people whom Herodotus calls Sattagyda and the companions of Alexander of Macedonia, Gedrosians. . . . Neighbours of the Gandarians, who, as we know, dwelt on the right bank of the Indus down to the Cabul, the Gedrosians led a wandering, predatory life; under the Persian kings they were united into one satrapy with the Gandarians."—M. Duncker, *Hist. of Antiquity*, bk. 7, ch. 1 (v. 5).

GEIZA II., King of Hungary, A. D. 1141–1160.

GELA, Founding of. See SYRACUSE, FOUNDING OF.

GELASIUS II., Pope, A. D. 1118–1119.

GELEONTES. See PHYLÆ.

GELHEIM, Battle of (1298). See GERMANY: A. D. 1273–1308.

GELONI, The.—An ancient colony of Greeks intermixed with natives which shared the country of the Budini, on the steppes between the Ural Mountains and the Caspian Sea.—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, v. 3, ch. 17.

GELVES, Battle of (1510). See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1505–1510.

GEMARA, The. See TALMUD.

GEMBLOURS, Battle of (1578). See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1577–1581.

GEMEINDE.—**GEMEINDERATH**. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1848–1890.

GEMOT.—A meeting, assembly, council, moot. See WITENAGEMOT.

GENABUM, OR **CENABUM**.—The principal town of the Gallic tribe called the Carnutes; identified by most archaeologists with the modern city of Orleans, France, though some think its site was at Gien. See GAUL, CÆSAR'S CONQUEST OF.

GENAUNI, The. See RÆTIANS.

GENERAL PRIVILEGE OF ARAGON.

See CORTES, THE EARLY SPANISH.

GENERALS, Execution of the Athenian. See GREECE: B. C. 406.

GENET, "Citizen," the mission of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1793.

GENEVA: Beginnings of the city. See HELVETII, THE ARRESTED MIGRATION OF THE.

A. D. 500.—Under the Burgundians. See BURGUNDIANS: A. D. 500.

10th Century.—In the kingdom of Arles. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 843–933.

A. D. 1401.—Acquisition of the Genevois, or County, by the House of Savoy.—The city surrounded. See SAVOY: 11TH–15TH CENTURIES.

A. D. 1504–1535.—The emancipation of the city from the Vidomme and the Prince-Bishop.—Triumph of the Reformation.—"Geneva was nominally a free city of the Empire, but had in reality been governed for some centuries by its own bishop, associated with a committee of lay-assessors, and controlled by the general body of the citizens, in whose hands the ultimate power of taxation, and of election of the magistrates and regulation of the police, rested. The prince-bishop did not exercise his temporal jurisdiction directly, but through an officer called the Vidomme (vice-dominus), whose rights had in the 15th century become hereditary in the dukes of Savoy. These rights appear to have been exercised without any considerable attempt at encroachment till the beginning of the following

century, when Charles III. succeeded to the ducal crown (1504). To his ambition the bishop, John, a weak and willing tool of the Savoy family, to which he was nearly allied, ceded everything; and the result was a tyrannical attempt to destroy the liberties of the Genevese. The Assembly of the citizens rose in arms; a bitter and sanguinary contest ensued between the Eidgenossen [Confederates] or Patriot party on the one side, and the Mamelukes or monarchical party on the other side. By the help of the free Helvetic states, particularly Berne and Friburg, the Patriots triumphed, the friends of Savoy were banished, the Vidomme abolished, and its powers transferred to a board of magistrates. The conduct of the bishops in this conflict . . . helped greatly, as may be imagined, to shake the old hierarchical authority in Geneva; and when, in 1532, Farel first made his appearance in the city, he found a party not indisposed to join him in his eager and zealous projects of reform. He had a hard fight for it, however, and was at first obliged to yield, and leave the city for a time; and it was not till August 1535 that he and Viret and Froment succeeded in abolishing the mass, and establishing the Protestant faith."—J. Tulloch, *Leaders of the Reformation*, pp. 161–162.

ALSO IN: J. Planta, *Hist. of the Helvetic Confederacy*, bk. 2, ch. 6 (v. 2).—I. Spon, *Hist. of the City and State of Geneva*, bk. 2.—See, also, SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1531–1648.

A. D. 1536.—The coming of Calvin. See PAPACY: A. D. 1521–1535.

A. D. 1536–1564.—**Calvin's Ecclesiastical State**.—"Humanly speaking, it was a mere accident which caused Calvin to yield to the entreaties of his friends to remain in the city where he was to begin his renowned efforts in the cause of reform. Geneva had been from ancient times one of the most flourishing imperial cities of the Burgundian territory; it was situated on the frontiers of several countries where the cross roads of various nationalities met. The city, which in itself was remarkable, belonged originally to the German empire; the language of its inhabitants was Romanic; it was bounded on one side by Burgundy, on the other by German Switzerland. . . . Geneva was apparently in a state of political, ecclesiastical, and moral decay. With the puritanical strictness of Geneva, as it afterwards became, before the mind's eye, it is difficult to picture the Geneva of that day. An unbridled love of pleasure, a reckless wantonness, a licentious frivolity had taken possession of Genevan life, while the State was the plaything of intestine and foreign feuds. . . . Reformers had already appeared in the city: Vinet, Farel, Theodore Beza; they were Frenchmen, Farel a near neighbour of Geneva. These French Reformers are of quite a different stamp from our Germans, who, according as Luther or Melancthon is taken as their type, have either a plebeian popular, or learned theological character. They are either popular orators of great power and little polish, or they belong to the learned circles, and keep strictly to this character. In France they were mostly men belonging not to the lower, but to the middle and higher ranks of society, refined and cultivated; and in this fact lay the weakness of Calvinism, which knew well how to rule the masses, but never to gain their affection. . . . His [Calvin's] great-

ness . . . was shown in the fanatical zeal with which he entered the city, ready to stake his life for his cause. He began to teach, to found a school, to labour on the structure which was the idea of his life, to introduce reforms in doctrine, worship, the constitution and discipline of the Church, and he preached with that powerful eloquence only possessed by those in whom character and teaching are in unison. The purified worship was to take place within bare, unadorned walls; no picture of Christ, nor pomp of any kind, was to disturb the aspirations of the soul. Life outside the temple was also to be a service of God; games, swearing, dancing, singing, worldly amusements, and pleasure were regarded by him as sins, as much as real vice and crime. He began to form little congregations, like those in the early ages of the Church, and it need scarcely be said that even in this worldly and pleasure-loving city the apparition of this man, in the full vigour of life, all conviction and determination, half prophet and half tribune, produced a powerful impression. The number of his outward followers increased, but they were outward followers only. Most of them thought it would be well to make use of the bold Reformer to oppose the bishop, and that he would find means of establishing a new and independent Church, but they seemed to regard freedom as libertinism. Calvin therefore regarded the course things were taking with profound dissatisfaction. . . . So he delivered some extremely severe sermons, which half frightened and half estranged his hearers; and at Easter, 1538, when the congregation came to partake of the Lord's Supper, he took the unheard-of step of sending them all back from the altar, saying, 'You are not worthy to partake of the Lord's body; you are just what you were before; your sentiments, your morals, and your conduct are unchanged.' This was more than could be hazarded without peril to his life. The effect was indescribable; his own friends disapproved of the step. But that did not dismay him. He had barely time to flee for his life, and he had to leave Geneva in a state of transition—a chaos which justified a saying of his own, that defection from one Church is not renovation by another. He was now once more an exile. He wandered about on the frontiers of his country, in the German cities of Strasburg, Basle, &c., and we several times meet with him in the religious discussions between 1540 and 1550. . . . But a time came when they wished him back at Geneva. . . . In September, 1541, he returned and began his celebrated labours. Endowed with supreme power, like Lysurgus at Sparta, he set to work to make Geneva a city of the Lord—to found an ecclesiastical state in which religion, public life, government, and the worship of God were to be all of a piece, and an extraordinary task it was. Calvinistic Geneva became the school of reform for western Europe, and scattered far and wide the germs of similar institutions. In times when Protestantism elsewhere had become cool, this school carried on the conflict with the mediæval Church. Calvin was implacable in his determination to purify the worship of God of all needless adjuncts. All that was calculated to charm and affect the senses was abolished; spiritual worship should be independent of all earthly things, and should consist of edification by the word, and simple spiritual songs. All the traditional externals that Luther

had retained—altars, pictures, ceremonials, and decorations of every kind—were dispensed with. . . . Calvin next established a system of Church discipline which controlled the individual in every relation of life, and ruled him from the cradle to the grave. He retained all the means by which ecclesiastical authority enforced obedience on the faithful in the Middle Ages—baptism, education up to confirmation, penance, penal discipline, and excommunication. . . . Calvin began his labours late in the autumn of 1541, and he acquired and maintained more power than was ever exercised by the most powerful popes. He was indeed only the 'preacher of the word,' but through his great influence he was the lawgiver, the administrator, the dictator of the State of Geneva. There was nothing in the commonwealth that had not been ordained by him, and this indicates a remarkable aspect of his character. The organization of the State of Geneva began with the ordinances of the 2nd of January, 1542. There were four orders of officials—pastors, teachers, elders, and deacons. The Consistory was formed of the pastors and elders. . . . It was the special duty of the Consistory, which was composed of the clergy and twelve laymen, to see that the ordinances were duly observed, and it was the supreme tribunal of morals. The twelve laymen were elected for a year, by the council of two hundred, on the nomination by the clergy. The Consistory met every Thursday to see that everything in the church was in order. They had the power of excommunication, but this only consisted in exclusion from the community of the faithful, and the loss of the privilege of partaking of the Lord's Supper. It also decided questions relating to marriage. The deacons had the care of the poor and of almsgiving. Calvin himself was the soul of the whole organization. But he was a cold, stiff, almost gloomy being, and his character produces a very different impression from the genial warmth of Luther, who could be cheerful and merry with his family. Half Old Testament prophet, half Republican demagogue, Calvin could do anything in his State, but it was by means of his personal influence, the authority of his words, 'the majesty of his character,' as was said by a magistrate of Geneva after his death. He was to the last the simple minister, whose frugal mode of life appeared to his enemies like niggardliness. After a reign of twenty-three years, he left behind him the possessions of a mendicant monk. . . . No other reformer established so rigid a church discipline. . . . All noisy games, games of chance, dancing, singing of profane songs, cursing and swearing, were forbidden, and . . . church-going and Sabbath-keeping were strictly enjoined. The moral police took account of everything. Every citizen had to be at home by nine o'clock, under heavy penalties. Adultery, which had previously been punished by a few days' imprisonment and a small fine, was now punished by death. . . . At a time when Europe had no solid results of reform to show, this little State of Geneva stood up as a great power; year by year it sent forth apostles into the world, who preached its doctrines everywhere, and it became the most dreaded counterpoise to Rome, when Rome no longer had any bulwark to defend her. . . . It formed a weighty counterpoise to the desperate efforts which the ancient Church and monarchical power

were making to crush the spirit of the Reformation. It was impossible to oppose Caraffa, Philip II., and the Stuarts, with Luther's passive resistance; men were wanted who were ready to wage war to the knife, and such was the Calvinistic school. It everywhere accepted the challenge; throughout all the conflicts for political and religious liberty, up to the time of the first emigration to America, in France, the Netherlands, England, and Scotland, we recognise the Genevan school. A little bit of the world's history was enacted in Geneva, which forms the proudest portion of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."—L. Häusser, *The Period of the Reformation*, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: P. Henry, *Life and Times of Calvin*, pt. 2-3.—J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, *Hist. of the Reformation in the time of Calvin*, bk. 9 and 11.—F. P. Guizot, *Calvin*, ch. 12-22.—L. von Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France, 16th-17th Centuries*, ch. 8.

A. D. 1570.—Treaty with the Duke of Savoy.—Agreement of non-molestation. See SAVOY: A. D. 1559-1580.

A. D. 1602-1603.—The escalade of the Savoyards and its repulse.—Treaty of St. Julien.—Finding a pretext in some hostile manifestations which had appeared among the Genevese during a conflict between the French king and himself, Charles Emanuel I., duke of Savoy, chose to consider himself at war with Geneva, and "determined to fight out his quarrel without further notice. The night of the 11th to the 12th of December, 1602, is forever memorable in the annals of Geneva. 4,000 Savoyards, aided by darkness, attempted the escalade of its walls; an unforeseen accident disconcerted them; the citizens exhibited the most heroic presence of mind; the ladders by which the aggressors ascended were shot down by a random cannon-ball; the troops outside fell into confusion; those who had already entered the town were either mowed down in fight or hung on the scaffold on the morrow; thus the whole enterprise miscarried. It was in vain that the Duke came forward with his whole host, and tried to prevail by open force where stratagem had failed. He was thwarted by the intervention of the French and Swiss, and compelled by their threats to sign the Treaty of St. Julien (July 21st, 1603), which secured the independence of the Genevese. Charles nevertheless did not, to his last day, give up his designs upon that city."—A. Gallenga, *Hist. of Piedmont*, v. 3, ch. 2.

A. D. 1798.—Forcibly united to the French Republic. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1792-1798.

A. D. 1814.—United with the Swiss Confederation. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1803-1848.

A. D. 1815.—United as a canton to the Swiss Confederation, by the Congress of Vienna. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

GENEVA CONVENTION, The. See RED CROSS.

GENEVA TRIBUNAL OF ARBITRATION. See ALABAMA CLAIMS: A. D. 1871, and 1871-1872.

GENEVOIS, The. See SAVOY AND PIEDMONT: 11TH-15TH CENTURIES.

GENGHIS KHAN, The conquests of. See MONGOLS: A. D. 1153-1227.

GENOA: Origin and rise of the city.—"Genoa, anciently Genua, was the chief maritime city of Liguria, and afterwards a Roman municipium. Under the Lombards the constant invasions of the Saracens united the professions of trade and war, and its greatest merchants became also its greatest generals, while its naval captains were also merchants. The Crusades were of great advantage to Genoa [see CRUSADES: A. D. 1104-1111] in enabling it to establish trading settlements as far as the Black Sea; but the power of Pisa in the East, as well as its possession of Corsica and Sardinia, led to wars between it and Genoa, in which the Genoese took Corsica [see CORSICA: EARLY HISTORY] and drove the Pisans out of Sardinia. By land the Genoese territory was extended to Nice on one side and to Spezia on the other."—A. J. C. Hare, *Cities of Northern and Central Italy*, v. 1, p. 30.

A. D. 1256-1257.—Battles with the Venetians at Acre. See VENICE: A. D. 1256-1258.

A. D. 1261-1299.—The supplanting of Venice at Constantinople and in the Black Sea trade.—Colonies in the Crimea.—Wars with Venice.—Victory at Curzola and favorable treaty of peace.—"During the Latin dynasty in Constantinople the Genoese never gained the first place in the commerce of the Black Sea. . . . It was Venice who held the key of all this commerce, at Constantinople; when, after diverting the whole course of the fourth Crusade, she induced Christendom to waste its energies on subduing the Greek empire for her benefit [see BYZANTINE EMPIRE: A. D. 1203-1204]. With the exiled Greek dynasty, however, the Genoese were always on the best of terms, at Trebizond, Nicca, and in Roumania; and recognizing that as long as the Latins were all-powerful in Constantinople she would have to relinquish the cream of the Black Sea commerce to the Queen of the Adriatic, she at length determined to strike a bold stroke and replace a Greek again on the throne." This was accomplished in 1261, when Baldwin II. fled from the Byzantine capital and Michael Paleologus took possession of his throne and crown (see GREEK EMPIRE OF NICÆA: A. D. 1204-1261). For the assistance given in that revolution, the Genoese obtained the treaty of Ninfœo, "which firmly established their influence in the Black Sea. . . . Thus did the brave mariner-town of Genoa turn the scale of the vast, but rotten, Eastern Empire; and her reward was manifold. The grateful emperor gave her streets and quays in Constantinople, immunity from tribute, and a free passage for her commerce. . . . In addition to these excellent terms in the treaty of Ninfœo, the emperor conceded to various Genoese private families numerous islands in the Archipelago. . . . But the great nucleus of this power was the streets, churches, and quays in Constantinople which were allotted to the Genoese, and formed a vast emporium of strength and commerce, which must have eventually led to entire possession of Constantinople, had not the 'podestà,' or ruler of the Genoese colony there, thought fit, from personal motives, or from large offers made him by the Venetians, to attempt a restoration of the Latin line. . . . His conspiracy was discovered, and the Genoese were sent away in a body to Eraclea. However, on representation from home that it was none of their doing, and that Guercio had been acting entirely on his own account, the emperor yielded in perpetuity to the

Genoese the town of Pera, on the sole condition that the governors should do him homage [see, also, CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 1261-1453]. . . . Thus were the Genoese established in this commanding position; here they had a separate government of their own, from here they ruled the road of commerce from China to Europe; and, taking advantage of the weakness of the emperors, they were able to do much as they wished about building fortresses and palaces, with gardens to the water's edge; and thus from Pera, with its citadel of Galata behind it, they were enabled to dictate what terms they pleased to ships passing to and from the Bosphorus." In the Black Sea, "from time immemorial, the small tongue of land now known as the Crimea, then as the Tauric Chersonese, was the mart towards which all the caravan trade of Asia was directed by this northern road, and upon this tongue of land sprang up a group of noble cities which, until finally seized by the Turks, were without exception Genoese property. Of these, Caffa was the chief. When this city was built on the ruins of Theodosia, and by whom, is somewhat shrouded in mystery. Certain it is that Genoa had a colony here soon after the first Crusade. . . . Second only to Caffa in importance, and better known to us by name, was the town of Crim, which gave its name eventually to the whole peninsula, which originally it had got from the Crim Tatars. . . . Prior to its cession to the Genoese, it had been the residence of a Tatar emperor. . . . Here, then, in this narrow tongue of land, which we now call the Crimea, was the kernel of Genoese prosperity. As long as she flourished here she flourished at home. And when at length the Turkish scourge swept over this peninsula and swallowed up her colonies, the Ligurian Republic, by a process of slow decay, withered like a sapless tree." The supplanting of the Venetians at Constantinople by the Genoese, and the great advantages gained by the latter in the commerce of the Black Sea, led necessarily to war between the rival republics. "To maintain her newly acquired influence in the East, Genoa sent forth a fleet under the joint command of Pierino Grimaldi, a noble, and Perchelto Mallone, the people's representative. They encountered the Venetian squadron at Malvasia [1263] which was greatly inferior to their own. But as the combatants were just warming to their work, Mallone, actuated by party spirit, withdrew his ships and sailed away. The Venetians could scarcely believe what they saw; they anticipated some deep laid stratagem, and withdrew for a while from the contest. When however they beheld Mallone's galleys fairly under sail, they wonderingly attacked Grimaldi and his 13 ships and obtained an easy victory. Grimaldi fell at his post. . . . This fatal day of Malvasia [sometimes called the battle of Sette Pozzi] might easily have secured Venice her lost place in the Black Sea had she been able to follow up her victory, but with inexplicable want of vigour she remained inactive." Genoa, meantime, recovered from the disaster and sent out another fleet which captured a rich squadron of Venetian merchant ships in the Adriatic, taking large booty. "It surprises us immensely to find how for the next thirty years Genoa was able to keep up a desultory warfare with Venice, when she was at the height of her struggle with Pisa; and it surprises us still more that Venice raised not a

hand to assist Pisa, though she was on most friendly terms with her, and when by so doing she could have ruined Genoa. . . . After the fall of Pisa at Meloria, in 1296 [1284], Genoa could transfer her attention with all the greater vigour to her contest against Venice. Four years after this victory men's minds were again bent on war. Venice cared not to pay a tax to her rival on all ships which went to Caffa, Genoa resented the treatment she had received in Cyprus, and thus the rivals prepared for another and more determined contest for supremacy." The Venetians sent a fleet to operate in the Black Sea. "Fire was set to the houses of Galata, irreparable damage was done to Caffa, and in the Archipelago everything Genoese was burnt, and then off they sailed for Cyprus, whilst the Genoese were squabbling amongst themselves. With much trouble the many rulers of Genoa succeeded at length in adjusting their difference, and a goodly array of 76 galleys was entrusted to the care of Lamba D'Oria to punish the Venetians for their depredations. . . . Much larger was the force Venice produced for the contest, and when the combatants met off Curzola, amongst the Dalmatian islands, the Genoese were anxious to come to terms, and sought them, but the Venetians haughtily refused. . . . This battle of Curzola [September 8, 1298] was a sharp and vehement struggle, and resulted in terrible loss to the Venetians, four of whose galleys alone escaped to tell the tale. . . . Had Lamba D'Oria but driven the contest home, Venice was ill-prepared to meet him; as it was, he determined to sail off to Genoa, taking with him the Venetian admiral . . . Dandolo. Chained to the mast of his own vessel, and unable to sustain the effects of his humiliation, there, as he stood, Dandolo dashed his head against the mast and died. . . . The natural result of such a victory was a most favourable peace for Genoa, signed under the direction of Matteo Visconti, lord of Milan, in 1299; and thus the century closed on Genoa as without doubt the most powerful state in Italy, and unquestionably the mistress of the Mediterranean. . . . The next outbreak of war between the two Republics had its origin in the occupation of the island of Chios, in 1349," and Genoa in that struggle encountered not the Venetians alone, but the Greeks and Catalans in alliance with them (see CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 1348-1355).—J. T. Bent, *Genoa*; ch. 6 and 8. See, also, TRADE.

ALSO IN: W. C. Hazlitt, *Hist. of the Venetian Republic*, ch. 11 (v. 2).

A. D. 1282-1290.—War with Pisa.—The great victory of Meloria.—Capture of the chain of the Pisan harbor. See PISA: A. D. 1063-1293.

A. D. 1313.—Alliance with the Emperor Henry VII. against Naples. See ITALY: A. D. 1310-1313.

A. D. 1318-1319.—Feuds of the four great families.—Siege of the city by the exiles and the Lombard princes, and its defense by the King of Naples. See ITALY: A. D. 1313-1330.

A. D. 1348-1355.—War with the Greeks, Venetians and Aragonese. See CONSTANTINOPLE: A. D. 1348-1355.

A. D. 1353.—Annexed by the Visconti to their Milanese principality. See MILAN: A. D. 1277-1447.

A. D. 1378-1379.—Renewed war with Venice.—The victory at Pola. See VENICE: A. D. 1378-1379.

A. D. 1379-1381.—The disastrous war of Chioggia.—Venice triumphant. See VENICE: A. D. 1379-1381.

A. D. 1381-1422.—A succession of foreign masters:—The King of France, the Marquis of Monferrat and the Duke of Milan.—The history of Genoa for more than a century after the disastrous War of Chioggia "is one long and melancholy tissue of internal and external troubles, coming faster and faster upon one another as the inherent vitality of the Republic grew weaker. . . . During this period we have a constant and unhealthy craving for foreign masters, be they Marquises of Monferrato, Dukes of Milan, or the more formidable subverters of freedom, the kings of France. . . . In 1396 . . . Adorno [then doge of Genoa], finding himself unable to tyrannize as he wished, decided on handing over the government to Charles VI. of France. In this he was ably backed up by many members of the old nobility, as the signatures to the treaty testify. The king was to be entitled 'Defender of the Commune and People,' and was to respect in every way the existing order of things. So on the 27th of November, in that year, the great bell in the tower of the ducal palace was rung, the French standard was raised by the side of the red cross of Genoa, and in the great council hall, where her rulers had sat for centuries, now sat enthroned the French ambassadors, whilst Antoniotto Adorno handed over to them the sceptre and keys of the city. These symbols of government were graciously restored to him, with the admonition that he should no longer be styled 'doge,' but 'governor' in the name of France. Thus did Adorno sell his country for the love of power, preferring to be the head of many slaves, rather than to live as a subordinate in a free community. The first two governors sent by France after Adorno's death were unable to cope with the seething mass of corruption they found within the city walls, until the Marshal Boucicault was sent, whose name was far famed for cruelty in Spain against the Moors, in Bulgaria against the Turks, and in France against the rebels." The government of Boucicault was hard and cruel, and "his name is handed down by the Genoese as the most hateful of her many tyrants." In 1409 they took advantage of his absence from the city to bring in the Marquis of Monferrato, who established himself in his place. "It was but for a brief period that the Genoese submitted to the Marquis of Monferrato; they preferred to return to their doges and internal quarrels. . . . Throughout the city nothing was heard but the din of arms. Brother fought against brother, father against son, and for the whole of an unusually chill December, in 1414, there was not a by-path in Genoa which was not paved with lances, battle-axes and dead bodies. . . . Out of this fiery trial Genoa at length emerged with Tommaso Campofregoso as her doge, one of the few bright lights which illumined Liguria during the early part of this century. . . . The Genoese arms during this time of quiescence again shone forth with something of their ancient brilliancy. Corsica was subdued, and a substantial league was formed with Henry V. of England, . . . 1421, by which perpetual friendship and peace by land and sea was sworn. Short, however, was the period during which Genoa could rest contented at home. Campofregoso was driven from the dogeship, and Filippo Maria, Visconti of Milan,

was appointed protector of the Republic [1422], and through this allegiance the Genoese were drawn into an unprofitable war for the succession in Naples, in which the Duke of Milan and the Pope supported the claims of Queen Joanna and her adopted son, Louis of Anjou, against Alphonso of Aragon."—J. T. Bent, *Genoa*, ch. 9.—*The Universal Hist.*, ch. 73, sect. 3-4 (v. 25).

A. D. 1385-1386.—Residence of Pope Urban VI. See ITALY (SOUTHERN): A. D. 1343-1389.

A. D. 1407-1448.—The Bank of St. George.—"The Bank of St. George was founded in Genoa in the year 1407. It was an immense success and a great support to the government. It gradually became a republic within the republic, more peaceful and better regulated than its mistress." In 1448 the administration of Corsica and of the Genoese colonies in the Levant was transferred to the Bank, which thenceforward appointed governors and conducted colonial affairs.—G. B. Malleison, *Studies from Genoese History*, p. 75.

ALSO IN: J. T. Bent, *Genoa*, ch. 11.—See, also, CORSICA: EARLY HISTORY.

A. D. 1421-1435.—Submission to the Duke of Milan, and recovery of the freedom of the city. See ITALY: A. D. 1412-1447.

A. D. 1458-1464.—Renewed struggles of domestic faction and changes of foreign masters.—Submission to the Dukes of Milan.—"Genoa, wearied with internal convulsions, which followed each other incessantly, had lost all influence over the rest of Italy; continually oppressed by faction, it no longer preserved even the recollection of liberty. In 1458, it had submitted to the king of France, then Charles VII.; and John of Anjou, duke of Calabria, had come to exercise the functions of governor in the king's name. He made it, at the same time, his fortress, from whence to attack the kingdom of Naples [see ITALY: A. D. 1447-1490]. But this war had worn out the patience of the Genoese; they rose against the French; and, on the 17th of July, 1461, destroyed the army sent to subdue them by René of Anjou. The Genoese had no sooner thrown off a foreign yoke than they became divided into two factions, — the Adorni and the Fregosi [severally partisans of two families of that name which contended for the control of the republic]: both had at different times, and more than once, given them a doge. The more violent and tyrannical of these factious magistrates was Paolo Fregoso, also archbishop of Genoa, who had returned to his country, in 1462, as chief of banditti; and left it again, two years afterwards, as chief of a band of pirates. The Genoese, disgusted with their independence, which was disgraced by so many crimes and disturbances, had, on the 13th of April, 1464, yielded to Francesco Sforza, duke of Milan; and afterwards remained subject to his son Galeazzo."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Italian Republics*, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: B. Duffy, *The Tuscan Republics*, ch. 23.

A. D. 1475.—Loss of possessions in the Crimea. See TURKS: A. D. 1451-1481.

A. D. 1500-1507.—Capitulation to Louis XII. of France, conqueror of Milan.—Revolt and subjugation.—By the conquest of Milan (see ITALY: A. D. 1499-1500), Louis XII. of France acquired the signoria of Genoa, which had been held by the deposed duke, Ludovico

Sforza. "According to the capitulation, one half of the magistrates of Genoa should be noble, the other half plebeian. They were to be chosen by the suffrages of their fellow-citizens; they were to retain the government of the whole of Liguria, and the administration of their own finances, with the reservation of a fixed sum payable yearly to the king of France. But the French could never comprehend that nobles were on an equality with villains; that a king was bound by conditions imposed by his subjects; or that money could be refused to him who had force. All the capitulations of Genoa were successively violated; while the Genoese nobles ranged themselves on the side of a king against their country; they were known to carry insolently about them a dagger, on which was inscribed, 'Chastise villains'; so impatient were they to separate themselves from the people, even by meanness and assassination. That people could not support the double yoke of a foreign master and of nobles who betrayed their country. On the 7th of February, 1507, they revolted, drove out the French, proclaimed the republic, and named a new doge; but time failed them to organize their defence. On the 3d of April, Louis advanced from Grenoble with a powerful army. He soon arrived before Genoa: the newly-raised militia, unable to withstand veteran troops, were defeated. Louis entered Genoa on the 29th of April; and immediately sent the doge and the greater number of the generous citizens, who had signalized themselves in the defence of their country, to the scaffold."—J. C. L. de Sismondi, *Hist. of the Italian Republics*, ch. 14.

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Latin and Teutonic Nations from 1494 to 1514*, p. 260.

A. D. 1527-1528.—French dominion momentarily restored and then overthrown by Andrew Doria.—The republic revived. See ITALY: A. D. 1527-1529.

A. D. 1528-1559.—The conspiracy of Fiesco and its failure.—Revolt and recovery of Corsica.—"Sustained by the ability of Doria, and protected by the arms of Charles V., the Republic, during near nineteen years subsequent to this auspicious revolution, continued in the enjoyment of dignified independence and repose. But, the memorable conspiracy of Louis Fiesco, Count of Lavagna, the Catiline of Liguria, had nearly subverted Genoa, and reduced it anew to the obedience of France, or exposed it once more to all the misfortunes of anarchy. The massacre of Doria and his family constituted one of the primary objects of the plot; while the dissimulation, intrepidity, and capacity, which marked its leader . . . have rendered the attempt one of the most extraordinary related in modern history. It was accompanied with complete success till the moment of its termination. Jeannetin Doria, the heir of that house, having perished by the dagger, and Andrew, his uncle, being with difficulty saved by his servants, who transported him out of the city, the Genoese Senate was about to submit unconditionally to Fiesco, when that nobleman, by a sudden and accidental death, at once rendered abortive his own hopes and those of his followers. The government, resuming courage, expelled the surviving conspirators; and Doria, on his return to the city, sullied the lustre of his high character, by proceeding to acts of cruelty against the brothers and adherents of the Count of Lavagna. Notwithstanding this cul-

pable and vindictive excess, he continued invariably firm to the political principles which he had inculcated, for maintaining the freedom of the Commonwealth. Philip, Prince of Spain, son of Charles V., having visited Genoa in the succeeding year, attempted to induce the senate, underspecious pretences of securing their safety, to consent to the construction of a citadel, garrisoned by Spaniards. But he found in that assembly, as well as in Doria, an insurmountable opposition to the measure, which was rejected with unanimous indignation. The island of Corsica, which had been subjected for ages to Genoa, and which was oppressed by a tyrannical administration, took up arms at this period [1558-1559]; and the French having aided the insurgents, they maintained a long and successful struggle against their oppressors. But the peace concluded at Cateau between Philip, King of Spain, and Henry II., in which the Spanish court dictated terms to France, obliged that nation to evacuate their Corsican acquisitions, and to restore the island to the Genoese [see FRANCE: A. D. 1547-1559]. Soon afterwards [1559], at the very advanced age of ninety, Andrew Doria expired in his own palace, surrounded by the people on whom he had conferred freedom and tranquillity; leaving the Commonwealth in domestic repose and undisturbed by foreign war."—Sir N. W. Wraxall, *Hist. of France*, 1574-1610, v. 2, pp. 43-44.

ALSO IN: G. B. Malleison, *Studies from Genoese History*, ch. 1-3.

A. D. 1625-1626.—Unsuccessful attack by France and Savoy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1624-1626.

A. D. 1745.—The republic sides with Spain and France in the War of the Austrian Succession. See ITALY: A. D. 1745.

A. D. 1746-1747.—Surrendered to the Austrians.—Popular rising.—Expulsion of the Austrian garrison.—Long siege and deliverance of the city. See ITALY: A. D. 1746-1747.

A. D. 1748.—Territory secured by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE: A. D. 1748.

A. D. 1768.—Cession of Corsica to France. See CORSICA: A. D. 1729-1769.

A. D. 1796.—Treaty of peace with France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1797.—Revolution forced by Bonaparte.—Creation of the Ligurian Republic. See FRANCE: A. D. 1797 (MAY—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1800.—Siege by the Austrians.—Masséna's defense.—Surrender of the city. See FRANCE: A. D. 1800-1801 (MAY—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1805.—Surrender of independence.—Annexation to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1804-1805.

A. D. 1814.—Reduction of the forts by English troops.—Surrender of the French garrison. See ITALY: A. D. 1814.

A. D. 1814-1815.—Annexation to the kingdom of Sardinia. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE); and VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

GENOLA, Battle of (1799). See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (AUGUST—DECEMBER).

GENS, GENTES, GENTILES.—"When Roman history begins, there were within the city, and subordinate to the common city government, a large number of smaller bodies, each of which preserved its individuality and some

semblance of governmental machinery. These were clans [gens], and in prehistoric times each of them is taken to have had an independent political existence, living apart, worshipping its own gods, and ruled over by its own chieftain. This clan organization is not supposed to have been peculiar at all to Rome, but ancient society in general was composed of an indefinite number of such bodies, which, at the outset, treated with each other in a small way as nations might treat with each other to-day. It needs to be noted, however, that, at any rate, so far as Rome is concerned, this is a matter of inference, not of historical proof. The earliest political divisions in Latium of which we have any trace consisted of such clans united into communities. If they ever existed, separately, therefore their union must have been deliberate and artificial, and the body thus formed was the canton ('civitas' or 'populus'). Each canton had a fixed common stronghold ('capitolium,' 'height,' or 'arx'—cf. 'arceo'—'citadel') situated on some central elevation. The clans dwelt around in hamlets ('vici' or 'pagi') scattered through the canton. Originally, the central stronghold was not a place of residence like the 'pagi,' but a place of refuge . . . and a place of meeting. . . . In all of this, therefore, the clan seems to lie at the very foundation. . . . Any clan in the beginning, of course, must have been simply a family. When it grew so large as to be divided into sections, the sections were known as families ('familie') and their union was the clan. In this view the family, as we find it existing in the Roman state, was a subdivision of the clan. In other words, historically, families did not unite to form clans, but the clan was the primitive thing, and the families were its branches. Men thus recognized kinship of a double character. They were related to all the members of their clan as 'gentiles,' and again more closely to all the members of their branch of the clan at once as 'gentiles' and also as 'agnati.' As already stated, men belonged to the same family ('agnati') when they could trace their descent through males from a common ancestor who gave its name to the family, or, what is the same thing, was its eponym. Between the members of a clan the chief evidence of relationship in historical times was tradition. . . . We have thus outlined what is known as the patriarchal theory of society, and hinted at its application to certain facts in Roman history. It should be remembered, however, that it is only a theory, and that it is open to some apparent and to some real criticism."—A. Tighe, *Development of the Roman Const.*, ch. 2.—T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 5.—"The patricians were divided into certain private associations, called Gentes, which we may translate Houses or Clans. All the members of each Gens were called gentiles; and they bore the same name, which always ended in -ius; as for instance, every member of the Julian Gens was a Julius; every member of the Cornelian Gens was a Cornelius, and so on. Now in every Gens there were a number of Families which were distinguished by a name added to the name of the Gens. Thus the Scipios, Sullas, Cinna's, Cethegi, Lentuli, were all families of the Cornelian Gens. Lastly, every person of every Family was denoted by a name prefixed to the name of the Gens. The name of the person was, in Latin, prænomen; that of the Gens or House, nomen, that of the

Family, cognomen. Thus Caius Julius Cæsar was a person of the Cæsar Family in the Julian Gens; Lucius Cornelius Scipio was a person of the Scipio Family in the Cornelian Gens; and so forth."—H. G. Liddell, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 3.—"There is no word in the English language which satisfactorily renders the Latin word 'gens.' The term 'clan' is apt to mislead; for the Scotch Highland clans were very different from the Roman 'gentes.' The word 'House' is not quite correct, for it always implies relationship, which was not essential in the 'gens'; but for want of a better word we shall use 'House' to express 'gens,' except where the spirit of the language rejects the term and requires 'family' instead. The German language has in the word 'Geschlecht' an almost equivalent term for the Latin 'gens'."—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 1, ch. 13, *foot-note*.

ALSO IN: Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City*, bk. 2, ch. 10.—On the Greek gens, see *PHYLAÆ*.

GENSERIC AND THE VANDALS. See *VANDALS*: A. D. 429-439.

GENTILES. See *GENS*.

GENUCIAN LAW, The.—A law which prohibited the taking of interest for loans is said to have been adopted at Rome, B. C. 342, on the proposal of the tribune Genucius; but modern historians are skeptical as to the actual enactment of the law.—W. Ihne, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 3, ch. 5.

GEOK TEPE, Siege and capture of (1881). See *RUSSIA*: A. D. 1869-1881.

GEOMORI, OR GAMORI, The.—"As far as our imperfect information enables us to trace, these early oligarchies of the Grecian states, against which the first usurping despots contended, contained in themselves more repulsive elements of inequality, and more mischievous barriers between the component parts of the population, than the oligarchies of later days. . . . The oligarchy was not (like the government so denominated in subsequent times) the government of a rich few over the less rich and the poor, but that of a peculiar order, sometimes a Patrician order, over all the remaining society. . . . The country-population, or villagers who tilled the land, seem in these early times to have been held to a painful dependence on the great proprietors who lived in the fortified town, and to have been distinguished by a dress and habits of their own, which often drew upon them an unfriendly nickname. . . . The governing proprietors went by the name of the Gamori, or Geomori, according as the Doric or Ionic dialect might be used in describing them, since they were found in states belonging to one race as well as to the other. They appear to have constituted a close order, transmitting their privileges to their children, but admitting no new members to a participation. The principle called by Greek thinkers a Timocracy (the apportionment of political rights and privileges according to comparative property) seems to have been little, if at all, applied in the earlier times. We know no example of it earlier than Solon."—G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, pt. 2, ch. 9.

GEONIM, The. See *JEWS*: 7TH CENTURY.

GEORGE I., King of England (first of the Hanoverian or Brunswick line), A. D. 1714-1727. . . . **George II., King of England**, 1727-1760. . . . **George III., King of England**, 1760-

1820. . . . George IV., King of England, 1820–1830.

GEORGE, HENRY, and the Single Tax Movement. See **SOCIAL MOVEMENTS**: A. D. 1880.

GEORGIA: The Aboriginal Inhabitants. See **AMERICAN ABORIGINES**: APALACHES, MUSK-OGEEAN FAMILY, CHEROKEES.

A. D. 1539–1542.—Traversed by Hernando de Soto. See **FLORIDA**: A. D. 1528–1542.

A. D. 1629.—Embraced in the Carolina grant to Sir Robert Heath. See **AMERICA**: A. D. 1629.

A. D. 1663.—Embraced in the Carolina grant to Monk, Clarendon, and others. See **NORTH CAROLINA**: A. D. 1663–1670.

A. D. 1732–1739.—Oglethorpe's colony.—“Among the members of Parliament during the rule of Sir Robert Walpole was one almost unknown to us now, but deserving of honour beyond most men of his time. His name was James Oglethorpe. He was a soldier, and had fought against the Turks and in the great Marlborough wars against Louis XIV. In advanced life he became the friend of Samuel Johnson. Dr. Johnson urged him to write some account of his adventures. ‘I know no one,’ he said, ‘whose life would be more interesting: if I were furnished with materials I should be very glad to write it.’ Edmund Burke considered him ‘a more extraordinary person than any he had ever read of.’ John Wesley ‘blessed God that ever he was born.’ Oglethorpe attained the great age of ninety-six, and died in the year 1785. . . . In Oglethorpe's time it was in the power of a creditor to imprison, according to his pleasure, the man who owed him money and was not able to pay it. It was a common circumstance that a man should be imprisoned during a long series of years for a trifling debt. Oglethorpe had a friend upon whom this hard fate had fallen. His attention was thus painfully called to the cruelties which were inflicted upon the unfortunate and helpless. He appealed to Parliament, and after inquiry a partial remedy was obtained. The benevolent exertions of Oglethorpe procured liberty for multitudes who but for him might have ended their lives in captivity. This, however, did not content him. Liberty was an incomplete gift to men who had lost, or perhaps had scarcely ever possessed, the faculty of earning their own maintenance. Oglethorpe devised how he might carry these unfortunates to a new world, where, under happier auspices, they might open a fresh career. He obtained [A. D. 1732] from King George II. a charter by which the country between the Savannah and the Alatomaha, and stretching westward to the Pacific, was erected into the province of Georgia. It was to be a refuge for the deserving poor, and next to them for Protestants suffering persecution. Parliament voted £10,000 in aid of the humane enterprise, and many benevolent persons were liberal with their gifts. In November the first exodus of the insolvent took place. Oglethorpe sailed with 120 emigrants, mainly selected from the prisons—penniless, but of good repute. He surveyed the coasts of Georgia, and chose a site for the capital of his new State. He pitched his tent where Savannah now stands, and at once proceeded to mark out the line of streets and squares. Next year the colony was joined by about a hundred German Protestants, who were then under persecution

for their beliefs. . . . The fame of Oglethorpe's enterprise spread over Europe. All struggling men, against whom the battle of life went hard, looked to Georgia as a land of promise. They were the men who most urgently required to emigrate; but they were not always the men best fitted to conquer the difficulties of the immigrant's life. The progress of the colony was slow. The poor persons of whom it was originally composed were honest but ineffective, and could not in Georgia more than in England find out the way to become self-supporting. Encouragements were given which drew from Germany, from Switzerland, and from the Highlands of Scotland men of firmer texture of mind—better fitted to subdue the wilderness and bring forth its treasures. With Oglethorpe there went out, on his second expedition to Georgia [1736], the two brothers John and Charles Wesley. Charles went as secretary to the Governor. John was even then, although a very young man, a preacher of unusual promise. . . . He spent two years in Georgia, and these were unsuccessful years. His character was unformed; his zeal out of proportion to his discretion. The people felt that he preached ‘personal satires’ at them. He involved himself in quarrels, and at last had to leave the colony secretly, fearing arrest at the instance of some whom he had offended. He returned to begin his great career in England, with the feeling that his residence in Georgia had been of much value to himself, but of very little to the people whom he sought to benefit. Just as Wesley reached England, his fellow-labourer George Whitefield sailed for Georgia. . . . He founded an Orphan-House at Savannah, and supported it by contributions—obtained easily from men under the power of his unequalled eloquence. He visited Georgia very frequently, and his love for that colony remained with him to the last. Slavery was, at the outset, forbidden in Georgia. It was opposed to the gospel, Oglethorpe said, and therefore not to be allowed. He foresaw, besides, what has been so bitterly experienced since, that slavery must degrade the poor white labourer. But soon a desire sprung up among the less scrupulous of the settlers to have the use of slaves. Within seven years from the first landing, slave-ships were discharging their cargoes at Savannah.”—R. Mackenzie, *America: A History*, bk. 1, ch. 10.

ALSO IN: T. M. Harris, *Biog. Memorials of James Oglethorpe*, ch. 1–10.—R. Wright, *Memoir of Gen. Jas. Oglethorpe*, ch. 1–9.

For text of charter, etc., see in G. White, *Hist. Coll's of Georgia*, pp. 1–20.

A. D. 1734.—The settlement of the Salzburghers.—“As early as October the 12th, 1732, the ‘Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge’ expressed to the Trustees a desire ‘that the persecuted Salzburghers should have an asylum provided for them in Georgia.’ . . . These Germans belonged to the Archbishopric of Salzburg, then the most eastern district of Bavaria; but now forming a detached district in upper Austria, and called Salzburg from the broad valley of the Salzer, which is made by the approximating of the Norric and Rhetian Alps. Their ancestors, the Vallenges of Piedmont, had been compelled by the barbarities of the Dukes of Savoy, to find a shelter from the storms of persecution in the Alpine passes and vales of Salzburg and the Tyrol, before the Reformation; and

frequently since had they been hunted out by the hirelings and soldiery of the Church of Rome. . . . The quietness which they had enjoyed for nearly half a century was now rudely broken in upon by Leopold, Count of Firmian and Archbishop of Salzburg, who determined to reduce them to the Papal faith and power. He began in the year 1729, and, ere he ended in 1732, not far from 30,000 had been driven from their homes, to seek among the Protestant States of Europe that charity and peace which were denied them in the glens and fastnesses of their native Alps. More than two-thirds settled in the Prussian States; the rest spread themselves over England, Holland, and other Protestant countries. Thrilling is the story of their exile. The march of these Salzburgers constitutes an epoch in the history of Germany. . . . The sympathies of Reformed Christendom were awakened on their behalf, and the most hospitable entertainment and assistance were everywhere given them." Forty-two families, numbering 78 persons, accepted an invitation to settle in Georgia, receiving allotments of land and provisions until they could gather a harvest. They arrived at Savannah in March, 1734, and were settled at a spot which they selected for themselves, about thirty miles in the interior. "Oglethorpe marked out for them a town; ordered workmen to assist in building houses; and soon the whole body of Germans went up to their new home at Ebenezer."—W. B. Stevens, *Hist. of Georgia*, bk. 2, ch. 2 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: F. Shoberl, *Persecutions of Popery*, ch. 9 (v. 2).—E. B. Speirs, *The Salzburgers* (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Oct., 1890).

A. D. 1735-1749.—The Slavery question.—Original exclusion and subsequent admission of negro slaves.—Among the fundamental regulations of the Trustees was one prohibiting negro-slavery in the colony. "It was policy and not philanthropy which prohibited slavery; for, though one of the Trustees, in a sermon to recommend charity, declared, 'Let avarice defend it as it will, there is an honest reluctance in humanity against buying and selling, and regarding those of our own species as our wealth and possessions'; and though Oglethorpe himself, speaking of slavery as against 'the gospel as well as the fundamental law of England', asserted, 'we refused, as Trustees, to make a law permitting such a horrid crime'; yet in the official publications of that body its inhibition is based only on political and prudential, and not on humane and liberal grounds; and even Oglethorpe owned a plantation and negroes near Parachucla in South Carolina, about forty miles above Savannah. . . . Their [the Trustees'] design was to provide for poor but honest persons, to erect a barrier between South Carolina and the Spanish settlements, and to establish a wine and silk-growing colony. It was thought by the Trustees that neither of these designs could be secured if slavery was introduced. . . . But while the Trustees disallowed negroes, they instituted a system of white slavery which was fraught with evil to the servants and to the colony. These were white servants, consisting of Welch, English, or German, males and females—families and individuals—who were indentured to individuals or the Trustees, for a period of from four to fourteen years. . . . On arriving in Georgia, their service was sold for the term of indenture, or apportioned to the inhabitants by the

magistrates, as their necessities required. . . . Two years had not elapsed since the landing of Oglethorpe before many complaints originated from this cause; and in the summer of 1735 a petition, signed by seventeen freeholders, setting forth the unprofitableness of white servants, and the necessity for negroes, was carried by Mr. Hugh Sterling to the Trustees, who, however, resented the appeal as an insult to their honour. . . . The plan for substituting white for black labour failed through the sparseness of the supply and the refractoriness of the servants. As a consequence of the inability of the settlers to procure adequate help, the lands granted them remained uncleared, and even those which the temporary industry of the first occupants prepared remained uncultivated. . . . There accumulated on the Trustees' hands a body of idle, clamorous, mischief-making men, who employed their time in declaiming against the very government whose charity both fed and clothed them. . . . For nearly fifteen years from 1735, the date of the first petition for negroes, and the date of their express law against their importation, the Trustees refused to listen to any similar representations, except to condemn them," and they were supported by the Salzburgers and the Highlanders, both of whom opposed the introduction of negro slaves. But finally, in 1749, the firmness of the Trustees gave way and they yielded to the clamor of the discontented colony. The importation of black slaves was permitted, under certain regulations intended to diminish the evils of the institution. "The change in the tenure of grants, and the permission to hold slaves, had an immediate effect on the prosperity of the colony."—W. B. Stevens, *Hist. of Georgia*, bk. 2, ch. 9 (v. 1).

A. D. 1738-1743.—War with the Spaniards of Florida.—Discontents in the colony.—"The assiento enjoyed under the treaty of Utrecht by the English South Sea Company, the privilege, that is, of transporting to the Spanish colonies a certain number of slaves annually, . . . was made a cover for an extensive smuggling trade on the part of the English, into which private merchants also entered. . . . To guard against these systematic infractions of their laws, the Spaniards maintained a numerous fleet of vessels in the preventive service, known as 'guarda costas,' by which some severities were occasionally exercised on suspected or detected smugglers. These severities, grossly exaggerated, and resounded throughout the British dominions, served to revive in England and the colonies a hatred of the Spaniards, which, since the time of Philip II., had never wholly died out. Such was the temper and position of the two nations when the colonization of Georgia was begun, of which one avowed object was to erect a barrier against the Spaniards, among whom the runaway slaves of South Carolina were accustomed to find shelter, receiving in Florida an assignment of lands, and being armed and organized into companies, as a means of strengthening that feeble colony. A message sent to St. Augustine to demand the surrender of the South Carolina runaways met with a point blank refusal, and the feeling against the Spaniards ran very high in consequence. . . . Oglethorpe . . . returned from his second visit to England [Sept. 1738], with a newly-enlisted regiment of soldiers, and the appointment, also, of military commander

for Georgia and the Carolinas, with orders 'to give no offense, but to repel force by force.' Both in Spain and England the administrators of the government were anxious for peace. . . . The ferocious clamors of the merchants and the mob . . . absolutely forced Walpole into a war [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1739-1741.—THE WAR OF JENKINS' EAR]. Travelling 300 miles through the forests, Oglethorpe held at Coweta, on the Chattahoochee, just below the present site of Columbus, a new treaty with the Creeks, by which they confirmed their former cessions, acknowledged themselves subject to the King of Great Britain, and promised to exclude from their territories all but English settlers. After finishing the treaty, Oglethorpe returned through the woods by way of Augusta to Savannah, where he found orders from England to make an attack on Florida. He called at once on South Carolina and the Creeks for aid, and in the mean time made an expedition, in which he captured the Fort of Picolata, over against St. Augustine, thus securing the navigation of the St. John's, and cutting off the Spaniards from their forts at St. Mark's and Pensacola. South Carolina entered very eagerly into the enterprise. Money was voted; a regiment, 500 strong, was enlisted, partly in North Carolina and Virginia. This addition raised Oglethorpe's force to 1,200 men. The Indians that joined him were as many more. Having marched into Florida, he took a small fort or two, and, assisted by several ships of war, laid siege to St. Augustine. But the garrison was 1,000 strong, besides militia. The fortifications proved more formidable than had been expected. A considerable loss was experienced by a sortie from the town, falling heavily on the Highland Rangers. Presently the Indians deserted, followed by part of the Carolina regiment, and Oglethorpe was obliged to give over the enterprise. . . . From the time of this repulse, the good feeling of the Carolinians toward Oglethorpe came to an end. Many of the disappointed Georgia emigrants had removed to Charleston, and many calumnies against Oglethorpe were propagated, and embodied in a pamphlet published there. The Moravians also left Georgia, unwilling to violate their consciences by bearing arms. Most unfortunately for the new colony, the Spanish war withdrew the Highlanders and others of the best settlers from their farms to convert them into soldiers."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, ch. 25 (v. 2).—"After the late incursion into Florida, the General kept possession of a southern region which the Spaniards had claimed as their own; and, as they had taken encouragement from the successful defence of St. Augustine, and the well-known dissensions on the English side, it was to be expected that they would embrace the earliest opportunity of taking their revenge. . . . The storm, which had been so long anticipated, burst upon the colony in the year 1742. The Spaniards had . . . fitted out, at Havana, a fleet said to consist of 56 sail and 7,000 or 8,000 men. The force was probably not quite so great; if it was, it did not all reach its destination," being dispersed by a storm, "so that only a part of the whole number succeeded in reaching St. Augustine. The force was there placed under the command of Don Manuel de Monteano, the Governor of that place. . . . The fleet made its appearance on the coast of Georgia on the 21st of June"; but all its attempts, first to

take possession of the Island of Amelia, and afterwards to reduce the forts at Frederica, were defeated by the vigor and skill of General Oglethorpe. After losing heavily in a fight called the Battle of the Bloody Marsh, the Spaniards retreated about the middle of July. The following year they prepared another attempt; but Oglethorpe anticipated it by a second demonstration on his own part against St. Augustine, which had no other result than to disconcert the plans of the enemy.—W. B. O. Peabody, *Life of Oglethorpe* (*Library of Am. Biog.*, 2d series, v. 2), ch. 11-12.—"While Oglethorpe was engaged in repelling the Spaniards, the trustees of Georgia had been fiercely assailed by their discontented colonists. They sent Thomas Stevens to England with a petition containing many charges of mismanagement, extravagance, and speculation, to which the trustees put in an answer. After a thorough examination of documents and witnesses in committee of the whole, and hearing counsel, the House of Commons resolved that 'the petition of Thomas Stevens contains false, scandalous, and malicious charges'; in consequence of which Stevens, the next day, was brought to the bar, and reprimanded on his knees. . . . Oglethorpe himself had been a special mark of the malice and obloquy of the discontented settlers. . . . Presently his lieutenant colonel, a man who owed everything to Oglethorpe's favor, re-echoing the slanders of the colonists, lodged formal charges against him. Oglethorpe proceeded to England to vindicate his character, and the accuser, convicted by a court of inquiry of falsehood, was disgraced and deprived of his commission. Appointed a major general, ordered to join the army assembled to oppose the landing of the Pretender, marrying also about this time, Oglethorpe did not again return to Georgia. The former scheme of administration having given rise to innumerable complaints, the government of that colony was intrusted to a president and four counselors."—R. Hildreth, *Hist. of the U. S.*, ch. 25 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: C. C. Jones, *Hist. of Georgia*, ch. 17-22 (v. 1).

A. D. 1743-1764.—Surrender to the Crown.—Government as a royal province.—"On Oglethorpe's departure [1743], William Stephens, the secretary, was made President, and continued in office until 1751, when he was succeeded by Henry Parker. The colony, when Stephens came into office, comprised about 1,500 persons. It was almost at a stand-still. The brilliant prospects of the early days were dissipated, and immigration had ceased, thanks to the narrow policy and feeble government of the Trustees. An Indian rising, in 1749, headed by Mary Musgrove, Oglethorpe's Indian interpreter, and her husband, one Bosomworth, who laid claim to the whole country, came near causing the destruction of the colony, and was only repressed by much negotiation and lavish bribes. The colony, thus feeble and threatened, struggled on, until it was relieved from danger from the Indians and from the restrictive laws, and encouraged by the appointment of Parker, and the establishment of a representative government. This produced a turn in the affairs of Georgia. Trade revived, immigration was renewed, and everything began to wear again a more hopeful look. Just at this time, however, the original trust was on the point of expiring by limitation. There was a party in

the colony who desired a renewal of the charter; but the Trustees felt that their scheme had failed in every way, except perhaps as a defence to South Carolina, and when the limit of the charter was reached, they turned the colony over to the Crown. . . . A form of government was established similar to those of the other royal provinces, and Captain John Reynolds was sent out as the first Governor." The administration of Reynolds produced wide discontent, and in 1757 he was recalled, being "succeeded by Henry Ellis as Lieutenant-governor. The change proved fortunate, and brought rest to the colony. Ellis ruled peaceably and with general respect for more than two years, and was then promoted to the governorship of Nova Scotia. In the same year his successor arrived at Savannah, in the person of James Wright, who continued to govern the province until it was severed from England by the Revolution. The feebleness of Georgia had prevented her taking part in the union of the colonies, and she was not represented in the Congress at Albany. Georgia also escaped the ravages of the French war, partly by her distant situation, and partly by the prudence of Governor Ellis; and the conclusion of that war gave Florida to England, and relieved the colony from the continual menace of Spanish aggression. A great Congress of southern Governors and Indian chiefs followed, in which Wright, more active than his predecessor, took a prominent part. Under his energetic and firm rule, the colony began to prosper greatly, and trade increased rapidly; but the Governor gained at the same time so much influence, and was a man of so much address, that he not only held the colony down at the time of the Stamp Act, but seriously hampered its action in the years which led to revolution."—H. C. Lodge, *Short Hist. of the Eng. Colonies in Am.*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1760-1775.—Opening events of the Revolution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1760-1775, to 1775.

A. D. 1775-1777.—The end of royal government.—Constitutional organization of the state.—"The news of the battle of Lexington reached Savannah on the night of the 10th of May, 1775, and produced intense excitement among all classes. On the night of the 11th, Noble Wimberly Jones, Joseph Habersham, Edward Telfair, and a few others, impressed with the necessity of securing all military stores, and preserving them for colonial use, took from the King's magazine, in Savannah, about 500 pounds of powder. . . . Tradition asserts that part of this powder was sent to Boston, and used by the militia at the battle of Bunker Hill. . . . The activity of the Liberty party, and its rapid increase, . . . gave Governor Wright just cause for alarm; and he wrote to General Gage, expressing his amazement 'that these southern provinces should be left in the situation they are, and the Governors and King's officers, and friends of Government, naked and exposed to the resentment of an enraged people.' . . . The assistance so earnestly solicited in these letters would have been promptly rendered, but that they never reached their destination. The Committee of Safety at Charleston withdrew them from their envelopes, as they passed through the port, and substituted others, stating that Georgia was quiet, and there existed no need either of troops or vessels." The position of Governor Wright

soon became one of complete powerlessness and he begged to be recalled. In January, 1776, however, he was placed under arrest, by order of the Council of Safety, and gave his parole not to leave town, nor communicate with the men-of-war which had just arrived at Tybee; notwithstanding which he made his escape to one of the King's ships on the 11th of February. "The first effective organization of the friends of liberty in the province took place among the deputies from several parishes, who met in Savannah, on the 18th January, 1775, and formed what has been called 'A Provincial Congress.' Guided by the action of the other colonies, a 'Council of Safety' was created, on the 22d June, 1775, to whom was confided the general direction of the measures proper to be pursued in carrying out resistance to the tyrannical designs of the King and Parliament. William Ewen was the first President of this Council of Safety, and Seth John Cuthbert was the Secretary. On the 4th July, the Provincial Congress (now properly called such, as every parish and district was represented) met in Savannah, and elected as its presiding officer Archibald Bulloch. This Congress conferred upon the 'Council of Safety,' 'full power upon every emergency during the recess of Congress.'" Soon finding the need of a more definite order of government, the Provincial Congress, on the 15th of April, 1776, adopted provisionally, for six months, a series of "Rules and Regulations," under which Archibald Bulloch was elected President and Commander-in-chief of Georgia, and John Glen, Chief Justice. After the Declaration of Independence, steps were taken toward the settling of the government of the state on a permanent basis. On the proclamation of President Bulloch a convention was elected which met in Savannah in October, and which framed a constitution that was ratified on the 5th of February, 1777.—W. B. Stevens, *Hist. of Georgia*, bk. 4, ch. 2, and bk. 5, ch. 1 (v. 2).

A. D. 1776-1778.—The war in the North.—The Articles of Confederation.—The alliance with France. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776, to 1778.

A. D. 1778-1779.—Savannah taken and the state subjugated by the British. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778-1779.

A. D. 1779.—Unsuccessful attack on Savannah by the French and Americans. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1779 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1780.—Successes of the British arms in South Carolina. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780 (FEBRUARY—AUGUST).

A. D. 1780-1783.—Greene's campaign in the South.—Lafayette and Washington in Virginia.—Siege of Yorktown and surrender of Cornwallis.—Peace. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1780, to 1783.

A. D. 1787-1788.—The formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787, and 1787-1789.

A. D. 1802.—Cession of Western land claims to the United States. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1781-1786; and MISSISSIPPI: A. D. 1798-1804.

A. D. 1813-1814.—The Creek War. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1813-1814 (AUGUST—APRIL).

A. D. 1816-1818.—The First Seminole War. See FLORIDA: A. D. 1816-1818.

A. D. 1861 (January).—Secession from the Union. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (JANUARY—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1861 (October—December).—Savannah threatened.—The Union forces in possession of the mouth of the river. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1861 (OCTOBER—DECEMBER: SOUTH CAROLINA—GEORGIA).

A. D. 1862 (February—April).—Reduction of Fort Pulaski and sealing up of the port of Savannah by the National forces. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1862 (FEBRUARY—APRIL: GEORGIA—FLORIDA).

A. D. 1864 (May—September).—Sherman's campaign against Atlanta.—The capture of the city. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (MAY: GEORGIA), and (MAY—SEPTEMBER: GEORGIA).

A. D. 1864 (September—October).—Military occupation of Atlanta.—Removal of the inhabitants.—Hood's Raid to Sherman's rear. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER: GEORGIA).

A. D. 1864 (November—December).—Destruction of Atlanta.—Sherman's March to the Sea. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1864 (NOVEMBER—DECEMBER: GEORGIA).

A. D. 1865 (March—May).—Wilson's Raid.—End of the Rebellion. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (APRIL—MAY).

A. D. 1865-1868.—Reconstruction. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1865 (MAY—JULY), and after, to 1868-1870.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY. See EDUCATION, MODERN: AMERICA: A. D. 1769-1884.

GEUGEN, The. See TURKS: 6TH CENT'Y.

GEPIDÆ, The. See GOTH: ORIGIN OF; HUNS; LOMBARDS: EARLY HISTORY; and AVARS.

GERALDINES, The.—The Geraldines of Irish history were descendants of Maurice and William Fitzgerald, two of the first among the Anglo-Norman adventurers to engage in the conquest of Ireland, A. D. 1169-1170. Their mother was a Welsh princess, named Nest, or Nesta, who is said to have been the mistress of Henry I. of England, and afterwards to have married the Norman baron, Gerald Fitz Walter, who became the father of the Fitzgeralds. "Maurice Fitzgerald, the eldest of the brothers, became the ancestor both of the Earls of Kildare and Desmond; William, the younger, obtained an immense grant of land in Kerry from the McCarthys,—indeed as time went on the lordship of the Desmond Fitzgeralds grew larger and larger, until it covered nearly as much ground as many a small European kingdom. Nor was this all. The White Knight, the Knight of Glyn, and the Knight of Kerry were all three Fitzgeralds, all descended from the same root, and all owned large tracts of country. The position of the Geraldines of Kildare was even more important, on account of their close proximity to Dublin. In later times their great keep at Maynooth dominated the whole Pale, while their followers swarmed everywhere, each man with a G. embroidered upon his breast in token of his allegiance. By the beginning of the 16th century their power had reached to, perhaps, the highest point ever attained in these islands by any subject. Whoever might be called the Viceroy in Ireland it was the Earl of Kildare who practically governed the country."—Hon. E. Lawless, *The*

Story of Ireland, ch. 14.—See, also, IRELAND: A. D. 1515; and for some account of the subsequent rebellion and fall of the Geraldines, see IRELAND: A. D. 1535-1553.

GERALDINES, League of the. See IRELAND: A. D. 1559-1603.

GERBA, OR JERBA, The disaster at (1560). See BARBARY STATES: A. D. 1543-1560.

GEREFA.—"The most general name for the fiscal, administrative and executive officer among the Anglosaxons was Gerefa, or as it is written in very early documents geroefa: but the peculiar functions of the individuals comprehended under it were further defined by a prefix compounded with it, as scirgerefa, the reeve of the shire or sheriff: tungerefa, the reeve of the farm or bailiff. The exact meaning and etymology of this name have hitherto eluded the researches of our best scholars."—J. M. Kemble, *The Saxons in England*, bk. 2, ch. 5 (v. 2).—See, also, SHIRE; and EALDORMAN.

GERGESENES, The.—One of the tribes of the Canaanites, whose territory is believed by Lenormant to have "included all Decapolis and even Galilee," and whose capital he places at Gerasa, now Djerash, in Perea.—F. Lenormant and E. Chevallier, *Manual of Ancient Hist.*, bk. 6, ch. 1 (v. 2).

GERGITHIAN SIBYL. See CUMÆ.

GERGITHIANS, The. See TROJA; and ASIA MINOR: THE GREEK COLONIES.

GERGOVIA OF THE ARVERNI.—"The site of Gergovia of the Arverni is supposed to be a hill on the bank of the Allier, two miles from the modern Clermont in Auvergne. The Romans seem to have neglected Gergovia, and to have founded the neighbouring city, to which they gave the name Augustonemetum. The Roman city became known afterwards as Civitas Arvernorum, in the middle ages Arverna, and then, from the situation of its castle, clarus mons, Clermont."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 12 (v. 2, p. 20, foot-note).—For an account of Caesar's reverse at Gergovia of the Arverni, see GAUL: B. C. 58-51.

GERGOVIA OF THE BOIANS. See BOIANS.

GERIZIM.—"The sacred centre of the Samaritans is Gerizim, the 'Mount of Blessings.' On its summit a sacred rock marks the site where, according to their tradition, Joshua placed the Tabernacle and afterwards built a temple, restored later by Sanballat, on the return of the Israelites from captivity." C. R. Conder, *Syrian Stone Lore*, ch. 4.

GERM THEORY OF DISEASE, Origin and development of the. See MEDICAL SCIENCE: 17-18TH CENTURIES, and 19TH CENTURY.

GERMAN, High and Low.—The distinction made between High German and Low German is that resulting from differences of language, etc., between the Germanic peoples which dwelt anciently in the low, flat countries along the German Ocean and the Baltic, and those which occupied the higher regions of the upper Rhine, Elbe and Danube.

GERMAN EAST AFRICAN AND WEST AFRICAN ASSOCIATIONS. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884-1891.

GERMAN EMPIRE, The Constitution of the new. See CONSTITUTION OF GERMANY.

GERMAN FLATS: A. D. 1765.—Treaty with the Indians. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1765-1768.

A. D. 1778.—Destruction by Brant. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1778 (JUNE-NOVEMBER).

GERMAN NATIONS, The wandering of. See GOTHIS; FRANKS; ALEMANNI; MARCOMANNI; QUADI; GEPIDÆ; SAXONS; ANGLES; BURGUNDIANS; VANDALS; SUEVI; LOMBARDS.

GERMAN SOUTHWEST AFRICA.—The whole region on the western coast of S. Africa, between Cape Colony and Portuguese territory, comprising Great Namaqualand and Damaraland, except Walfish Bay (which England holds), was taken up by Germany in 1883-5.

GERMAN UNIVERSITIES. See EDUCATION, MEDIEVAL: GERMANY.

GERMANIA. "The meaning of the name may be either 'good shouters' (Grimm), or, according to other writers, 'East-men,' or 'neighbours.'"—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of England*, v. 1, p. 17, note.

GERMANIC CONFEDERATION, The First. See GERMANY: A. D. 1814-1820. . . . The Second. See GERMANY: A. D. 1870 (SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER).

GERMANIC DIET, The. See DIET, GERMANIC.

GERMANIC PEOPLES OF THE ALEMANNIC LEAGUE. See ALEMANNI: A. D. 213.

GERMANICUS, Campaigns of. See GERMANY: A. D. 14-16.

GERMANTOWN, Battle of. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1777 (JANUARY-DECEMBER).

GERMANY.


The national name.—"The nations of the Germania had no common name recognised by themselves, and were content, when, ages after, they had realised their unity of tongue and descent, to speak of their language simply as the *Lingua Theotisca*, the language of the people (theod). . . . Whence the name 'Deutsch.' Zeuss derives it rather from the root of 'deuten,' to explain, so that 'theotisc' should mean 'significant.' But the root of 'theod' and 'deuten' is the same. . . . The general name by which the Romans knew them [Germani] was one which they had received from their Gallic neighbours."

—W. Stubbs, *Const. Hist. of England*, v. 1, ch. 3, and foot-note.—"In Gothic we have 'thiuda,' people; 'thiudisks,' belonging to the people. . . . The High-German, which looks upon Sanskrit 't' and Gothic 'th' as 'd,' possesses the same word, as 'diot,' people; 'diutisc,' popularis; hence Deutsch, German, and 'deuten,' to explain, literally to Germanize."—F. Max Müller, *Lects. on the Science of Language*, 2d series, lect. 5.

—The account which Tacitus gives of the origin of the name Germany is this: "The name Germany . . . they [the Germans] say, is modern and newly introduced, from the fact that the tribes which first crossed the Rhine and drove out the Gauls, and are now called Tungrians, were then called Germans. Thus what was the name of a tribe, and not of a race, gradually prevailed, till all called themselves by this self-invented name of Germans, which the conquerors had first employed to inspire terror."—Tacitus, *Germany*; trans. by Church and Brodribb, ch. 2.—"It is only at the mouth of the Elbe that the Germany of the really historical period begins; and this is a Germany only in the eyes of scholars, antiquarians, and generalizing ethnologists. Not one of the populations to whom the name is here extended would have attached any meaning to the word, except so far as they had been instructed by men who had studied certain Latin writers. There was no name which was, at one and the same time, native and general. There were native names, but they were limited to special populations. There was a general name, but it was one which was applied by strangers and enemies. What this name was for the northern districts, we know beforehand. It was that

of Saxones and Saxonia in Latin; of Sachsen and Sachsenland in the ordinary German. Evidence, however, that any German population ever so named itself is wholly wanting, though it is not impossible that some unimportant tribe may have done so: the only one so called being the Saxons of Ptolemy, who places them, along with several others, in the small district between the Elbe and the Eyder, and on three of the islands off the coast. . . . The Franks gave it its currency and generality; for, in the eyes of a Frank, Saxony and Friesland contained all those parts of Germany which, partly from their difference of dialect, partly from their rudeness, partly from their paganism, and partly from the obstinacy of their resistance, stood in contrast to the Empire of Charlemagne and his successors. A Saxon was an enemy whom the Franks had to coerce, a heathen whom they had to convert. What more the term meant is uncertain."—R. G. Latham, *Introd. to Kemble's "Hortæ Ferales."*—See, also, TEUTONES.

As known to Tacitus.—"Germany is separated from the Galli, the Rheti, and Pannonii, by the rivers Rhine and Danube; mountain ranges, or the fear which each feels for the other, divide it from the Sarmatæ and Daci. Elsewhere ocean girds it, embracing broad peninsulas and islands of unexplored extent, where certain tribes and kingdoms are newly known to us, revealed by war. The Rhine springs from a precipitous and inaccessible height of the Rhetian Alps, bends slightly westward, and mingles with the Northern Ocean. The Danube pours down from the gradual and gently rising slope of Mount Abnoba, and visits many nations, to force its way at last through six channels into the Pontus; a seventh mouth is lost in marshes. The Germans themselves I should regard as aboriginal, and not mixed at all with other races through immigration or intercourse. For, in former times, it was not by land but on shipboard that those who sought to emigrate would arrive; and the boundless and, so to speak, hostile ocean beyond us, is seldom entered by a sail from our world. And, besides the perils of rough and unknown seas, who would leave Asia, or Africa, or Italy for Germany, with its wild country, its inclement skies, its sullen manners and aspect, unless in-



A Logical Outline of German History

IN WHICH THE DOMINANT CONDITIONS AND

INFLUENCES ARE DISTINGUISHED BY COLORS.

*Ethnological.
Social and political.
Intellectual, moral and
religious.*

Foreign.

Germany was slow in finding the definite place in geography and history that belongs to it at the present day. It was no more at first than a name, applied with large vagueness to the country beyond the Rhine and the Danube, where many restless tribes, of kindred language and character, were unstably distributed. In time, the tribes crowded one another into wide wandering movements, were pushed and pressed together into confederacies and nations, and went swarming over the Danube and the Rhine into Roman provinces, to take possession of them and to be the new masters of the European world; but it was the Germans, not Germany, who began then to be historic.

As a fact in history, Germany emerged first with the Franks, out of the dust-clouds of the wandering time and the darker clouds of the Gallic conquest. Fast seated on the great dividing river, the Rhine, the Franks reached backward into the land which gave them birth, and forward into the land which took their name, and gathered a broad empire out of both. But always the two parts of it refused to be held together. Neither by Clovis, the first conqueror, nor by Charlemagne, after three hundred years, were the Kingdom of the East Franks and the Kingdom of the West Franks bound fast into one. Under Charlemagne's successors, the Kingdom of the East Franks began to be Germany, in the growing of the fact as well as the name.

But no sooner had a Kingdom of Germany been created than it was strangely deprived of the distinctness needful to the making of a nation. The adventurous Otho, its second Saxon king, who reclaimed Italy and revived the imperial sovereignty of Charlemagne, diminished the weight and dignity of his Germanic realm as much as he advanced himself and his successors in title and rank. By that elevation of its kings to a pseudo-Roman throne, Germany lost its own proper place in history, and was obscured by the shadow of an empire which soon existed as a shadow only. Its elective kings, forsaking the title of Kings of Germany, and calling themselves Kings of the Romans, even while they waited for an imperial coronation at the hands of the Pope, made the nationalizing of Germany, as France was being nationalized, by its monarchy, impossible.

For three centuries, the ambitions and the interests of the imperialized monarchy were ultramontane. Its Teutonic seat was a mere resting-place between Italian expeditions. Its quarrels with the Popes cast all questions of German politics into the background. It took no root in German feeling, rallied no national sentiment, gathered no increase of authority, sent out from itself no centralizing influences, judicial or administrative, to resist the dissolving forces of feudalism. And nowhere else in Europe was the action of those forces so destructive of political unity. That great Fatherland of the German peoples, where the slow solidification of a nation should have been going on as surely as in France, was crumbled by them into petty principalities, which time only hardened in their separateness.

When, at last, the crown came to be settled in one fast-rooted and enduring House, it was not fortunately placed. Territorially the Hapsburgs were planted on the verge of the Teutonic lands, where they fronted the Hungarians and the Slavs and were threatened by the approaching Turks. Speaking figuratively, they stood with their backs to Germany, facing their

*3d—5th centuries.
The wandering of the
nations.*

*5th—9th centuries.
Empire of the Franks.*

*A. D. 962.
The Holy Roman Empire.*

*10th—13th centuries.
Contests in Italy.*

A. D. 1273—1440.

*Rise of the House of
Hapsburg.*

greater dangers and their greater opportunities, ease and sorrow. Their king-
outside of the Teutonic line. Their immediate subjects were of many alien races, with few of German blood. Their king-
ship of Hungary was more substantial in its political weight than any Germanic sovereignty that they held. From the
beginning of its remarkable dynastic career, the House of Austria was in all respects quite at one side of the great people
whose crown had unhappily passed to its keeping. The emperor-kings, throned with less reality at Vienna than at Presburg
and Prague, lost more and more their German character, receded more and more from the range of German influence. Thus
Germany was robbed again of the centralizing constraints which a vigorous, rising monarchy of the true stamp, not falsified
by a fictitious imperialization, would have brought to bear upon it, for the unifying of a great nation.

The marriages which linked the Austrian House with the sovereign families of Burgundy and Spain only drew it
still farther away, and made it more alien than before to the people of the German North. The imperial government was
brought then under influences from Spain which opposed every tendency of their feeling and thought. While the strong
Teutonic mind worked its slow way towards personal freedom, — towards fearless inquiry and independent belief, — a contrary
movement went on in the Austrian court. Between Germany at large and the circle in which Vienna stood really a center and
a capital, a widening intellectual breach began when the Hapsburg brain was narrowed by the astringent blood of Castile. This
appeared, not alone in the rupture of the religious Reformation, but in all the advances that were made, from the sixteenth
century down, in science, philosophy, literature and art.

Some advance was always made; but the modern impulses which woke early in the German race were wastefully spent,
during many generations, for want of any national concentration. No large channel opened to them; no worthy spirit
directed them. The pettiness of petty politics and courts belittled in most ways, for a lamentable time, the workings of
German energy and genius.

The Thirty Years War made chaos in Germany complete. No semblance of substance in the empire remained. The
Kaiser had become a sovereign less honored than the King of France, and Vienna a capital less considered than Paris. But
the first nucleus of nationality took form in that chaos, when Brandenburg drew Prussia to itself, in the union which produced
a new kingdom at the North. The rise of Prussia was the rise of German nationality. It brought to bear on the German
people the first centralizing influence that had acted upon them since their kings took the crown of Rome. For the first time
in their history they felt the pull of a force which drew them towards common lines of action.

The aggrandizement of Prussia by Frederick the Great, though iniquitous when considered in itself, was splendid work
for Germany. It prepared, for the perils of the next generation, a power which Napoleon could humble at the moment, but
which he could not crush. It gave footing for the great heroic rally of the Germanic people, whereby they conquered their
place in the world and secured their future.

In all that has come to pass since Leipsic and Waterloo, the logical sequence is plainer than history is wont to show it.
From men of the first decade in this century, who put the school and the camp side by side in Prussian training, there came
more than from Bismarck or Moltke of the power which triumphed at Sadowa and Sedan, which has constructed a new and
true Empire of Germany, with its capital at Berlin, and which has dismissed Austria from German reckonings as mistress or
as rival, but to make of her an ally and a friend.

Within the last third of the nineteenth century, the Germans may be said to have opened a great national career, such as
the English, their kinsmen, had entered upon nearly two hundred years before. The energies of their powerful race have
been centered at last, and are acting with new potency, in commerce and colonization, abroad, and in all modes of human
advancement, at home.

A. D. 1477—1496.
*Burgundian and
Spanish marriages.*

A. D. 1619—1648.

A. D. 1678.
Brandenburg—Prussia.

A. D. 1740—1786.
Frederick the Great.

A. D. 1800—1813.
Struggle with Napoleon.

A. D. 1866.
The Seven Weeks War

A. D. 1870—1871.
*The Franco-German
War.*

A. D. 1871.
The Empire.

deed it were his home? In their ancient songs, their only way of remembering or recording the past, they celebrate an earth-born god, Tuisko, and his son Mannus, as the origin of their race, as their founders. To Mannus they assign three sons, from whose names, they say, the coast tribes are called Ingevoones; those of the interior, Herminones; all the rest, Istævoones. Some, with the freedom of conjecture permitted by antiquity, assert that the god had several descendants, and the nation several appellations, as Marsi, Gambrivii, Suevi, Vandilii, and that these are genuine old names. The name Germany, on the other hand, they say, is modern and newly introduced."—Tacitus, *Germany*; trans. by A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb, ch. 1-2.

B. C. 12-9.—Campaigns of Drusus.—The first serious advance of the Roman arms beyond the Rhine was made in the reign of Augustus, by the emperor's step-son, Drusus. Cæsar had crossed the river, only to chastise and terrify the tribes on the right bank which threatened Gaul. Agrippa, some years later, repeated the operation, and withdrew, as Cæsar had done. But Drusus invaded Germany with intentions of conquest and occupation. His first campaign was undertaken in the spring of the year 12 B. C. He crossed the Rhine and drove the Usipetes into their strongholds; after which he embarked his legions on transport ships and moved them down the river to the ocean, thence to coast northwards to the mouth of the Ems, and so penetrate to the heart of the enemy's country. To facilitate this bold movement, he had caused a channel to be cut from the Rhine, at modern Arnheim, to the Zuyder Zee, utilizing the river Yssel. The expedition was not successful and retreated overland from the Frisian coast after considerable disaster and loss. The next year, Drusus returned to the attack, marching directly into the German country and advancing to the banks of the Weser, but retreating, again, with little to show of substantial results. He established a fortified outpost, however, on the Lippe, and named it Aliso. During the same summer, he is said to have fixed another post in the country of the Chatti. Two years then passed before Drusus was again permitted by the emperor to cross the Rhine. On his third campaign he passed the Weser and penetrated the Hercynian forest as far as the Elbe,—the Germans declining everywhere to give him battle. Erecting a trophy on the bank of the Elbe, he retraced his steps, but suffered a fall from his horse, on the homeward march, which caused his death. "If the Germans were neither reduced to subjection, nor even overthrown in any decisive engagement, as the Romans vainly pretended, yet their spirit of aggression was finally checked and from thenceforth, for many generations, they were fully occupied with the task of defending themselves."—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 36.

B. C. 8—A. D. 11.—Campaigns of Tiberius.—The work of Roman conquest in Germany, left unfinished by Drusus, was taken up by his brother Tiberius (afterwards emperor) under the direction of Augustus. Tiberius crossed the Rhine, for the first time, B. C. 8. The frontier tribes made no resistance, but offered submission at once. Tiberius sent their chiefs to Augustus, then holding his court at Lugdunum (Lyons), to make terms with the emperor in person, and Augustus basely treated them as captives and

threw them into prison. The following year found the German tribes again under arms, and Tiberius again crossed the Rhine; but it was only to ravage the country, and not to remain. Then followed a period of ten years, during which the emperor's step-son, dissatisfied with his position and on ill terms with Augustus, retired to Rhodes. In the summer of A. D. 4, he returned to the command of the legions on the Rhine. Meantime, under other generals,—Domitius and Vini-cius,—they had made several campaigns beyond the river; had momentarily crossed the Elbe; had constructed a road to the outposts on the Weser; had fought the Cherusci, with doubtful results, but had not settled the Roman power in Germany. Tiberius invaded the country once more, with a powerful force, and seems to have crushed all resistance in the region between the lower Rhine and the Weser. The following spring, he repeated, with more success, the movement of Drusus by land and sea, sending a flotilla around to the Elbe and up that stream, to a point where it met and co-operated with a column moved overland, through the wilderness. A single battle was fought and the Germans defeated; but, once more, when winter approached, the Romans retired and no permanent conquest was made. Two years later (A. D. 6), Tiberius turned his arms against the powerful nation of the Marcomanni, which had removed itself from the German mark, or border, into the country formerly occupied by the Boii—modern Bohemia. Here, under their able chief Marbod, or Maroboduus, they developed a formidable military organization and became threatening to the Roman frontiers on the Upper Danube. Two converging expeditions, from the Danube and from the Rhine, were at the point of crushing the Marcomanni between them, when news of the alarming revolt, in Pannonia and Dalmatia, called the "Batonian War," caused the making of a hasty peace with Maroboduus. The Batonian or Pannonian war occupied Tiberius for nearly three years. He had just brought it to a close, when intelligence reached Rome of a disaster in Germany which filled the empire with horror and dismay. The tribes in northwestern Germany, between the lower Rhine and the Elbe, supposed to be cowed and submissive, had now found a leader who could unite them and excite them to disdain the Roman yoke. This leader was Arminius, or Hermann, a young chief of the Cherusci, who had been trained in the Roman military service and admitted to Roman citizenship, but who hated the oppressors of his country with implacable bitterness. The scheme of insurrection organized by Arminius was made easy of execution by the insolent carelessness and the incapacity of the Roman commander in Germany, L. Quintilius Varus. It succeeded so well that Varus and his army,—three entire legions, horse, foot and auxiliaries,—probably 20,000 men in all,—were overwhelmed in the Teutoburger Wald, north of the Lippe, and destroyed. Only a few skulking fugitives reached the Rhine and escaped to tell the fate of the rest. This was late in the summer of A. D. 9. In the following spring Tiberius was sent again to the Rhine-frontier, with as powerful a levy of men and equipments as the empire could collect. He was accompanied by his nephew, Germanicus, son of Drusus, destined to be his successor in the field of German conquest. But dread and fear were

in the Roman heart, and the campaign of Tiberius, delayed another twelve months, until A. D. 11, was conducted too cautiously to accomplish any important result. He traversed and ravaged a considerable region of the German country, but withdrew again across the Rhine and left it, apparently, unoccupied. This was his last campaign. Returning to Rome, he waited only two years longer for the imperial sovereignty to which he succeeded on the death of Augustus, who had made him, by adoption, his son and his heir.—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 36-38.

ALSO IN: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 1.—Sir E. Creasy, *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World*, ch. 5.—T. Smith, *Arminius*, pt. 1, ch. 4-6.

A. D. 14-16.—Campaigns of Germanicus.—Germanicus—the son of Drusus—was given the command on the Rhine at the beginning of the year 13 A. D. The following year, Augustus died and Tiberius became emperor; whereupon Germanicus found himself no longer restrained from crossing the river and assuming the offensive against Arminius and his tribes. His first movement, that autumn, was up the valley of the Lippe, which he laid waste, far and wide. The next spring, he led one column, from Mentz, against the Chatti, as far as the upper branches of the Weser, while he sent another farther north to chastise the Cherusci and the Marsi, surprising and massacring the latter at their feast of Tanfana. Later in the same year, he penetrated, by a double expedition,—moving by sea and by land, as his father had done before,—to the country between the Ems and the Lippe, and laid waste the territory of the Bructeri, and their neighbors. He also visited the spot where the army of Varus had perished, and erected a monument to the dead. On the return from this expedition, four legions, under Cæcina, were beset in the same manner that Varus had been, and under like difficulties; but their commander was of different stuff and brought them safely through, after punishing his pursuers severely. But the army had been given up as lost, and only the resolute opposition of Agrippina, the wife of Germanicus, had prevented the Roman commander at Vetera, on the Rhine, from destroying the bridge there, and abandoning the legions to their supposed fate. In the spring of A. D. 16, Germanicus again embarked his army, 80,000 strong, at the mouth of the Rhine, on board transports, and moved it to the mouth of the Ems, where the fleet remained. Thence he marched up the Ems and across to the Weser, and was encountered, in the country of the Cherusci, by a general levy of the German tribes, led by Arminius and Inguomerus. Two great battles were fought, in which the Romans were victorious. But, when returning from this campaign, the fleet encountered a storm in which so much of it perished, with the troops on board, that the disaster threw a heavy cloud of gloom over the triumph of Germanicus. The young general was soon afterwards recalled, and three years later he died,—of poison, as is supposed,—at Antioch. “The central government ceased from this time to take any warm interest in the subjugation of the Germans; and the dissensions of their states and princes, which peace was not slow in developing, attracted no Roman emissaries to the barbarian camps, and rarely led the

legions beyond the frontier, which was now allowed to recede finally to the Rhine.”—C. Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, ch. 42.

ALSO IN: T. Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, bk. 8, ch. 1.—T. Smith, *Arminius*, pt. 1, ch. 7.

3d Century.—Beginning of the “Wandering of the Nations.”—“Towards the middle of the third century, . . . a change becomes perceptible in the relations and attitude of the German peoples. Many of the nations, which have been celebrated in the annals of the classical writers, disappear silently from history; new races, new combinations and confederacies start into life, and the names which have achieved an imperishable notoriety from their connection with the long decay and the overthrow of the Roman Empire, come forward, and still survive. On the soil whereon the Sigambri, Marsi, Chauci, and Cherusci had struggled to preserve a rude independence, Franks and Saxons lived free and formidable; Alemanni were gathered along the foot of the Roman wall which connected the Danube with the Rhine, and had, hitherto, preserved inviolate the Agri decumates; while eastern Germany, allured by the hope of spoil, or impelled by external pressure, precipitated itself under the collective term of Goths upon the shrinking settlements of the Dacia and the Danube. The new appellations which appear in western Germany in the third century have not unnaturally given rise to the presumption that unknown peoples had penetrated through the land, and overpowered the ancient tribes, and national vanity has contributed to the delusion. As the Burgundians . . . were flattered by being told they were descendants of Roman colonists, so the barbarian writers of a later period busied their imaginations in the solitude of monastic life to enhance the glory of their countrymen, by the invention of what their inkling of classical knowledge led them to imagine a more illustrious origin. . . . Fictions like these may be referred to as an index of the time when the young barbarian spirit, eager after fame, and incapable of balancing probabilities, first gloated over the marvels of classical literature, though its refined and delicate beauties eluded their grosser taste; but they require no critical examination; there are no grounds for believing that Franks, Saxons, or Alemanni, were other than the original inhabitants of the country, though there is a natural difficulty arising from the want of written contemporary evidence in tracing the transition, and determining the tribes of which the new confederacies were formed. At the same time, though no immigration of strangers was possible, a movement of a particular tribe was not unfrequent. The constant internal dissensions of the Germans, combined with their spirit of warlike enterprise, led to frequent domestic wars; and the vanquished sometimes chose rather to seek an asylum far from their native soil, where they might live in freedom, than continue as bondmen or tributaries to the conqueror. Of such a nature were the wanderings of the Usipites and Teuchteri [Tenchteri] in Cæsar’s time, the removal of the Ubii from Nassau to the neighbourhood of Cöln and Xanthén; and to this must be ascribed the appearance of the Burgundians, who had dwelt beyond the Oder, in the vicinity of the Main and the Necker. Another class of national emigrations, were those which implied a final abandonment of the native Germany with the object of

seeking a new settlement among the possessions of the sinking empire. Those of the Goths, Vandals, Alans, Sueves, the second movement of the Burgundians, may be included in this category; the invasions of the Franks, Alemanni, and Saxons, on the contrary, cannot be called national emigrations, for they never abandoned, with their families, their original birthplace; their outwanderings, like the emigrations of the present day, were partial; their occupation of the enemy's territory was, in character, military and progressive; and, with the exception of the Anglo-Saxon settlement in Britain, their connection with the original stock was never interrupted. In all the migrations of German peoples spoken of from Cæsar downwards, the numbers of the emigrants appear to be enormously exaggerated. The Usipites and Teuchteri are estimated by Cæsar at 430,000 souls. How could such a multitude find nourishment during a three years' wandering? If 80,000 Burgundian Wehrmen came to the Rhine to the assistance of Valentinian, as Cassiodorus, Jerome, and other chroniclers state, the numbers of the whole nation must have approached 400,000, and it is impossible to believe that such a mass could obtain support in the narrow district lying between the Alemanni, the Hermunduri, and the Chatti. In other cases, vague expressions, and still more the wonderful achievements of the Germans in the course of their emigrations, have led to the supposition of enormous numbers; but Germany could not find nourishment for the multitudes which have been ascribed to it. Corn at that period was little cultivated; it was not the food of the people, whose chief support was flesh. . . . The conquests of the barbarians may be ascribed as much to the weakness of their adversaries, to their want of energy and union, as to their own strength. There was, in fact, no enemy to meet them in the field; and their domination was, at least, as acceptable to the provincial inhabitants as that of the imbecile, but rapacious ministers of the Roman government. . . . It was not the lust of wandering, but the influence of external circumstances which brought them to the vicinity of the Danube: at first the aggressions of the Romans, then the pressure of the Huns and the Slavonic tribes. The whole intercourse of Germany with Rome must be considered as one long war, which began with the invasion of Cæsar; which, long restrained by the superior power of the enemy, warmed with his growing weakness, and only ended with the extinction of the Roman name. The wars of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, were only a continuance of the ancient hostility. There might be partial truce, or occasional intermission; some tribes might be almost extirpated by the sword; some, for a time, bought off by money; but Rome was the universal enemy, and much of the internal restlessness of the Germans was no more than the natural movement towards the hostile borders. As the invasion of northern Germany gave rise to the first great northern union, so the conquest of Dacia brought Goths from the Vistula to the south, while the erection of the giant wall naturally gathered the Suevic tribes along its limits, only waiting for the opportunity to break through. Step by step this battle of centuries was fought; from the time of Caracalla the flood turned, wave followed wave like the encroaching tide, and the ancient landmarks receded bit by bit, till Rome

itself was buried beneath the waters. . . . Three great confederacies of German tribes, more or less united by birth, position, interest, or language, may be discerned, during this period, in immediate contact with the Romans—the Alemanni, the Goths, and the Franks. A fourth, the Saxons, was chiefly known from its maritime voyages off the coast of Gaul and Britain. There were also many independent peoples which cannot be enumerated among any of the political confederacies, but which acted for themselves, and pursued their individual ends: such were the Burgundians, the Alans, the Vandals, and the Lombards.”—T. Smith, *Arminius*, pt. 2, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: R. G. Latham, *Nationalities of Europe*, v. 2, ch. 21.—See, also, ALEMANNI; MARCOMANNI; QUADI; GOTHs; GEPIDÆ; SAXONS; ANGOLES, FRANKS; BURGUNDIANS; VANDALS; SUEVI; LOMBARDS; and, also, Appendix A, vol. 5.

A. D. 277.—Invasion by Probus.—The vigorous emperor Probus, who, in the year 277, drove from Gaul the swarms of invaders that had ravaged the unhappy province with impunity for two years past, then crossed the Rhine and harried the country of the marauders, as far as the Elbe and the Neckar. “Germany, exhausted by the ill success of the last emigration, was astonished by his presence. Nine of the most considerable princes repaired to his camp and fell prostrate at his feet. Such a treaty was humbly received by the Germans as it pleased the conqueror to dictate.” Probus then caused a stone wall, strengthened at intervals with towers, to be built from the Danube, near Neustadt and Ratisbon, to Wimpfen on the Neckar, and thence to the Rhine, for the protection of the settlers of the “Agri Decumates.” But the wall was thrown down, a few years afterwards, by the Alemanni.—E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 12.

5th Century.—Conversion of the Franks. See CHRISTIANITY: A. D. 496-800.

A. D. 481-768.—Acquisition of supremacy by the Franks.—The original dominions of Clovis, or Chlodwig—with whose reign the career of the Franks as a consolidated people began—corresponded nearly to the modern kingdom of Belgium. His first conquests were from the Romans, in the neighboring parts of Gaul, and when those were finished, “the king of the Franks began to look round upon the other German nations settled upon its soil, with a view to the further extension of his power. A quarrel with the Alemanni supplied the first opportunity for the gratification of his ambition. For more than a century the Alemanni had been in undisturbed possession of Alsace, and the adjoining districts; Mainz, Worms, Speyer, Strasburg, Basel, Constanx, Bregenz, lay within their territory. . . . The Vosegen range was a bulwark on the side of Gaul, waste lands separated them from the Burgundians, who were settled about the Jura and in the south-west part of Helvetia, and the Moselle divided them from the Ripuarian Franks. It is unknown whether they formed a state distinct from their brethren on the right of the Rhine; probably such was the case, for the Alemanni, at all times, were divided into separate tribes, between which, however, was generally a common union; nor is it certain whether the Alsatian Alemanni were under one or several Adelings; a single king is mentioned as having fallen in the battle with Chlodwig, who may have been merely an elected

military leader. Equally obscure is the cause of their war with Chlodwig, though it has been assumed, perhaps too hastily, by all recent historians, that the Frank king became involved in it as an ally of the Ripuarians. The Ripuarian Franks were settled, as the name imports, upon the banks of the Rhine, from the Moselle downwards; their chief seat was the city of Cologne. It is probable that they consisted of the remains of the ancient Ubii, strengthened by the adventurers who crossed over on the first invasion, and the name implies that they were regarded by the Romans as a kind of limiteman soldiery. For, in the common parlance of the Romans of that period, the tract of land lying along the Rhine was called Ripa, in an absolute sense, and even the river itself was not unfrequently denominated by the same title. Ripuarii are Ripa-wehren, Hreop, or Hrepa-wehren, defenders of the shore. About the close of the fifth century these Ripuarii were under the government of a king, named Sigebert, usually called 'the lance.' The story told by modern writers is, that this Sigebert, having fallen into dispute with the Alemanni, called upon Chlodwig for assistance, a call which the young king willingly listened to. The Alemanni had invaded the Ripuarian territory, and advanced within a short distance of Cologne, when Chlodwig and his Franks joined the Ripuarii; a battle took place at Zülpich, about twenty-two English miles from Cologne, which, after a fierce struggle, ended in the defeat of the Alemanni. . . . Chlodwig was following up his victory over the Alemanni, perhaps with unnecessary ferocity, when he was stopped in his course by a flattering embassy from the great Theodorich. Many of the Alemanni had submitted, after the death of their chief, on the field of battle. 'Spare us,' they cried, 'for we are now thy people!' but there were many who, abhorring the Frank yoke, fled towards the south, and threw themselves under the protection of the Ostrogothic king, who had possessed himself of the ancient Rætia and Vindelicia."—T. Smith, *Arminius*, pt. 2, ch. 4.—The sons of Clovis pushed their conquests on the Germanic as well as on the Gallic side of the Rhine. Theodorik, or Theuderik, who reigned at Metz, with the aid of his brother Clotaire, or Chlothar, of Soissons, subjugated the Thuringians, between A. D. 515 and 528. "How he [Theuderik] acquired authority over the Alemans and the Bavarians is not known. Perhaps in the subjugation of Thuringia he had taken occasion to extend his sway over other nations; but from this time forth we find not only these, but the Saxons more to the north, regarded as the associates or tributaries of the Eastern or Ripuarian Franks. From the Elbe to the Meuse, and from the Northern Ocean to the sources of the Rhine, a region comprising a great part of ancient Germany, the ascendancy of the Franks was practically acknowledged, and a kingdom was formed [Austrasia—Oster-rike—the Eastern Kingdom] which was destined to overshadow all the other Mérovingian states. The various tribes which composed its Germanic accretions, remote and exempt from the influences of the Roman civilization, retained their fierce customs and their rude superstitions, and continued to be governed by their hereditary dukes; but their wild masses marched under the standards of the Franks, and conceded to those formidable conquerors a certain degree of political suprem-

acy." When, in 558, Clotaire, by the death of his brothers, became the sole king of the Franks, his empire embraced all Roman Gaul, except Septimania, still held by the Visigoths, and Brittany, but slightly subjected; "while in ancient Germany, from the Rhine to the Weser, the powerful duchies of the Alemans, the Thuringians, the Bavarians, the Frisons, and the Saxons, were regarded not entirely as subject, and yet as tributary provinces." During the next century and a half, the feebleness of the Merovingians lost their hold upon these German tributaries. "As early as the time of Chlothar II. the Langobards had recovered their freedom; under Dagobert [622-638], the Saxons; under Sighebert II. [638-656], the Thuringians; and now, during the late broils [670-687], the Alemans, the Bavarians and the Frisons." But the vigorous Mayors of the Palace, Pepin Heristal and Karl Martel, applied themselves resolutely to the restoration of the Frank supremacy, in Germany as well as in Aquitaine. Pepin "found the task nearly impossible. Time and again he assailed the Frisons, the Saxons, the Bavarians, and the Alemans, but could bind them to no truce nor peace for any length of time. No less than ten times the Frisons resumed their arms, while the revolts of the others were so incessant that he was compelled to abandon all hope of recovering the southern or Roman part of Gaul, in order to direct his attention exclusively to the Germans. The aid which he received from the Christian missionaries rendered him more successful among them. Those intrepid propagandists pierced where his armies could not. . . . The Franks and the Popes of Rome had a common interest in this work of the conversion of the Germans, the Franks to restrain irruptions, and the Popes to carry their spiritual sway over Europe." Pepin left these unfinished German wars to his son Karl, the Hammer, and Karl prosecuted them with characteristic energy during his first years of power. "Almost every month he was forced into some expedition beyond the Rhine. . . . The Alemans, the Bavarians, and the Frisons, he succeeded in subjecting to a formal confession at least of the Frankish supremacy; but the turbulent and implacable Saxons baffled his most strenuous efforts. Their wild tribes had become, within a few years, a powerful and numerous nation; they had appropriated the lands of the Thuringians and Hassi, or Catti, and joined to themselves other confederations and tribes; and, stretching from the Rhine to the Elbe, offered their marshes and forests a free asylum to all the persecuted sectaries of Odhinn, to all the lovers of native and savage independence. Six times in succession the armies of Karl penetrated the wilderness they called their home, ravaging their fields and burning their cabins, but the Saxon war was still renewed. He left it to the energetic labors of other conquerors, to Christian missionaries, . . . to break the way of civilization into those rude and darkened realms." Karl's sons Pepin and Karloman crushed revolts of the Alemans, or Suabians, and the Bavarians in 742, and Karloman humbled the Saxons in a great campaign (744), compelling them in large numbers to submit to Christian baptism. After that, Germany waited for its first entire master—Charlemagne.—P. Godwin, *Hist. of France: Ancient Gaul*, ch. 12-15.

ALSO IN: W. C. Perry, *The Franks*, ch. 2-6.—See, also, FRANKS, and AUSTRASIA.

A. D. 687-800.—Rise of the Carolingians and the Empire of Charlemagne.—"Towards the close of the Merovingian period, . . . the kingdom of the Franks . . . was divided into four great districts, or kingdoms as they were called: Austrasia, or the eastern kingdom, from the river Rhine to the Meuse, with Metz as its principal city; Neustria, or the western kingdom, extending from Austrasia to the ocean on the west, and to the Loire on the south; Aquitaine, south of that river to the foot of the Pyrenees; and Burgundy, from the Rhone to the Alps, including Switzerland. These four kingdoms became, before the extinction of the Merovingian race, consolidated into two,—viz., Austrasia and Neustria, Eastern and Western Francia,—modern Germany and modern France, roughly speaking,—of which the first was to gain the pre-eminence, as it was the seat of the power of that race of Charlemagne which seized upon the kingdoms of the Merovingians. But in these kingdoms, while the family of Clovis occupied them, the royal power became more and more feeble as time went on, a condition which is illustrated by the title given in history to these kings,—that of 'rois fainéants.' . . . The most powerful officer of a Frankish king was his steward, or, as he was called, the mayor of his palace. . . . In Austrasia the office had become hereditary in the family of Pepin of Landen (a small village near Liège), and under its guidance the degenerate children of Clovis in that kingdom fought for the supremacy with those equally degenerate in Neustria, at that time also under the real control of another mayor of the palace, called Ebroin. The result of this struggle, after much bloodshed and misery, was reached in the year 687 at the battle of Testry, in which the Austrasians completely defeated the Neustrians. . . . The Merovingian princes were still nominally kings, while all the real power was in the hands of the descendants of Pepin of Landen, mayors of the palace, and the policy of government was as fully settled by them as if they had been kings *de jure* as well as *de facto*. This family produced in its earlier days some persons who have become among the most conspicuous figures in history:—Pepin, the founder; Pepin le Gros, of Héristal; Charles, his son, commonly called Martel, or the Hammerer; Pepin le Bref, under whom the Carolingian dynasty was, by aid of the Pope, recognized as the lawful successor of the Merovingians, even before the extinction of that race; and, lastly, Charles, surnamed the Great, or Charlemagne, one of the few men of the human race who, by common consent, have occupied the foremost rank in history. . . . The object of Pepin of Héristal was two-fold,—to repress the disposition of the turbulent nobles to encroach upon the royal authority, and to bring again under the yoke of the Franks those tribes in Germany who had revolted against the Frankish rule owing to the weakness of the Merovingian government. He measurably accomplished both objects. . . . He seems to have had what perhaps is the best test at all times of the claims of a man to be a real statesman: some consciousness of the true nature of his mission,—the establishment of order. . . . His son and successor, Charles Martel, was even more conspicuous for the possession of this genius of statesmanship, but he exhibited it in a somewhat different direction. He, too, strove to hold

the nobles in check, and to break the power of the Frisian and the Saxon tribes; and he fought besides, fortunately for his fame, one of the fifteen decisive battles in the history of the world, that of Poitiers, in 732, by which the Saracens, who had conquered Spain, and who had strong hopes of gaining possession of the whole of Western Europe, were driven back from Northern France, never to return. . . . His son, Pepin le Bref, is equally conspicuous with the rest in history, but in a somewhat different way. He continued the never-ending wars in Germany and in Gaul with the object of securing peace by the sword, and with more or less success. But his career is noteworthy principally because he completed the actual deposition of the last of the Merovingian race, whose nominal servants but real masters he and his predecessors, mayors of the palace, had been, and because he sought and obtained the sanction of the Church for this usurpation. . . . The Pope's position at this time was one of very great embarrassment. Harassed by the Lombards, who were not only robbers, but who were also Arians, and who admitted none of the Catholic clergy to their councils,—with no succor from the Emperors at Constantinople (whose subject he nominally was) against the Lombards, and, indeed, in open revolt against them because as bishop and patriarch of the West he had forbidden the execution of the decree against the placing of images in the churches,—for these and many such reasons he sorely needed succor, and naturally in his necessity he turned to the powerful King of the Franks. The coronation of Pepin le Bref, first by St. Boniface, and then by the Pope himself, was the first step in the fulfilment of the alliance on his part. Pepin was soon called upon to do his share of the work. Twice at the bidding of the Pope he descended from the Alps, and, defeating the Lombards, was rewarded by him and the people of Rome with the title of Patrician. . . . On the death of Pepin, the Lombards again took up arms and harassed the Church's territory. Charlemagne, his successor, was called upon to come to the rescue, and he swept the Lombard power in Italy out of existence, annexing its territory to the Frankish kingdom, and confirming the grant of the Exarchate and of the Pentapolis which his father had made to the Popes. This was in the year 774. . . . For twenty-five years Charlemagne ruled Rome nominally as Patrician, under the supremacy, equally nominal, of the Emperor at Constantinople. The true sovereign, recognized as such, was the Pope or Bishop of Rome, but the actual power was in the hands of the mob, who at one time towards the close of the century, in the absence of both Emperor and Patrician, assaulted the Pope while conducting a procession, and forced him to abandon the city. This Pope, Leo, with a fine instinct as to the quarter from which succor could alone come, hurried to seek Charlemagne, who was then in Germany engaged in one of his never-ending wars against the Saxons. The appeal for aid was not made in vain, and Charles descended once more from the Alps in the summer of 799, with his Frankish hosts. On Christmas day, A. D. 800, in the Church of St. Peter . . . Pope Leo, during the mass, and after the reading of the gospel, placed upon the brow of Charlemagne, who had abandoned his northern furs for the dress of a Roman patrician, the diadem of

the Cæsars, and hailed him Imperator Semper Augustus, while the multitude shouted, 'Carolo, Augusto a Deo coronato magno et pacifico Imperatori Vita et Victoria.' In that shout and from that moment one of the most fruitful epochs of history begins."—C. J. Stillé, *Studies in Mediæval History*, ch. 3.—See, also, FRANKS: A. D. 768-814.

A. D. 800.—Charlemagne's restoration of the Roman Empire.—"Three hundred and twenty-four years had passed since the last Cæsar of the West resigned his power into the hands of the senate, and left to his Eastern brother the sole headship of the Roman world. To the latter Italy had from that time been nominally subject; but it was only during one brief interval, between the death of Totila the last Ostrogothic king and the descent of Alboin the first Lombard, that his power had been really effective. In the further provinces, Gaul, Spain, Britain, it was only a memory. But the idea of a Roman Empire as a necessary part of the world's order had not vanished: it had been admitted by those who seemed to be destroying it; it had been cherished by the Church; was still recalled by laws and customs; was dear to the subject populations, who fondly looked back to the days when slavery was at least mitigated by peace and order. . . . Both the extinction of the Western Empire in [A. D. 476] . . . and its revival in A. D. 800 have been very generally misunderstood in modern times. . . . When Odoacer compelled the abdication of Romulus Augustulus, he did not abolish the Western Empire as a separate power, but caused it to be reunited with or sink into the Eastern, so that from that time there was, as there had been before Diocletian, a single undivided Roman Empire. In A. D. 800 the very memory of the separate Western Empire, as it had stood from the death of Theodosius till Odoacer, had, so far as appears, been long since lost, and neither Leo nor Charles nor any one among their advisers dreamt of reviving it. They, too, like their predecessors, held the Roman Empire to be one and indivisible, and proposed by the coronation of the Frankish king, not to proclaim a severance of the East and West, but to reverse the act of Constantine, and make Old Rome again the civil as well as the ecclesiastical capital of the Empire that bore her name. . . . Although therefore we must in practice speak during the next seven centuries (down till A. D. 1453, when Constantinople fell before the Mohammedan) of an Eastern and a Western Empire, the phrase is in strictness incorrect, and was one which either court ought to have repudiated. The Byzantines always did repudiate it; the Latins usually; although, yielding to facts, they sometimes condescended to employ it themselves. But their theory was always the same. Charles was held to be the legitimate successor, not of Romulus Augustulus, but of Basil, Heraclius, Justinian, Arcadius, and all the Eastern line. . . . North Italy and Rome ceased for ever to own the supremacy of Byzantium; and while the Eastern princes paid a shameful tribute to the Mussulman, the Frankish Emperor—as the recognised head of Christendom—received from the patriarch of Jerusalem the keys of the Holy Sepulchre and the banner of Calvary; the gift of the Sepulchre itself, says Eginhard, from Aaron king of the Persians [the Caliph Haroun el Rashid]. . . . Four centuries

later, when Papacy and Empire had been forced into the mortal struggle by which the fate of both was decided, three distinct theories regarding the coronation of Charles will be found advocated by three different parties, all of them plausible, all of them to some extent misleading. The Swabian Emperors held the crown to have been won by their great predecessor as the prize of conquest, and drew the conclusion that the citizens and bishop of Rome had no rights as against themselves. The patriotic party among the Romans, appealing to the early history of the Empire, declared that by nothing but the voice of their senate and people could an Emperor be lawfully created, he being only their chief magistrate, the temporary depositary of their authority. The Popes pointed to the indisputable fact that Leo imposed the crown, and argued that as God's earthly vicar it was then his, and must always continue to be their right to give to whomsoever they would an office which was created to be the handmaid of their own. Of these three it was the last view that eventually prevailed."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 4-5.

ALSO IN: J. I. Mombert, *Hist. of Charles the Great*, ch. 14.—See, also, FRANKS: A. D. 768-814.

A. D. 805.—Conquest of the Avars.—Creation of the Austrian March. See AVARS, and AUSTRIA: A. D. 805-1246.

A. D. 814-843.—Division of the Empire of Charlemagne.—"There was a manifest conflict, during his later years, in the court, in the councils, in the mind of Charlemagne [who died in 814], between the King of the Franks and the Emperor of the West; between the dissociating, independent Teutonic principle, and the Roman principle of one code, one dominion, one sovereign. The Church, though Teutonic in descent, was Roman in the sentiment of unity. . . . That unity had been threatened by the proclaimed division of the realm between the sons of Charlemagne. The old Teutonic usage of equal distribution seemed doomed to prevail over the august unity of the Roman Empire. What may appear more extraordinary, the kingdom of Italy was the inferior appanage: it carried not with it the Empire, which was still to retain a certain supremacy; that was reserved for the Teutonic sovereign. It might seem as if this were but the continuation of the Lombard kingdom, which Charlemagne still held by the right of conquest. It was bestowed on Pepin; after his death entrusted to Bernhard, Pepin's illegitimate but only son. Wiser counsels prevailed. The two elder sons of Charlemagne died without issue; Louis the third son was summoned from his kingdom of Aquitaine, and solemnly crowned [813] at Aix-la-Chapelle, as successor to the whole Empire."—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, bk. 5, ch. 2 (v. 2).—"Instead of being preoccupied with the care of keeping the empire united, Louis divided it in the year 817 by giving kingdoms to his three sons. The eldest, Lothaire, had Italy; Louis, Bavaria; Pepin, Aquitaine. A nephew of the emperor, Bernard, imagined himself wronged by this partition, and took up arms to hold Italy. Vanquished without striking a blow, he delivered himself up to his uncle, who caused his eyes to be put out. He expired under that torture. Louis reproached himself later for that cruel death, and to expiate it, subjected himself to a public penance. In

823, there was born to him a fourth son. To make him a sharer of his inheritance, the emperor, annulling in 829 the partition of 817, gave him Germany, thus depriving his elder sons of part of the inheritance previously assigned them. This provoked the resentment of those princes; they rose in rebellion against their father, and the rest of the reign of Louis was only a succession of impious contests with his turbulent sons. In 833, he deposed Pepin, and gave his kingdom of Aquitaine to his youngest born, Charles. Twice deposed himself, and twice restored, Louis only emerged from the cloister, for which he was so well fitted, to repeat the same faults. When Louis the Good-natured died in 840, it was not his cause only which he had lost through his weakness, but that of the empire. Those intestine quarrels presaged its dismemberment, which ere long happened. The sons of Louis, to serve their own ambition, had revived the national antipathies of the different races. Lothaire placed himself at the head of the Italians; Louis rallied the Germans round him, and Charles the Bald the Franks of Gaul, who were henceforward called Frenchmen. Those three peoples aspired to break up the union whose bond Charlemagne had imposed upon them, as the three brothers aspired to form each for himself a kingdom. The question was decided at the great battle of Fontanet, near Auxerre, in 841. Lothaire, who fought therein for the preservation of the empire and of his authority, was conquered. By the treaty of Verdun [843—see VERDUN, TREATY OF] it was decided that Louis should have Germany to the east of the Rhine; Charles, France to the west of the Scheldt, the Meuse, the Saone, and the Rhone; finally, Lothaire, Italy, with the long range of country comprised between the Alps and the Cevennes, the Jura, the Saone, the Rhine, and the Meuse, which from his name was called Lotharingia. This designation is still to be traced in one of the recently French provinces, Lorraine.”—S. Menzies, *Hist. of Europe from the Decadence of the Western Empire to the Reformation*, ch. 13.

A. D. 843.—Accession of Louis II.

A. D. 843-962.—Treaty of Verdun.—Definite separation from France.—The kingdom of the East Franks.—The partition of the empire of Charlemagne among his three grandsons, by the Treaty of Verdun, A. D. 843 (see VERDUN, TREATY OF; also, FRANKS: A. D. 814-962), gave to Charles the Bald a kingdom which nearly coincided with France, as afterwards existing under that name, “before its Burgundian and German annexations. It also founded a kingdom which roughly answered to the later Germany before its great extension to the East at the expense of the Slavonic nations. And as the Western kingdom was formed by the addition of Aquitaine to the Western Francia, so the Eastern kingdom was formed by the addition of the Eastern Francia to Bavaria. Lewis of Bavaria [surnamed ‘the German’] became king of a kingdom which we are tempted to call the kingdom of Germany. Still it would as yet be premature to speak of France at all, or even to speak of Germany, except in the geographical sense. The two kingdoms are severally the kingdoms of the Eastern and of the Western Franks. . . . The Kings had no special titles, and their dominions had no special names recognized in formal use. Every king who ruled over any part of the ancient Francia

was a king of the Franks. . . . The Eastern part of the Frankish dominions, the lot of Lewis the German and his successors, is thus called the Eastern Kingdom, the Teutonic Kingdom. Its king is the King of the East-Franks, sometimes simply the King of the Eastern men, sometimes the King of Germany. . . . The title of King of Germany is often found in the ninth century as a description, but it was not a formal title. The Eastern king, like other kings, for the most part simply calls himself ‘Rex,’ till the time came when his rank as King of Germany, or of the East-Franks, became simply a step towards the higher title of Emperor of the Romans. . . . This Eastern or German kingdom, as it came out of the division of 887 [after the deposition of Charles III., called Charles the Fat, who came to the throne in 881, and who had momentarily reunited all the Frankish crowns, except that of Burgundy], had, from north to south, nearly the same extent as the Germany of later times. It stretched from the Alps to the Eider. Its southern boundaries were somewhat fluctuating. Verona and Aquileia are sometimes counted as a German march, and the boundary between Germany and Burgundy, crossing the modern Switzerland, often changed. To the north-east the kingdom hardly stretched beyond the Elbe, except in the small Saxon land between the Elbe and the Eider [called ‘Saxony beyond the Elbe’—modern Holstein]. The great extension of the German power over the Slavonic lands beyond the Elbe had hardly yet begun. To the south-east lay the two border-lands or marks; the Eastern Mark, which grew into the later duchy of Oesterreich or the modern Austria, and to the south of it the mark of Kärnthen or Carinthia. But the main part of the kingdom consisted of the great duchies of Saxony, Eastern Francia, Alemannia, and Bavaria. Of these the two names of Saxony and Bavaria must be carefully marked as having widely different meanings from those which they bear on the modern map. Ancient Saxony lies, speaking roughly, between the Eider, the Elbe, and the Rhine, though it never actually touches the last-named river. To the south of Saxony lies the Eastern Francia, the centre and kernel of the German kingdom. The Main and the Neckar both join the Rhine within its borders. To the south of Francia lie Alemannia and Bavaria. This last, it must be remembered, borders on Italy, with Bötzen for its frontier town. Alemannia is the land in which both the Rhine and the Danube take their source; it stretches on both sides of the Bodensee or Lake of Constanx, with the Rætian Alps as its southern boundary. For several ages to come, there is no distinction, national or even provincial, between the lands north and south of the Bodensee.”—E. A. Freeman, *Historical Geog. of Europe*, ch. 6, sect. 1.

ALSO IN: Sir F. Palgrave, *Hist. of Normandy and England*, v. 1-2.—On the indefiniteness of the name of the Germanic kingdom in this period, see FRANCE: 9TH CENTURY.

A. D. 881.—Accession of Charles III. (called The Fat), afterwards King of all the Franks and Emperor.

A. D. 888.—Accession of Arnulf, afterwards Emperor.

A. D. 899.—Accession of Louis III. (called The Child).

A. D. 911.—Election of Conrad I.

A. D. 911-936.—Conrad the Franconian and Henry the Fowler.—Beginning of the Saxon line.—Hungarian invasion.—The building of towns.—In 911, on the death of Louis, surnamed the Child, the German or East-Frank branch of the dynasty of Charlemagne had become extinct. "There remained indeed Charles the Simple, acknowledged as king in some parts of France, but rejected in others, and possessing no personal claims to respect. The Germans therefore wisely determined to chose a sovereign from among themselves. They were at this time divided into five nations, each under its own duke, and distinguished by difference of laws, as well as of origin; the Franks, whose territory, comprising Franconia and the modern Palatinate, was considered as the cradle of the empire, and who seem to have arrogated some superiority over the rest, the Suabians, the Bavarians, the Saxons . . . and the Lorrainers, who occupied the left bank of the Rhine as far as its termination. The choice of these nations in their general assembly fell upon Conrad, duke of Franconia, according to some writers, or at least a man of high rank, and descended through females from Charlemagne. Conrad dying without male issue, the crown of Germany was bestowed [A. D. 919] upon Henry the Fowler, duke of Saxony, ancestor of the three Othos, who followed him in direct succession. To Henry, and to the first Otho [A. D. 936-973], Germany was more indebted than to any sovereign since Charlemagne."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 5.—"In 924, the Hungarians, who were as much dreaded as the angel of destruction, re-appeared. They came from the grassy plains of Hungary, mounted on small and ugly, but strong horses, and swept along the Danube like a hailstorm. Wherever they came they set fire to farms, hamlets, and towns, and killed all living creatures or carried them off. And often they bound their prisoners to the tails of their horses, and dragged them along till they died from the dreadful torture. Their very figures inspired disgust and terror, for their faces were brown, and disfigured by scars to absolute hideousness; their heads were shaven, and brutal ferocity and rapacity shone out of their deep-set eyes. And though the Germans fought bravely, these enemies always overmatched them, because they appeared now here, now there, on their fleet horses, and fell upon isolated districts before they were expected or could be stopped. . . . When on a sudden the terrible cry, 'The Hungarians are coming, the Hungarians are coming,' resounded through the land, all fled who could, as if the wild legions of hell were marching through Saxony and Thuringia. King Henry, however, would not fly, but encountered them in combat, like a true knight. Yet he lost the battle, either because he was ill, or because his soldiers were too few, and unaccustomed to the enemy's mode of fighting, which enabled them to conquer while they were fleeing. Henry was obliged to shut himself up in the royal palace of Werla, near Goslar, which he bravely defended. The Hungarians stormed it again and again, but they could not scale the walls; while Henry's men by a daring sally took a Hungarian chieftain prisoner, which so terrified the besiegers that they concluded a truce for nine years on condition that their chief should be released, and that Henry should engage to pay a yearly tribute. Henry submitted to the dishonourable sacrifice that he might husband his strength

for better times. . . . How important it was to have fortified places which could not be stormed by cavalry, and therefore afforded a safe refuge to the neighbouring peasantry, Henry recognised in 929, when the Hungarians marched through Bavaria and Suabia to Lorraine, plundered the time-honoured monastery of St. Gall, and burnt the suburbs of Constance, but could not take the fortified town itself. Henry, accordingly, published an order throughout the land, that at suitable places large fortresses should be built, in which every ninth man from the neighbouring district must take garrison duty. Certainly living in towns was contrary to the customs of the North Germans, and here and there there was much resistance; but they soon recognised the wisdom of the royal order, and worked night and day with such diligence that there soon arose throughout the land towns with stately towers and strong walls, behind whose battlements the armed burghers defiantly awaited the Hungarians. Hamburg was then fortified, Itzehoe built, the walls of Magdeburg, Halle, and Erfurt extended, for these towns had stood since the time of Charlemagne. Quedlinburg, Merseburg, Meissen, Wittenberg, Goslar, Soest, Nordhausen, Duderstadt, Gronau, Pölde, were rebuilt, and many others of which the old chroniclers say nothing. Those who dwelt in the cities were called burghers, and in order that they might not be idle they began to practise many kinds of industry, and to barter their goods with the peasants. The emperor encouraged the building of towns, and granted emancipation to every slave who repaired to a town, allowed the towns to hold fairs and markets, granted to them the right of coining money and levying taxes, and gave them many landed estates and forests. Under such encouragement town life rapidly developed, and the emperor, in his disputes with the lawless nobility, always received loyal support from his disciplined burghers. After a few centuries the towns, which had now generally become republics, under the name of 'free imperial towns,' became the seats of the perfection of European trade, science, and culture. . . . These incalculable benefits are due to Henry's order to build towns."—A. W. Grube, *Heroes of History and Legend*, ch. 8.—At the expiration of the nine years truce, the Hungarians resumed their attacks, and were defeated by Henry in two bloody battles.

A. D. 936-973.—Restoration of the Roman Empire by Otho I., called the Great.—"Otho the Great, son and successor of Henry I., added the kingdom of Italy to the conquests of his father, and procured also the Imperial dignity for himself, and his successors in Germany. Italy had become a distinct kingdom since the revolution, which happened (888) at the death of the Emperor Charles the Fat. Ten princes in succession occupied the throne during the space of seventy-three years. Several of these princes, such as Guy, Lambert, Arnulf, Louis of Burgundy, and Berenger I., were invested with the Imperial dignity. Berenger I., having been assassinated (924), this latter dignity ceased entirely, and the city of Rome was even dismembered from the kingdom of Italy. The sovereignty of that city was seized by the famous Marozia, widow of a nobleman named Alberic. She raised her son to the pontificate by the title of John XI.; and the better to establish her dominion, she espoused Hugo King of Italy (932), who became, in consequence

of this marriage, master of Rome. But Alberic, another son of Marozia, soon stirred up the people against this aspiring princess and her husband Hugo. Having driven Hugo from the throne, and shut up his mother in prison, he assumed to himself the sovereign authority, under the title of Patrician of the Romans. At his death (954) he transmitted the sovereignty to his son Octavian, who, though only nineteen years of age, caused himself to be elected pope, by the title of John XII. This epoch was one most disastrous for Italy. The weakness of the government excited factions among the nobility, gave birth to anarchy, and fresh opportunity for the depredations of the Hungarians and Arabs, who, at this period, were the scourge of Italy, which they ravaged with impunity. Pavia, the capital of the kingdom, was taken, and burnt by the Hungarians. These troubles increased on the accession of Berenger II. (950), grandson of Berenger I. That prince associated his son Adelbert with him in the royal dignity; and the public voice accused them of having caused the death of King Lothaire, son and successor of Hugo. Lothaire left a young widow, named Adelaide, daughter of Rodolph II., King of Burgundy and Italy. To avoid the importunities of Berenger II., who wished to compel her to marry his son Adelbert, this princess called in the King of Germany to her aid. Otho complied with the solicitations of the distressed queen; and, on this occasion, undertook his first expedition into Italy (951). The city of Pavia, and several other places, having fallen into his hands, he made himself be proclaimed King of Italy, and married the young queen, his protégée. Berenger and his son, being driven for shelter to their strongholds, had recourse to negotiation. They succeeded in obtaining for themselves a confirmation of the royal title of Italy, on condition of doing homage for it to the King of Germany. . . . It appears that it was not without the regret, and even contrary to the wish of Adelaide, that Otho agreed to enter into terms of accommodation with Berenger. . . . Afterwards, however, he lent a favourable ear to the complaints which Pope John XII. and some Italian noblemen had addressed to him against Berenger and his son; and took occasion, on their account, to conduct a new army into Italy (961). Berenger, too feeble to oppose him, retired a second time within his fortifications. Otho marched from Pavia to Milan, and there made himself be crowned King of Italy; from thence he passed to Rome, about the commencement of the following year. Pope John XII., who had himself invited him, and again implored his protection against Berenger, gave him, at first, a very brilliant reception; and revived the Imperial dignity in his favour, which had been dormant for thirty-eight years. It was on the 2d of February, 962, that the Pope consecrated and crowned him Emperor; but he had soon cause to repent of this proceeding. Otho, immediately after his coronation at Rome, undertook the siege of St. Leon, a fortress in Umbria, where Berenger and his queen had taken refuge. While engaged in the siege, he received frequent intimations from Rome, of the misconduct and immoralities of the Pope. The remonstrances which he thought it his duty to make on this subject, offended the young pontiff, who resolved, in consequence, to break off union with the Emperor. Hurried on by the impetuosity of his char-

acter, he entered into a negotiation with Adelbert; and even persuaded him to come to Rome, in order to concert with him measures of defence. On the first news of this event, Otho put himself at the head of a large detachment, with which he marched directly to Rome. The Pope, however, did not think it advisable to wait his approach, but fled with the King, his new ally. Otho, on arriving at the capital, exacted a solemn oath from the clergy and the people, that henceforth they would elect no pope without his counsel, and that of the Emperor and his successors. Having then assembled a council, he caused Pope John XII. to be deposed; and Leo VIII. was elected in his place. This latter Pontiff was maintained in the papacy, in spite of all the efforts which his adversary made to regain it. Berenger II., after having sustained a long siege at St. Leon, fell at length (964) into the hands of the conqueror, who sent him into exile at Bamberg, and compelled his son, Adelbert, to take refuge in the court of Constantinople. All Italy, to the extent of the ancient kingdom of the Lombards, fell under the dominion of the Germans; only a few maritime towns in Lower Italy, with the greater part of Apulia and Calabria, still remained in the power of the Greeks. This kingdom, together with the Imperial dignity, Otho transmitted to his successors on the throne of Germany. From this time the Germans held it to be an inviolable principle, that as the Imperial dignity was strictly united with the royalty of Italy, kings elected by the German nation should, at the same time, in virtue of that election, become Kings of Italy and Emperors. The practice of this triple coronation, viz., of Germany, Italy, and Rome, continued for many centuries; and from Otho the Great, till Maximilian I. (1508), no king of Germany took the title of Emperor, until after he had been formally crowned by the Pope."—C. W. Koch, *The Revolutions of Europe, period 3.*—"At the first glance it would seem as if the relation in which Otho now stood to the pope was the same as that occupied by Charlemagne; on a closer inspection, however, we find a wide difference. Charlemagne's connexion with the see of Rome was produced by mutual need; it was the result of long epochs of political combination embracing the development of various nations; their mutual understanding rested on an internal necessity, before which all opposing views and interests gave way. The sovereignty of Otho the Great, on the contrary, rested on a principle fundamentally opposed to the encroachment of spiritual influences. The alliance was momentary; the disruption of it inevitable. But when, soon after, the same pope who had invoked his aid, John XII., placed himself at the head of a rebellious faction, Otho was compelled to cause him to be formally deposed, and to crush the faction that supported him by repeated exertions of force, before he could obtain perfect obedience; he was obliged to raise to the papal chair a pope on whose co-operation he could rely. The popes have often asserted that they transferred the empire to the Germans; and if they confined this assertion to the Carolingian race, they are not entirely wrong. The coronation of Charlemagne was the result of their free determination. But if they allude to the German emperors, properly so called, the contrary of their statement is just as true; not only Carlmann and Otho the Great, but their successors, constantly

had to conquer the imperial throne, and to defend it, when conquered, sword in hand. It has been said that the Germans would have done more wisely if they had not meddled with the empire; or, at least, if they had first worked out their own internal political institutions, and then, with matured minds, taken part in the general affairs of Europe. But the things of this world are not wont to develop themselves so methodically. A nation is often compelled by circumstances to increase its territorial extent, before its internal growth is completed. For was it of slight importance to its inward progress that Germany thus remained in unbroken connexion with Italy?—the depository of all that remained of ancient civilisation, the source whence all the forms of Christianity had been derived. The mind of Germany has always unfolded itself by contact with the spirit of antiquity, and of the nations of Roman origin. . . . The German imperial government revived the civilising and Christianising tendencies which had distinguished the reigns of Charles Martell and Charlemagne. Otho the Great, in following the course marked out by his illustrious predecessors, gave it a fresh national importance by planting German colonies in Slavonian countries simultaneously with the diffusion of Christianity. He Germanised as well as converted the population he had subdued. He confirmed his father's conquests on the Saale and the Elbe, by the establishment of the bishoprics of Meissen and Osterland. After having conquered the tribes on the other side the Elbe in those long and perilous campaigns where he commanded in person, he established there, too, three bishoprics, which for a time gave an extraordinary impulse to the progress of conversion. . . . And even where the project of Germanising the population was out of the question, the supremacy of the German name was firmly and actively maintained. In Bohemia and Poland bishoprics were erected under German metropolitans; from Hamburg Christianity found its way into the north; missionaries from Passau traversed Hungary, nor is it improbable that the influence of these vast and sublime efforts extended even to Russia. The German empire was the centre of the conquering religion; as itself advanced, it extended the ecclesiastico-military State of which the Church was an integral part; it was the chief representative of the unity of western Christendom, and hence arose the necessity under which it lay of acquiring a decided ascendancy over the papacy. This secular and Germanic principle long retained the predominancy it had triumphantly acquired. . . . How magnificent was the position now occupied by the German nation, represented in the persons of the mightiest princes of Europe and united under their sceptre; at the head of an advancing civilisation, and of the whole of western Christendom; in the fullness of youthful aspiring strength! We must here however remark and confess, that Germany did not wholly understand her position, nor fulfil her mission. Above all, she did not succeed in giving complete reality to the idea of a western empire, such as appeared about to be established under Otho I. Independent and often hostile, though Christian powers arose through all the borders of Germany; in Hungary and in Poland, in the northern as well as in the southern possessions of the Normans; England and France

were snatched again from German influence. Spain laughed at the German claims to a universal supremacy; her kings thought themselves emperors; even the enterprises nearest home—those across the Elbe—were for a time stationary or retrograde. If we seek for the causes of these unfavourable results, we need only turn our eyes on the internal condition of the empire, where we find an incessant and tempestuous struggle of all the forces of the nation. Unfortunately the establishment of a fixed rule of succession to the imperial crown was continually prevented by events.”—L. Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*, introd.—See, also, ITALY: A. D. 961-1039; and ROMAN EMPIRE, THE HOLY.

A. D. 955.—Great defeat and repulse of the Hungarians by Otho I. See HUNGARIANS: A. D. 934-955.

A. D. 973-1122.—End of the Saxon line.—Election of the Franconians.—Reformation of the Papacy.—Contest of Henry IV. with the Head of the Church.—The question of Investitures.—“Otho II. had a short and troubled reign, 973-983 A. D., having to repress the Slavi, the Danes, the Greeks of Lower Italy, and to defend Lorraine against the French. He died at Rome in his twenty-eighth year, 983 A. D. Otho III. (aged three years) succeeded under the regency of his mother, Theophania (a Greek princess), who had to contend with the rebellious nobles, the Slavi, the Poles, the Bohemians, and with France, which desired to conquer Lorraine. This able lady died 991 A. D. Otho III. made three expeditions into Italy, and in 998 A. D. put down the republic of Rome, which had been created by the patrician Crescentius. The resistance of Crescentius had been pardoned the preceding year, but on this occasion he was publicly beheaded on the battlements of Rome, in view of the army and of the people. In 999 A. D. Otho placed his tutor Gerbert in the papal chair as Sylvester II. The tutor and the emperor were in advance of their age. The former had gleaned from Saracen translations from the Greek, as well as from Latin literature, and was master of the science of the day. It is supposed that they had planned to remove the seat of empire to Rome—a project which, had he lived, he would not have been able to carry out, for the centre of political power had long moved northward: he died at the early age of twenty-two, 1002 A. D. Henry II. (the Holy), Duke of Bavaria, was elected emperor, and had to battle, like his predecessors, with rebellious nobles, with the Poles, and Bohemians, and the Slavi. He was thrice in Italy, and died 1024 A. D. ‘Perhaps, with the single exception of St. Louis IX., there was no other prince of the middle ages so uniformly swayed by justice.’ Conrad II. (the Salic) of Franconia was elected emperor in a diet in the plains between Mentz and Worms, near Oppenheim, which was attended by princes, nobles, and 50,000 people altogether. His reign was remarkable for the justice and mercy which he always kept in view. The kingdom of Arles and Burgundy was united to the empire, 1033 A. D. He checked the Poles, the Hungarians, and the Lombards, and gave Schleswick to Denmark as a fief. In 1037 A. D. he granted to the lower vassals of the empire the hereditary succession to their offices and estates, and so extended the privileges of the great nobles, as to make them almost independent of the crown.

Henry III. succeeded, 1039 A. D., and established the imperial power with a high hand."—W. B. Boyce, *Introduction to the Study of History*, pp. 230-231.—"Henry III. was, as sovereign, able, upright, and resolute; and his early death—for his reign was cut short by disasters that preyed upon his health—is one of the calamities of history. The cause of the Roman Court he judged with vigor and good sense. His strong hand, more than any man's, dragged the Church out of the slough it had fallen into [see Rome: A. D. 962-1057]. . . . A few years before, in 1033, a child ten years old, son of one of the noble houses, had been put on the papal throne, under the name of Benedict IX.; and was restored to it by force of arms, five years later, when he had grown into a lewd, violent, and wilful boy of fifteen. At the age of twenty-one he was weary of the struggle, and sold out, for a large sum of money paid down, to a rich purchaser,—first plundering the papal treasury of all the funds he could lay his hands on. His successor, Gregory VI., naturally complained of his hard bargain, which was made harder by another claimant (Sylvester III.), elected by a different party; while no law that could possibly be quoted or invented would make valid the purchase and sale of the spiritual sovereignty of the world, which in theory the Papacy still was. Gregory appears to have been a respectable and even conscientious magistrate, by the standard of that evil time. But his open purchase of the dignity not only gave a shock to whatever right feeling there was left, but it made the extraordinary dilemma and scandal of three popes at once,—a knot which the German king, now Emperor, was called in to cut. . . . The worthless Benedict was dismissed, as having betrayed his charge. The impotent Sylvester was not recognized at all. The respectable Gregory was duly convinced of his deep guilt of Simony,—because he had 'thought that the gift of God could be purchased with money,'—and was suffered as a penitent to end his days in peace. A fourth, a German ecclesiastic, who was clean of all these intrigues, was set in the chair of Peter, where he reigned righteously for two years under the name of Clement II."—J. H. Allen, *Christian History in its Three Great Periods: Second period*, pp. 57-58.—"With the popes of Henry's appointment a new and most powerful force rose to the control of the papacy—a strong and earnest movement for reformation which had arisen outside the circle of papal influence during the darkest days of its degradation, indeed, and entirely independent of the empire. This had started from the monastery of Cluny, founded in 910, in eastern France, as a reformation of the monastic life, but it involved gradually ideas of a wider reformation throughout the whole church. Two great sins of the time, as it regarded them, were especially attacked, the marriage of priests and simony, or the purchase of ecclesiastical preferment for money, including also appointments to church offices by temporal rulers. . . . The earnest spirit of Henry III. was not out of sympathy with the demand for a real reformation, and with the third pope of his appointment, Leo IX., in 1048, the ideas of Cluny obtained the direction of affairs. . . . One apparently insignificant act of Leo's had important consequences. He brought back with him to Rome the monk Hildebrand. He had been brought up in a monastery in Rome in

the strictest ideas of Cluny, had been a supporter of Gregory VI., one of the three rival popes deposed by Henry, who, notwithstanding his outright purchase of the papacy, represented the new reform demand, and had gone with him into exile on his deposition. It does not appear that he exercised any decisive influence during the reign of Leo IX., but so great was his ability and such the power of his personality that very soon he became the directing spirit in the papal policy, though his influence over the papacy before his own pontificate was not so great nor so constant as it has sometimes been said to have been. So long as Henry lived the balance of power was decidedly in favor of the emperor, but in 1056 happened that disastrous event, which occurred so many times at critical points of imperial history, from Arnulf to Henry VI., the premature death of the emperor. His son, Henry IV., was only six years old at his father's death, and a minority followed just in the crisis of time needed to enable the feudal princes of Germany to recover and strengthen their independence against the central government, and to give free hands to the papacy to carry out its plans for throwing off the imperial control. Never again did an emperor occupy, in respect either to Germany or the papacy, the vantage-ground on which Henry III. had stood. . . . The triumph of the reform movement and of its ecclesiastical theory is especially connected with the name of Hildebrand, or Gregory VII., as he called himself when pope, and was very largely, if not entirely, due to his indomitable spirit and iron will, which would yield to no persuasion or threats or actual force. He is one of the most interesting personalities of history. . . . The three chief points which the reform party attempted to gain were the independence of the church from all outside control in the election of the pope, the celibacy of the clergy, and the abolition of simony or the purchase of ecclesiastical preferment. The foundation for the first of these was laid under Nicholas II. by assigning the selection of the pope to the college of cardinals in Rome, though it was only after some considerable time that this reform was fully secured. The second point, the celibacy of the clergy, had long been demanded by the church, but the requirement had not been strictly enforced, and in many parts of Europe married clergy were the rule. . . . As interpreted by the reformers, the third of their demands, the suppression of simony, was as great a step in advance and as revolutionary as the first. Technically, simony was the sin of securing an ecclesiastical office by bribery, named from the incident recorded in the eighth chapter of the Acts concerning Simon Magus. But at this time the desire for the complete independence of the church had given to it a new and wider meaning which made it include all appointment to positions in the church by laymen, including kings and the emperor. . . . According to the conception of the public law the bishop was an officer of the state. He had, in the great majority of cases, political duties to perform as important as his ecclesiastical duties. The lands which formed the endowment of his office had always been considered as being, still more directly than any other feudal land, the property of the state. . . . It was a matter of vital importance whether officers exercising such important functions and controlling so large a

part of its area—probably everywhere as much as one-third of the territory—should be selected by the state or by some foreign power beyond its reach and having its own peculiar interests to seek. But this question of lay investiture was as vitally important for the church as for the state. . . . It was as necessary to the centralization and independence of the church that it should choose these officers as that it should elect the head of all—the pope. This was not a question for Germany alone. Every northern state had to face the same difficulty. . . . The struggle was so much more bitter and obstinate with the emperor than with any other sovereign because of the close relation of the two powers one to another, and because the whole question of their relative rights was bound up with it. It was an act of rebellion on the part of the papacy against the sovereign, who had controlled it with almost absolute power for a century, and it was rising into an equal, or even superior, place beside the emperor of what was practically a new power, a rival for his imperial position. . . . It was absolutely impossible that a conflict with these new claims should be avoided as soon as Henry IV. arrived at an age to take the government into his own hands and attempted to exercise his imperial rights as he understood them.”—G. B. Adams, *Civilization During the Middle Ages*, ch. 10.—“At Gregory’s accession, he [Henry] was a young man of twenty-three. His violence had already driven a whole district into rebellion. . . . The Pope sided with the insurgents. He summoned the young king to his judgment-seat at Rome; threatened at his refusal to ‘cut him off as a rotten limb’; and passed on him the awful sentence of excommunication. The double terror of rebellion at home and the Church’s curse at length broke down the passionate pride of Henry. Humbled and helpless, he crossed the Alps in midwinter, groping among the bleak precipices and ice-fields,—the peasants passing him in a rude sledge of hide down those dreadful slopes,—and went to beg absolution of Gregory at the mountain castle of Canossa. History has few scenes more dramatic than that which shows the proud, irascible, crest-fallen young sovereign confronted with the fiery, little, indomitable old man. To quote Gregory’s own words:—‘Here he came with few attendants, and for three days before the gate—his royal apparel laid aside, barefoot, clad in wool, and weeping abundantly—he never ceased to implore the aid and comfort of apostolic mercy, till all there present were moved with pity and compassion; inasmuch that, interceding for him with many prayers and tears they all wondered at my strange severity, and some even cried out that it was not so much the severe dignity of an apostle as the cruel wrath of a tyrant. Overcome at length by the urgency of his appeal and the entreaties of all present, I relaxed the bond of anathema, and received him to the favor of communion and the bosom of our holy Mother the Church.’ It was a truce which one party did not mean nor the other hope to keep. It was policy, not real terror or conviction, that had led Henry to humble himself before the Pope. It was policy, not contrition or compassion, that had led Gregory (against his better judgment, it is said) to accept his Sovereign’s penance. In the war of policy, the man of the world prevailed. Freed of the Church’s curse, he quickly won back the strength he had

lost. He overthrew in battle the rival whom Gregory upheld. He swept his rebellious lands with sword and flame. He carried his victorious army to Rome, and was there crowned Emperor by a rival Pope [1084]. Gregory himself was only saved by his ferocious allies, Norman and Saracen, at cost of the devastation of half the capital,—that broad belt of ruin which still covers the half mile between the Coliseum and the Lateran gate. Then, hardly rescued from the popular wrath, he went away to die, defeated and heart-broken, at Salerno, with the almost despairing words on his lips: ‘I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile!’ But ‘a spirit hath not flesh or bones,’ as a body hath, and so it will not stay mangled and bruised. The victory lay, after all, with the combatant who could appeal to fanaticism as well as force.”—J. H. Allen, *Christian History in its Three Great Periods: second period*, pp. 69-72.—“Meanwhile, the Saxons had recognized Hermann of Luxemburg as their King, but in 1087 he resigned the crown; and another claimant, Eckbert, Margrave of Meissen, was murdered. The Saxons were now thoroughly weary of strife, and as years and bitter experience had softened the character of Henry, they were the more willing to return to their allegiance. Peace was therefore, for a time, restored in Germany. The Papacy did not forgive Henry. He was excommunicated several times, and in 1091 his son Conrad was excited to rebel against him. In 1104 a more serious rebellion was headed by the Emperor’s second son Henry, who had been crowned King, on promising not to seize the government during his father’s lifetime, in 1099. The Emperor was treated very cruelly, and had to sign his own abdication at Ingelheim in 1105. A last effort was made on his behalf by the Duke of Lotharingia; but worn out by his sorrows and struggles, Henry died in August, 1106. His body lay in a stone coffin in an unconsecrated chapel at Speyer for five years. Not till 1111, when the sentence of excommunication was removed, was it properly buried. Henry V. was not so obedient to the Church as the Papal party had hoped. He stoutly maintained the very point which had brought so much trouble on his father. The right of investiture, he declared, had always belonged to his predecessors, and he was not to give up what they had handed on to him. In 1110 he went to Rome, accompanied by a large army. Next year Pope Paschal II. was forced to crown him Emperor; but as soon as the Germans had crossed the Alps again Paschal renewed all his old demands. The struggle soon spread to Germany. The Emperor was excommunicated; and the discontented princes, as eager as ever to break the royal power, sided with the Pope against him. Peace was not restored till 1122, when Calixtus II. was Pope. In that year, in a Diet held at Worms, both parties agreed to a compromise, called the Concordat of Worms.”—J. Sime, *History of Germany*, ch. 8.—“The long-desired reconciliation was effected in the form of the following concordat. The emperor renounced the right of investiture with the ring and crosier, and conceded that all bishoprics of the empire should be filled by canonical election and free consecration; the election of the German bishops (not of the Italian and Burgundian) should be held in presence of the emperor; the bishops elect should receive investiture, but only

of their fiefs and regalia, by the sceptre in Germany before, in Italy and in Burgundy after, their consecration; for these grants they should promise fidelity to the emperor; contested elections should be decided by the emperor in favour of him who should be considered by the provincial synod to possess the better right. Finally he should restore to the Roman Church all the possessions and regalia of St. Peter. This convention secured to the Church many things, and above all, the freedom of ecclesiastical elections. Hitherto, the different Churches had been compelled to give their consent to elections that had been made by the king, but now the king was pledged to consent to the elections made by the Churches; and although these elections took place in his presence, he could not refuse his consent and investiture without violating the treaty, in which he had promised that for the future elections should be according to the canons. This, and the great difference, that the king, when he gave the ring and crosier, invested the bishop elect with his chief dignity, namely, his bishopric, but now granted him by investiture with the sceptre, only the accessories, namely the regalia, was felt by Lothaire, the successor of Henry, when he required of pope Innocent II. the restoration of the right of investiture. Upon one important point, the homage which was to be sworn to the king, the concordat was silent. By not speaking of it, Calixtus seemed to tolerate it, and the Roman see therefore permitted it, although it had been prohibited by Urban and Paschal. It is certain that Calixtus was as fully convinced as his predecessors, that the condition of vassals, to which bishops and abbots were reduced by their oath of homage, could hardly be reconciled with the nature and dignity of the episcopacy, or with the freedom of the Church, but he perhaps foresaw, that by insisting too strongly upon its discontinuance, he might awaken again the unholy war, and without any hopes of benefit, inflict many evils upon the Church. Sometime later Adrian endeavoured to free the Italian bishops from the homage, instead of which, the emperor was to be content with an oath of fidelity; but Frederick I. would not renounce the homage unless they resigned the regalia. The greatest concession made by the papal see in this concordat, was, that by its silence it appeared to have admitted the former pretensions of the emperors to take a part in the election of the Roman pontiff. . . . In the following year the concordat was ratified in the great council of three hundred bishops, the ninth general council of the Church, which was convened by Calixtus in Rome."—J. J. Dollinger, *History of the Church*, v. 3, pp. 345-347.—See, also, PAPACY: A. D. 1056-1122; CANOSSA; ROME: A. D. 1081-1084; and SAXONY: A. D. 1073-1075.

ALSO IN: A. F. Villemain, *Life of Gregory VII.*, bk. 2.—Comte C. F. Montalembert, *The Monks of the West*, bk. 19.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, bk. 6-8.—W. R. W. Stephens, *Hildebrand and His Times*.—E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Docs. of the Middle Ages*, bk. 4.

A. D. 1101.—Disastrous Crusade under Duke Welf of Bavaria. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1101-1102.

A. D. 1125.—Election of Lothaire II., King, afterwards Emperor.

A. D. 1125-1272.—The rise of the College of Electors.—The election of Lothaire II., in

1125, when a great assembly of nobles and church dignitaries was convened at Mentz, and when certain of the chiefs made a selection of candidates to be voted for, has been regarded by some historians—Hallam, Comyn and Dunham, for example—as indicating the origin of the German electoral college. They have held that a right of "pretaxation," or preliminary choice, was gradually acquired by certain princes, which grew into the finally settled electoral right. But this view is now looked upon as more than questionable, and is not supported by the best authorities. "At the election of Rudolph [1272 or 3?] we meet for the first time the fully developed college of electors as a single electoral body; the secondary matter of a doubt regarding what individuals composed it was definitely settled before Rudolph's reign had come to an end. How did the college of electors develop itself? . . . The problem is made more difficult at the outset from the fact that in the older form of government in Germany there can be no question at all of a simple electoral right in a modern sense. The electoral right was amalgamated with a hereditary right of that family which had happened to come to the throne: it was only a right of selection from among the heirs available within this family. Inasmuch now as such selection could—as well from the whole character of German kingship as in consequence of its amalgamation with the empire—take place already during the lifetime of the ruling member of the family, it is easy to understand that in ages in which the ruling race did not die out during many generations, the right came to be at last almost a mere form. Usually the king, with the consent of those who had the right of election, would, already during his lifetime, designate as his successor one of his heirs,—if possible his oldest son. Such was the rule in the time of the Ottos and of the Salian emperors. It was a rule which could not be adhered to in the first half of the 12th century after the extinction of the Salian line, when free elections, not determined beforehand by designation, took place in the years 1125, 1138 and 1152. Necessarily the element of election now predominated. But had any fixed order of procedure at elections been handed down from the past? The very principle of election having been disregarded in the natural course of events for centuries, was it any wonder that the order of procedure should also come to be half forgotten? And had not in the meantime social readjustments in the electoral body so disturbed this order of procedure, or such part of it as had been important enough to be preserved, as necessarily to make it seem entirely antiquated? With these questions the electoral assemblies of the year 1125 as well as of the year 1138 were brought face to face, and they found that practically only those precedents could be taken from what seemed to have been the former customary mode of elections which provided that the archbishop of Mainz as chancellor of the empire should first solemnly announce the name of the person elected and the electors present should do homage to the new king. This was at the end of the whole election, after the choice had to all intents and purposes been already made. For the material part of the election, on the other hand, the part that preceded this announcement, they found an apparently new expedient. A committee was to

draw up an agreement as to the person to be chosen; in the two cases in question the manner of constituting this committee differed. Something essential had now been done towards establishing a mode of procedure at elections which should accord with the changed circumstances. One case however had not been provided for in these still so informal and uncertain regulations; the case, namely, that those taking part in the election could come to no agreement at all with regard to the person whose choice was to be solemnly announced by the archbishop of Mainz. And how could men have foreseen such a case in the first half of the 12th century? Up till then double elections had absolutely never taken place. Anti-kings there had been, indeed, but never two opposing kings elected at the same time. In the year 1198, however, this contingency arose; Philip of Suabia and Otto IV. were contemporaneously elected and the final unanimity of choice that in 1152 had still been counted on as a matter of course did not come about. As a consequence questions with regard to the order of procedure now came up which had hardly ever been touched upon before. First and foremost this one: can a better right of one of the elected kings be founded on a majority of the votes obtained? And in connection with it this other: who on the whole has a right to cast an electoral vote? Even though men were inclined now to answer the first question in the affirmative, the second, the presupposition for the practical application of the principle that had been laid down in the first, offered all the greater difficulties. Should one, after the elections of the years 1125 and 1152 and after the development since 1180 of a more circumscribed class of princes of the realm, accept the existence of a narrower electoral committee? Did this have a right to elect exclusively, or did it only have a simple right of priority in the matter of casting votes, or perhaps only a certain precedence when the election was being discussed? And how were the limits to be fixed for the larger circle of electors below this electoral committee? These are questions which the German electors put to themselves less soon and less clearly than did the pope, Innocent III., whom they had called upon to investigate the double election of the year 1198. . . . He speaks repeatedly of a narrower electoral body with which rests chiefly the election of the king, and he knows only princes as the members of this body. And beyond a doubt the repeated expressions of opinion of the pope, as well as this whole matter of having two kings, at the beginning of the 13th century, gave men in Germany cause for reflection with regard to these weighty questions concerning the constitutional forms of the empire. One of the most important results of this reflection on the subject is to be found in the solution given by the *Sachsenspiegel*, which was compiled about 1230. Eike von Repgow knows in his law-book only of a precedence at elections of a smaller committee of princes, but mentions as belonging to this committee certain particular princes: the three Rhenish archbishops, the count Palatine of the Rhine, the duke of Saxony, the margrave of Brandenburg and — his right being questionable indeed — the king of Bohemia. . . . So far, at all events, did the question with regard to the limitation of the electors seem to have advanced towards its solu-

tion by the year 1230 that an especial electoral college of particular persons was looked upon as the nucleus of those electing. But side by side with this view the old theory still held its own, that certainly all princes at least had an equal right in the election. Under Emperor Frederick II., for instance, it was still energetically upheld. A decision one way or the other could only be reached according to the way in which the next elections should actually be carried out. Henry Raspe was elected in the year 1246 almost exclusively by ecclesiastical princes, among them the three Rhenish archbishops. He was the first 'priest-king' (*Pfaffenkönig*). The second 'priest-king' was William of Holland. He was chosen by eleven princes, among whom was only one layman, the duke of Brabant. The others were bishops; among them, in full force, the archbishops of the Rhine. Present were also many counts. But William caused himself still to be subsequently elected by the duke of Saxony and the margrave of Brandenburg, while the king of Bohemia was also not behindhand in acknowledging him — that, too, with special emphasis. What transpired at the double election of Alphonse and Richard in the year 1257 has not been handed down with perfect trustworthiness. Richard claimed later to have been elected by Mainz, Cologne, the Palatinate and Bohemia; Alphonse by Treves, Saxony, Brandenburg and Bohemia. But in addition to the princes of these lands, other German princes also took part, — according to the popular view by assenting, according to their own view, in part at least, by actually electing. All the same the lesson taught by all these elections is clear enough. The general right of election of the princes disappears almost altogether; a definite electoral college, which was looked upon as possessing almost exclusively the sole right of electing, comes into prominence, and the component parts which made it up correspond in substance to the theory of the *Sachsenspiegel*. And whatever in the year 1257 is not established firmly and completely and in all directions, stands there as incontrovertible at the election of Rudolph. The electors, and they only, now elect; all share of others in the election is done away with. Although in place of Ottocar of Bohemia, who was at war with Rudolph, Bavaria seems to have been given the electoral vote, yet before Rudolph's reign is out, in the year 1290, Bohemia at last attains to the dignity which the *Sachsenspiegel*, even if with some hesitation, had assigned to it. One of the most important revolutions in the German form of government was herewith accomplished. From among the aristocratic class of the princes an oligarchy had raised itself up, a representation of the princely provincial powers as opposed to the king. Unconsciously, as it were, had it come into being, not exactly desired by any one as a whole, nor yet the result of a fixed purpose even as regarded its separate parts. It must clearly have corresponded to a deep and elementary and gradually developing need of the time. Undoubtedly from a national point of view it denotes progress; henceforward at elections the danger of 'many heads many minds' was avoided; the era of double elections was practically at an end."—K. Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte* (trans. from the German), v. 4, pp. 23-28.—In 1356 the Margraf of Brandenburg was recognized in the Golden Bull as one

of the Kurfürsts,—that is as “one of the Seven who have a right . . . to choose, to ‘kieren’ the Romish Kaiser; and who are therefore called Kur Princes, Kurfürste, or Electors. . . . Fürst (Prince) I suppose is equivalent originally to our noun of number, ‘First.’ The old verb ‘kieren’ (participle ‘erkoren’ still in use, not to mention ‘Val-kyr’ and other instances) is essentially the same word as our ‘choose,’ being written ‘kiesen’ as well as ‘kieren.’ Nay, say the etymologists, it is also written ‘Küssen’ (‘to kiss,’—to choose with such emphasis!), and is not likely to fall obsolete in that form.—The other Six Electoral Dignitaries, who grew to Eight by degrees, and may be worth noting once by the readers of this book, are: 1. Three Ecclesiastical, Mainz, Cöln, Trier (Mentz, Cologne, Treves), Archbishops all. . . . 2. Three Secular, Sachsen, Pfalz, Böhmen (Saxony, Palatinate, Bohemia); of which the last, Böhmen, since it fell from being a kingdom in itself, to being a province of Austria, is not very vocal in the Diets. These Six, with Brandenburg, are the Seven Kurfürsts in old time; Septemvirs of the Country, so to speak. But now Pfalz, in the Thirty-Years War (under our Prince Rupert’s Father, whom the Germans call the ‘Winter-King’), got abrogated, put to the ban, so far as an indignant Kaiser could; and the vote and Kur of Pfalz was given to his Cousin of Baiern (Bavaria),—so far as an indignant Kaiser could [see GERMANY: A. D. 1621-1623]. However, at the Peace of Westphalia (1648) it was found incompetent to any Kaiser to abrogate Pfalz, or the like of Pfalz, a Kurfürst of the Empire. So, after jargon inconceivable, it was settled, That Pfalz must be reinstated, though with territories much clipped, and at the bottom of the list, not the top as formerly; and that Baiern, who could not stand to be balked after twenty-years possession, must be made Eighth Elector [see GERMANY: A. D. 1648]. The Ninth, we saw (Year 1692), was Gentleman Ernst of Hanover [see GERMANY: A. D. 1648-1705]. There never was any Tenth.”—T. Carlyle, *Frederick the Great*, bk. 2, ch. 4.—“All the rules and requisites of the election were settled by Charles the Fourth in the Golden Bull [A. D. 1356—see below: A. D. 1347-1493], thenceforward a fundamental law of the Empire.”—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 14.

12-13th Centuries.—Causes of the Disintegration of the Empire.—“The whole difference between French and German constitutional history can be summed up in a word: to the ducal power, after its fall, the crown fell heir in France; the lesser powers, which had been its own allies, in Germany. The event was the same, the results were different: in France centralization, in Germany disintegration. The fall of the power of the stem-duchies is usually traced to the subjugation of the mightiest of the dukes, Henry the Lion [see SAXONY: A. D. 1178-1183], who refused military service to the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa just when the latter most needed him in the struggle against the Lombards. . . . The emperor not only banned the duke, he not only took away his duchy to bestow it elsewhere, but he entirely did away with this whole form of rule. The western part, Westphalia, went to the archbishops of Cologne; in the East the different margraves were completely freed from the last remnants of dependence that might have continued to exist. In

the intervening space the little ecclesiastical and secular lords came to be directly under the emperor without a trace of an intermediate power and with the title of bishop or abbot, imperial count, or prince. If one of these lords, Bernard of Ascaunum, received the title of Saxon duke, that title no longer betokened the head of a stem or nation but simply an honorary distinction above other counts and lords. What happened here had already begun to take place in the other duchy of the Guelphs, in Bavaria, through the detachment from it of Austria; sooner or later the same process came about in all parts of the empire. With the fall of the old stem-duchies those lesser powers which had been under their shadow or subject to them gained everywhere an increase of power; partly by this acquiring the ducal title as an honorary distinction by the ruler of a smaller district, partly by joining rights of the intermediate powers that had just been removed to their own jurisdictions and thus coming into direct dependence on the empire. . . . Such was the origin of the idea of territorial supremacy. The ‘dominus terrae’ comes to feel himself no longer as a person commissioned by the emperor but as lord in his own land. . . . As to the cities, behind their walls remnants of old Germanic liberty had been preserved. Especially in the residences of the bishops had artisans and merchants thriven and these classes had gradually thrown off their bondage, forming, both together, the new civic community. . . . The burghers could find no better way to show their independence of the princes than that the community itself should exercise the rights of a territorial lord over its members. Thus did the cities as well as the principalities come to form separate territories, only that the latter had a monarchical, the former a republican form of government. . . . It is a natural question to ask, on the whole, when this new formation of territories was completed. . . . The question ought really only to be put in a general way: at what period in German history is it an established fact that there are in the empire and under the empire separate territorial powers (principalities and cities)? As such a period we can designate approximately the end of the 12th and beginning of the 13th centuries. From that time on the double nature of imperial power and of territorial power is an established fact and the mutual relations of these two make up the whole internal history of later times. . . . The last ruler who had spread abroad the glory of the imperial name had been Frederick II. For a long time after him no one had worn the imperial crown at all, and of those kings who reigned during a whole quarter of a century not one succeeded in making himself generally recognized. There came a time when the duties of the state, if they were fulfilled at all, were fulfilled by the territorial powers. Those are the years which pass by the name of the interregnum. . . . Rudolph of Hapsburg and his successors, chosen from the most different houses and pursuing the most different policies, have quite the same position in two regards: on the one hand the crown, in the weak state in which it had emerged from the interregnum, saw itself compelled to make permanent concessions to the territorial powers in order to maintain itself from one moment to another; on the other hand it finds no refuge for itself but in the constant striving to found its

own power on just such privileged territories. When the kings strive to make the princes and cities more powerful by giving them numerous privileges, and at the same time by bringing together a dynastic appanage to gain for themselves an influential position: this is no policy that wavers between conceding and maintaining. . . . The crown can only keep its place above the territories by first recognizing the territorial powers and then, through just such a recognized territorial power by creating for itself the means of upholding its rights. . . . The next great step in the onward progress of the territorial power was the codification of the privileges which the chief princes had obtained. Of the law called the 'Golden Bull' only the one provision is generally known, that the seven electors shall choose the emperor; yet so completely does the document in question draw the affairs of the whole empire into the range of its provisions that for centuries it could pass for that empire's fundamental law. It is true that for the most part it did not create a new system of legislation, but only sanctioned what already existed. But for the position of all the princes it was significant enough that the seven most considerable among them were granted an independence which comprised sovereign rights, and this not by way of a privilege but as a part of the law of the land. A sharply defined goal, and herein lies the deepest significance, was thus set up at which the lesser territories could aim and which, after three centuries, they were to attain. . . . This movement was greatly furthered when on the threshold of modern times the burning question of church reform, after waiting in vain to be taken up by the emperor, was taken up by the lower classes, but with revolutionary excesses. . . . The mightiest intellectual movement of German history found at last its only political mainstay in the territories. . . . This whole development, finally, found its political and legal completion through the Thirty Years War and the treaty of peace which concluded it. The new law which the Peace of Westphalia now gave to the empire proclaimed expressly that all territories should retain their rights, especially the right of making alliances among themselves and with foreigners so long as it could be done without violating the oath of allegiance to the emperor and the empire. Here-with the territories were proclaimed . . . states under the empire."—I. Jastrow, *Geschichte der deutschen Einheitstraum und seiner Erfüllung* (trans. from the German), pp. 30-37.

A. D. 1138-1268.—The house of Suabia, or the Hohenstaufen.—Its struggles in Germany and Italy, and its end.—The Factions of the Guelfs and Ghibellines.—Frederick Barbarossa and Frederick the Second.—On the death of Henry V., in 1125, the male line of the house of Franconia became extinct. Frederick, duke of Suabia, and his brother Conrad, duke of the Franks, were grandchildren of Henry IV. on their mother's side, and, inheriting the patrimonial estates, were plainly the heirs of the crown, if the crown was to be recognized as hereditary and dynastic. But jealousy of their house and a desire to reassert the elective dependence of the imperial office prevailed against their claims and their ambition. At an election which was denounced as irregular, the choice fell upon Lothaire of Saxony. The old imperial

family was not only set aside, but its bitterest enemies were raised over it. The consequences were a feud and a struggle which grew and widened into the long-lasting, far-reaching, historical conflict of Guelfs and Ghibellines (see GUELFs AND Ghibellines; also, SAXONY: DISSOLUTION OF THE OLD DUCHY). The Saxon emperor Lothaire found his strongest support in the great Wölf, Welf, or Guelf nobleman, Henry the Proud, duke of Bavaria, to whom he (Lothaire) now gave his daughter in marriage, together with the dukedom of Saxony, and whom he intended to make his successor on the imperial throne. But the scheme failed. On Lothaire's death, in 1138, the partisans of the Suabian family carried the election of Conrad (the Crusader—see CRUSADES: A. D. 1147-1149), and the dynasty most commonly called Hohenstaufen rose to power. It took the name of Hohenstaufen from its original family seat on the lofty hill of Staufen, in Suabia, overlooking the valley of the Rems. Its party, in the wars and factions of the time, received the name of the Waiblingen, from the birth-place of the Suabian duke Frederick—the little town of Waiblingen in Franconia. Under the tongue of the Italians, when these party names and war-cries were carried across the Alps, Waiblingen became Ghibelline and Welf became Guelf. During the first half century of the reign of the Hohenstaufen, the history of Germany is the history, for the most part, of the strife in which the Guelf dukes, Henry the Proud and Henry the Lion, are the central figures, and which ended in the breaking up of the old powerful duchy of Saxony. But Italy was the great historical field of the energies and the ambitions of the Hohenstaufen emperors. There, Frederick Barbarossa (Frederick Redbeard, as the Italians called him), the second of the line, and Frederick II., his adventurous grandson, fought their long, losing battle with the popes and with the city-republics of Lombardy and Tuscany.—U. Balzani, *The Popes and the Hohenstaufen*.—Frederick Barbarossa, elected Emperor in 1152, passed into Italy in 1154. "He came there on the invitation of the Pope, of the Prince of Capua, and of the towns which had been subjected to the ambition of Milan. He marched at the head of his German feudatories, a splendid and imposing array. His first object was to crush the power of Milan, and to exalt that of Pavia, the head of a rival league. Nothing could stand against him. At Viterbo he was compelled to hold the stirrup of the Pope, and in return for this submission he received the crown from the Pontiff's hands in the Basilica of St. Peter. He returned northwards by the valley of the Tiber, dismissed his army at Ancona, and with difficulty escaped safely into Bavaria. His passage left little that was solid and durable behind it. He had effected nothing against the King of Naples. His friendship with the Pope was illusory and short-lived. The dissensions of the North, which had been hushed for a moment by his presence, broke out again as soon as his back was turned. He had, however, received the crown of Charles the Great from the hands of the successor of St. Peter. But Frederick was not a man to brook easily the miscarriage of his designs. In 1158 he collected another army at Ulm. Brescia was quickly subdued; Lodi, which had been destroyed by the Milanese, was rebuilt, and Milan itself was reduced to terms. This

peace lasted but for a short time; Milan revolted, and was placed under the ban of the Empire. The fate of Cremona taught the Milanese what they had to expect from the clemency of the Emperor. After a desultory warfare, regular siege was laid to the town. On March 1, 1162, Milan, reduced by famine, surrendered at discretion, and a fortnight later all the inhabitants were ordered to leave the town. The circuit of the walls was partitioned out among the most pitiless enemies of its former greatness, and the inhabitants of Lodi, of Cremona, of Pavia, of Novara, and of Como were encouraged to wreak their vengeance on their defeated rival. For six days the imperial army laboured to overturn the walls and public buildings, and when the Emperor left for Pavia, on Palm Sunday 1162, not a fiftieth part of the city was standing. This terrible vengeance produced a violent reaction. The homeless fugitives were received by their ancient enemies, and local jealousies were merged in common hatred of the common foe. Frederick had already been excommunicated by Pope Alexander III. as the supporter of his rival Victor. Verona undertook to be the public vindicator of discontent. Five years after the destruction of Milan the Lombard league numbered fifteen towns amongst its members. Venice, Verona, Vicenza, Treviso, Ferrara, Brescia, Bergamo, Cremona, Milan, Lodi, Piacenza, Parma, Modena, and Bologna. The confederation solemnly engaged to expel the Emperor from Italy. The towns on the frontier of Piedmont asked and obtained admission to the league, and to mark the dawn of freedom a new town was founded on the low marshy ground which is drained by the Bormida and the Tanaro, and which afterwards witnessed the victory of Marengo. It was named by its founders Alessandria, in honour of the Pope, who had vindicated their independence of the Empire. . . . The Lombard league had unfortunately a very imperfect constitution. It had no common treasure, no uniform rules for the apportionment of contributions; it existed solely for the purposes of defence against the external foe. The time was not yet come when self-sacrifice and self-abnegation could lay the foundations of a united Italy. Frederick spent six years in preparing vengeance. In 1174 he laid siege to the new Alexandria, but did not succeed in taking it. A severe struggle took place two years later. In 1176 a new army arrived from Germany, and on May 29 Frederick Barbarossa was entirely defeated at Legnano. In 1876 the seventh hundred anniversary of the battle was celebrated on the spot where it was gained, and it is still regarded as the birthday of Italian freedom.—O. Browning, *Guelphs and Gibellines*, ch. 1.—See, also, ITALY: A. D. 1154-1162 to 1174-1183.—“The end was that the Emperor had to make peace with both the Pope and the cities, and in 1183 the rights of the cities were acknowledged in a treaty or law of the Empire, passed at Constanz or Constance in Swabia. In the last years of his reign, Frederick went on the third Crusade, and died on the way [see CRUSADES: A. D. 1188-1192]. Frederick was succeeded by his son Henry the Sixth, who had already been chosen King, and who in the next year, 1191, was crowned Emperor. The chief event of his reign was the conquest of the Kingdom of Sicily, which he claimed in right of his wife Constance, the daughter of the first King Wil-

liam. He died in 1197, leaving his son Frederick a young child, who had already been chosen King in Germany, and who succeeded as hereditary King in Sicily. The Norman Kingdom of Sicily thus came to an end, except so far as it was continued through Frederick, who was descended from the Norman Kings through his mother. On the death of the Emperor Henry, the election of young Frederick seems to have been quite forgotten, and the crown was disputed between his uncle Philip of Swabia and Otto of Saxony. He was son of Henry the Lion, who had been Duke of Saxony and Bavaria, but who had lost the more part of his dominions in the time of Frederick Barbarossa. Otto's mother was Matilda, daughter of Henry the Second of England. . . . Both Kings were crowned, and, after the death of Philip, Otto was crowned Emperor in 1209. But presently young Frederick was again chosen, and in 1220 he was crowned Emperor, and reigned thirty years till his death in 1250. This Frederick the Second, who joined together so many crowns, was called the Wonder of the World. And he well deserved the name, for perhaps no King that ever reigned had greater natural gifts, and in thought and learning he was far above the age in which he lived. In his own kingdom of Sicily he could do pretty much as he pleased, and it flourished wonderfully in his time. But in Germany and Italy he had constantly to struggle against enemies of all kinds. In Germany he had to win the support of the Princes by granting them privileges which did much to undermine the royal power, and on the other hand he showed no favour to the rising power of the cities. In Italy he had endless strivings with one Pope after another, with Innocent the Third, Honorius the Third, Gregory the Ninth, and Innocent the Fourth; as well as with the Guelfic cities, which withstood him much as they had withstood his grandfather. He was more than once excommunicated by the Popes, and in 1245 Pope Innocent the Fourth held a Council at Lyons, in which he professed to depose the Emperor. More than one King was chosen in opposition to him in Germany, just as had been done in the time of Henry the Fourth, and there were civil wars all his time, both in Germany and in Italy, while a great part of the Kingdom of Burgundy was beginning to slip away from the Empire altogether.—E. A. Freeman, *General Sketch of European Hist.*, ch. 11.—“It is probable that there never lived a human being endowed with greater natural gifts, or whose natural gifts were, according to the means afforded him by his age, more sedulously cultivated, than the last Emperor of the House of Swabia. There seems to be no aspect of human nature which was not developed to the highest degree in his person. In versatility of gifts, in what we may call manysidedness of character, he appears as a sort of mediæval Alkibiadēs, while he was undoubtedly far removed from Alkibiadēs' utter lack of principle or steadiness of any kind. Warrior, statesman, lawgiver, scholar, there was nothing in the compass of the political or intellectual world of his age which he failed to grasp. In an age of change, when, in every corner of Europe and civilized Asia, old kingdoms, nations, systems, were falling and new ones rising, Frederick was emphatically the man of change, the author of things new and unheard of—he was stupor mundi et immutator mirabilis.

A suspected heretic, a suspected Mahometan, he was the subject of all kinds of absurd and self-contradictory charges; but the charges mark real features in the character of the man. He was something unlike any other Emperor or any other man. . . . Of all men, Frederick the Second might have been expected to be the founder of something, the beginner of some new era, political or intellectual. He was a man to whom some great institution might well have looked back as its creator, to whom some large body of men, some sect or party or nation, might well have looked back as their prophet or founder or deliverer. But the most gifted of the sons of men has left behind him no such memory, while men whose gifts cannot bear a comparison with his are revered as founders by grateful nations, churches, political and philosophical parties. Frederick in fact founded nothing, and he sowed the seeds of the destruction of many things. His great charters to the spiritual and temporal princes of Germany dealt the death-blow to the Imperial power, while he, to say the least, looked coldly on the rising power of the cities and on those commercial Leagues which were in his time the best element of German political life. In fact, in whatever aspect we look at Frederick the Second, we find him, not the first, but the last, of every series to which he belongs. An English writer [Capgrave], two hundred years after his time, had the penetration to see that he was really the last Emperor. He was the last Prince in whose style the Imperial titles do not seem a mockery; he was the last under whose rule the three Imperial kingdoms retained any practical connexion with one another and with the ancient capital of all. . . . He was not only the last Emperor of the whole Empire; he might almost be called the last King of its several Kingdoms. After his time Burgundy vanishes as a kingdom. . . . Italy too, after Frederick, vanishes as a kingdom; any later exercise of the royal authority in Italy was something which came and went wholly by fits and starts. . . . Germany did not utterly vanish, or utterly split in pieces, like the sister kingdoms; but after Frederick came the Great Interregnum, and after the Great Interregnum the royal power in Germany never was what it had been before. In his hereditary Kingdom of Sicily he was not absolutely the last of his dynasty, for his son Manfred ruled prosperously and gloriously for some years after his death. But it is none the less clear that from Frederick's time the Sicilian Kingdom was doomed. . . . Still more conspicuously than all was Frederick the last Christian King of Jerusalem, the last baptized man who really ruled the Holy Land or wore a crown in the Holy City. . . . In the world of elegant letters Frederick has some claim to be looked on as the founder of that modern Italian language and literature which first assumed a distinctive shape at his Sicilian court. But in the wider field of political history Frederick appears nowhere as a creator, but rather everywhere as an involuntary destroyer. . . . Under Frederick the Empire and everything connected with it seems to crumble and decay while preserving its external splendour. As soon as its brilliant possessor is gone, it at once falls asunder. It is a significant fact that one who in mere genius, in mere accomplishments, was surely the greatest prince who ever wore a crown, a prince who held the greatest

place on earth, and who was concerned during a long reign in some of the greatest transactions of one of the greatest ages, seems never, even from his own flatterers, to have received that title of Great which has been so lavishly bestowed on far smaller men. . . . Many causes combined to produce this singular result, that a man of the extraordinary genius of Frederick, and possessed of every advantage of birth, office, and opportunity, should have had so little direct effect upon the world. It is not enough to attribute his failure to the many and great faults of his moral character. Doubtless they were one cause among others. But a man who influences future ages is not necessarily a good man. . . . The weak side in the brilliant career of Frederick is one which seems to have been partly inherent in his character, and partly the result of the circumstances in which he found himself. Capable of every part, and in fact playing every part by turns, he had no single definite object, pursued honestly and steadfastly, throughout his whole life. With all his powers, with all his brilliancy, his course throughout life seems to have been in a manner determined for him by others. He was ever drifting into wars, into schemes of policy, which seem to be hardly ever of his own choosing. He was the mightiest and most dangerous adversary that the Papacy ever had. But he does not seem to have withstood the Papacy from any personal choice, or as the voluntary champion of any opposing principle. He became the enemy of the Papacy, he planned schemes which involved the utter overthrow of Papacy, yet he did so simply because he found that no Pope would ever let him alone. . . . The most really successful feature in Frederick's career, his acquisition of Jerusalem [see *CRUSADES*: A. D. 1216-1229], is not only a mere episode in his life, but it is something that was absolutely forced upon him against his will. . . . With other Crusaders the Holy War was, in some cases, the main business of their lives; in all cases it was something seriously undertaken as a matter either of policy or of religious duty. But the Crusade of the man who actually did recover the Holy City is simply a grotesque episode in his life. Excommunicated for not going, excommunicated again for going, excommunicated again for coming back, threatened on every side, he still went, and he succeeded. What others had failed to win by arms, he contrived to win by address, and all that came of his success was that it was made the ground of fresh accusations against him. . . . For a man to influence his age, he must in some sort belong to his age. He should be above it, before it, but he should not be foreign to it. . . . But Frederick belongs to no age; intellectually he is above his own age, above every age; morally it can hardly be denied that he was below his age; but in nothing was he of his age."—E. A. Freeman, *The Emperor Frederick the Second (Historical Essays, v. 1, Essay 10)*.—For an account of Frederick's brilliant Sicilian court, and of some of the distinguishing features of his reign in Southern Italy, as well as of the end of his family, in the tragical deaths of his son Manfred and his grandson Conradin (1268), see *ITALY*: A. D. 1183-1250.

ALSO IN: T. L. Kington, *Hist. of Frederick the Second*.—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 10-13.—H. H. Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, bk. 8, ch. 7, and bk. 9.

A. D. 1142-1152.—Creation of the Electorate of Brandenburg. See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1142-1152.

A. D. 1156.—The Margravate of Austria created a Duchy. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 805-1246.

A. D. 1180-1214.—Bavaria and the Palatinate of the Rhine acquired by the house of Wittelsbach. See BAVARIA: A. D. 1180-1356.

A. D. 1196-1197.—The Fourth Crusade. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1196-1197.

13th Century.—The rise of the Hanseatic League. See HANSA TOWNS.

13th Century.—Cause of the multiplication of petty principalities and states.—“While the duchies and counties of Germany retained their original character of offices or governments, they were of course, even though considered as hereditary, not subject to partition among children. When they acquired the nature of fiefs, it was still consonant to the principles of a feudal tenure that the eldest son should inherit according to the law of primogeniture; an inferior provision or appanage, at most, being reserved for the younger children. The law of England favoured the eldest exclusively; that of France gave him great advantages. But in Germany a different rule began to prevail about the thirteenth century. An equal partition of the inheritance, without the least regard to priority of birth, was the general law of its principalities. Sometimes this was effected by undivided possession, or tenancy in common, the brothers residing together, and reigning jointly. This tended to preserve the integrity of dominion; but as it was frequently incommodious, a more usual practice was to divide the territory. From such partitions are derived those numerous independent principalities of the same house, many of which still subsist in Germany. In 1589 there were eight reigning princes of the Palatine family; and fourteen, in 1675, of that of Saxony. Originally these partitions were in general absolute and without reversion; but, as their effect in weakening families became evident, a practice was introduced of making compacts of reciprocal succession, by which a fief was prevented from escheating to the empire, until all the male posterity of the first feudatory should be extinct. Thus, while the German empire survived, all the princes of Hesse or of Saxony had reciprocal contingencies of succession, or what our lawyers call cross-remainders, to each other's dominions. A different system was gradually adopted. By the Golden Bull of Charles IV. the electoral territory, that is, the particular district to which the electoral suffrage was inseparably attached, became incapable of partition, and was to descend to the eldest son. In the 15th century the present house of Brandenburg set the first example of establishing primogeniture by law; the principalities of Anspach and Bayreuth were dismembered from it for the benefit of younger branches; but it was declared that all the other dominions of the family should for the future belong exclusively to the reigning elector. This politic measure was adopted in several other families; but, even in the 16th century, the prejudice was not removed, and some German princes denounced curses on their posterity, if they should introduce the impious custom of primogeniture. . . . Weakened by these subdivisions, the principalities of Germany in the 14th and 15th centu-

ries shrink to a more and more diminutive size in the scale of nations.”—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 5 (v. 2).—See, also, CITIES, IMPERIAL AND FREE, OF GERMANY.

A. D. 1212.—The Children's Crusade. See CRUSADES: A. D. 1212.

A. D. 1231-1235.—Relations of the Swiss Forest Cantons to the Empire and to the House of Austria. See SWITZERLAND: THE THREE FOREST CANTONS.

A. D. 1250-1272.—Degradation of the Holy Roman Empire.—The Great Interregnum.—Anarchy and disorder universal.—Election of Rudolf of Hapsburg.—“With Frederick [the Second] fell the Empire. From the ruin that overwhelmed the greatest of its houses it emerged, living indeed, and destined to a long life, but so shattered, crippled, and degraded, that it could never more be to Europe and to Germany what it once had been. . . . The German kingdom broke down beneath the weight of the Roman Empire. To be universal sovereign Germany had sacrificed her own political existence. The necessity which their projects in Italy and disputes with the Pope laid the Emperors under of purchasing by concessions the support of their own princes, the ease with which in their absence the magnates could usurp, the difficulty which the monarch returning found in resuming the privileges of his crown, the temptation to revolt and set up pretenders to the throne which the Holy See held out, these were the causes whose steady action laid the foundation of that territorial independence which rose into a stable fabric at the era of the Great Interregnum. Frederick II. had, by two Pragmatic Sanctions, A. D. 1220 and 1232, granted, or rather confirmed, rights already customary, such as to give the bishops and nobles legal sovereignty in their own towns and territories, except when the Emperor should be present; and thus his direct jurisdiction became restricted to his narrowed domain, and to the cities immediately dependent on the crown. With so much less to do, an Emperor became altogether a less necessary personage; and hence the seven magnates of the realm, now by law or custom sole electors, were in no haste to fill up the place of Conrad IV., whom the supporters of his father Frederick had acknowledged. William of Holland [A. D. 1254] was in the field, but rejected by the Swabian party: on his death a new election was called for, and at last set on foot. The archbishop of Cologne advised his brethren to choose some one rich enough to support the dignity, not strong enough to be feared by the electors: both requisites met in the Plantagenet Richard, earl of Cornwall, brother of the English Henry III. He received three, eventually four votes, came to Germany, and was crowned at Aachen [A. D. 1256]. But three of the electors, finding that his bribe to them was lower than to the others, seceded in disgust, and chose Alfonso X. of Castile, who, shrewder than his competitor, continued to watch the stars at Toledo, enjoying the splendours of his title while troubling himself about it no further than to issue now and then a proclamation. Meantime the condition of Germany was frightful. The new Didius Julianus, the chosen of princes baser than the prætorians whom they copied, had neither the character nor the outward power and resources to make himself respected. Every floodgate of anarchy was opened: prelates and barons extended their

domains by war: robber-knights infested the highways and the rivers: the misery of the weak, the tyranny and violence of the strong, were such as had not been seen for centuries. Things were even worse than under the Saxon and Franconian Emperors; for the petty nobles who had then been in some measure controlled by their dukes were now, after the extinction of the great houses, left without any feudal superior. Only in the cities was shelter or peace to be found. Those of the Rhine had already leagued themselves for mutual defence, and maintained a struggle in the interests of commerce and order against universal brigandage. At last, when Richard had been some time dead, it was felt that such things could not go on for ever: with no public law, and no courts of justice, an Emperor, the embodiment of legal government, was the only resource. The Pope himself, having now sufficiently improved the weakness of his enemy, found the disorganization of Germany beginning to tell upon his revenues, and threatened that if the electors did not appoint an Emperor, he would. Thus urged, they chose, in 1272 [1273], Rudolf, count of Hapsburg, founder of the house of Austria. From this point there begins a new era. We have seen the Roman Empire revived in A. D. 800, by a prince whose vast dominions gave ground to his claim of universal monarchy; again erected, in A. D. 962, on the narrower but firmer basis of the German kingdom. We have seen Otto the Great and his successors during the three following centuries, a line of monarchs of unrivalled vigour and abilities, strain every nerve to make good the pretensions of their office against the rebels in Italy and the ecclesiastical power. Those efforts had now failed signally and hopelessly. Each successive Emperor had entered the strife with resources scantier than his predecessors, each had been more decisively vanquished by the Pope, the cities, and the princes. The Roman Empire might, and, so far as its practical utility was concerned, ought now to have been suffered to expire; nor could it have ended more gloriously than with the last of the Hohenstaufen. That it did not so expire, but lived on 600 years more, till it became a piece of antiquarianism hardly more venerable than ridiculous—till, as Voltaire said, all that could be said about it was that it was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire—was owing partly indeed to the belief, still unshaken, that it was a necessary part of the world's order, yet chiefly to its connection, which was by this time indissoluble, with the German kingdom. The Germans had confounded the two characters of their sovereign so long, and had grown so fond of the style and pretensions of a dignity whose possession appeared to exalt them above the other peoples of Europe, that it was now too late for them to separate the local from the universal monarch. If a German king was to be maintained at all, he must be Roman Emperor; and a German king there must still be. . . . That head, however, was no longer what he had been. The relative position of Germany and France was now exactly the reverse of that which they had occupied two centuries earlier. Rudolf was as conspicuously a weaker sovereign than Philip III. of France, as the Franconian Emperor Henry III. had been stronger than the Capetian Philip I. In every other state of Europe the tendency of events had been to centralize the administration and increase the power of

the monarch, even in England not to diminish it: in Germany alone had political union become weaker, and the independence of the princes more confirmed."—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 13.—See, also, ITALY: A. D. 1250-1520.

A. D. 1273-1308.—The first Hapsburg kings of the Romans, Rodolph and Albert.—The choice made (A. D. 1273) by the German Electors of Rodolph of Hapsburg for King of the Romans (see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1246-1282), was duly approved and confirmed by Pope Gregory X., who silenced, by his spiritual admonitions, the rival claims of King Alfonso of Castile. But Rodolph, to secure this papal confirmation of his title, found it necessary to promise, through his ambassadors, a renewal of the Capitulation of Otho IV., respecting the temporalities of the Pope. This he repeated in person, on meeting the Pope at Lausanne, in 1275. On that occasion, "an agreement was entered into which afterwards ratified to the Church the long disputed gift of Charlemagne, comprising Ravenna, Emilia, Bobbio, Cesena, Forumpopoli, Forli, Faenza, Imola, Bologna, Ferrara, Comacchio, Adria, Rimini, Urbino, Monteferetro, and the territory of Bagno. Rodolph also bound himself to protect the privileges of the Church, and to maintain the freedom of Episcopal elections, and the right of appeal in all ecclesiastical causes; and having stipulated for receiving the imperial crown in Rome he promised to undertake an expedition to the holy land. If Rodolph were sincere in these last engagements, the disturbed state of his German dominions afforded him an apology for their present non-fulfilment: but there is good reason for believing that he never intended to visit either Rome or Palestine; and his indifference to Italy has even been the theme of panegyric with his admirers. The repeated and mortifying reverses of the two Frederics were before his eyes; there was little to excite his sympathy with the Italians; and though Lombardy seemed ready to acknowledge his supremacy, the Tuscan cities evinced aspirations after independence." During the early years of Rodolph's reign he was employed in establishing his authority, as against the contumacy of Ottocar, King of Bohemia, and the Duke of Bavaria (see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1246-1282). Meantime, Gregory X. and three short-lived successors in the papal office passed away, and Nicholas III. had come to it (1277). That vigorous pontiff called Rodolph to account for not having yet surrendered the states of the Church in due form, and whispered a hint of excommunication and interdict. "Rodolph was too prudent to disregard this admonition: he evaded the projected crusade and journey to Rome; but he took care to send thither an emissary, who in his name surrendered to the Pope the territory already agreed on. . . . During his entire reign Rodolph maintained his indifference towards Italy." His views "were rather directed to the wilds of Hungary and Germany than to the delicious regions of the south. . . . He compelled Philip, Count of Savoy, to surrender Morat, Payerne, and Guminen, which had been usurped from the Empire. By a successful expedition across the Jura, he brought back to obedience Otho IV. Count of Burgundy; and forced him to renounce the allegiance he had proffered to Philip III. King of France. . . . He crushed an insurrection headed by an impostor, who had persuaded the infatuated multitude

to believe that he was the Emperor Frederic II. And he freed his dominions from rapine and desolation by the destruction of several castles, whose owners infested the country with their predatory incursions." Before his death, in 1291, Rodolph "grew anxious to secure to his son Albert the succession to the throne, and his nomination by the Electors ere the grave closed upon himself. . . . But all his entreaties were unavailing; he was coldly reminded that he himself was still the 'King,' and that the Empire was too poor to support two kings. Rodolph might now repent his neglect to assume the imperial crown: but the character of Albert seems to have been the real obstacle to his elevation. With many of the great qualities of his father, this prince was deficient in his milder virtues; and his personal bravery and perseverance were tainted with pride, haughtiness, and avarice." On Rodolph's death, the Electors chose for his successor Adolphus, Count of Nassau, a choice of which they soon found reason to repent. By taking pay from Edward I. of England, for an alliance with the latter against the King of France, and by attempts to enforce a purchased claim upon the Landgraviate of Thuringia, Adolphus brought himself into contempt, and in 1298 he was solemnly deposed by the Electors, who now conferred the kingship upon Albert of Austria whom they had rejected six years before. "The deposed sovereign was, however, strongly supported; and he promptly collected his adherents, and marched at the head of a vast army against Albert, who was not unprepared for his reception. A great battle took place at Gelheim, near Worms; and, after a bloody contest, the troops of Adolphus were entirely defeated," and he himself was slain. But Albert, now unopposed in Germany, found his title disputed at Rome. Boniface VIII., the most arrogant of all popes, refused to acknowledge the validity of his election, and drove him into a close alliance with the Pope's implacable and finally triumphant enemy, Philip IV. of France (see PAPACY: A. D. 1294-1348). He was soon at enmity, moreover, with a majority of the Electors who had given the crown to him, and they, stimulated by the Pope, were preparing to depose him, as they had deposed Adolphus. But Albert's energy broke up their plans. He humbled their leader, the Archbishop-Elector of Mentz, and the rest became submissive. The Pope now came to terms with him, and invited him to Rome to receive the imperial crown; also offering to him the crown of France, if he would take it from the head of the excommunicated Philip; but while these proposals were under discussion, Boniface suffered humiliations at the hands of the French king which caused his death. During most of his reign, Albert was busy with undertakings of ambition and rapacity which had no success. He attempted to seize the counties of Holland, Zealand, and Friesland, as fiefs reverting to the crown, on the death of John, Count of Holland, in 1299. He claimed the Bohemian crown in 1306, when Wenceslaus V., the young king, was assassinated, and invaded the country; but only to be beaten back. He was defeated at Lucka, in 1308, when attempting to grasp the inheritance of the Landgrave of Thuringia—under the very transaction which had chiefly caused his predecessor Adolphus to be deposed, and he himself invested with the Roman crown. Finally,

he was in hostilities with the Swiss Forest Cantons, and was leading his forces against them, in May, 1308, when he was assassinated by several nobles, including his cousin John, whose enmity he had incurred.—Sir R. Comyn, *Hist. of the Western Empire*, ch. 14-17 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 5 (v. 1).

A. D. 1282.—Acquisition of the duchy of Austria by the House of Hapsburg. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1246-1282.

A. D. 1308-1313.—The reign of Henry of Luxemburg.—The king (subsequently crowned emperor) chosen to succeed Albert was Count Henry of Luxemburg, an able and excellent prince. The new sovereign was crowned as Henry VII. "Henry did not make the extension of his private domains his object, yet favoring fortune brought it to him in the largest measure. Since the death of Wenzel III., the succession to the throne of Bohemia had been a subject of constant struggles. A very small party was in favor of Austria; but the chief power was in the hands of Henry of Carinthia, husband of Anna, Wenzel's eldest daughter. But he was hated by the people, whose hopes turned more and more to Elizabeth, a younger daughter of Wenzel; though she was kept in close confinement by Henry, who was about to marry her, it was supposed, below her rank. She escaped, fled to the emperor, and implored his aid. He gave her in marriage to his young son John, sending him to Bohemia in charge of Peter Aichspalter, to take possession of the kingdom. He did so, and it remained for more than a century in the Luxemburg family. This King John of Bohemia was a man of mark. His life was spent in the ceaseless pursuit of adventure—from tournament to tournament, from war to war, from one enterprise to another. We meet him now in Avignon, and now in Paris; then on the Rhine, in Prussia, Poland, or Hungary, and then prosecuting large plans in Italy, but hardly ever in his own kingdom. Yet his restless activity accomplished very little, apart from some important acquisitions in Silesia. Henry then gave attention to the public peace; came to an understanding with Leopold and Frederick, the proud sons of Albert, and put under the ban Everard of Wirtemberg, long a fomentor of disturbances, sending against him a strong imperial army. . . . At the Diet of Spire, in September, 1309, it was cheerfully resolved to carry out Henry's cherished plan of reviving the traditional dignity of the Roman emperors by an expedition to the Eternal City. Henry expected thus to renew the authority of his title at home, as well as in Italy, where, in the traditional view, the imperial crown was as important and as necessary as in Germany. Every thing here had gone to confusion and ruin since the Hohenstaufens had succumbed to the bitter hostility of the popes. The contending parties still called themselves Guelphs and Ghibellines, though they retained little of the original characteristics attached to these names. A formal embassy, with Matteo Visconti at its head, invited Henry to Milan; and the parties every where anticipated his coming with hope. The great Florentine poet, Dante, hailed him as a saviour for distracted Italy. Thus, with the pope's approval, he crossed the Alps in the autumn of 1310, attended by a splendid escort of princes of the empire. The news of his

approach excited general wonder and expectation, and his reception at Milan in December was like a triumph. He was crowned King of Lombardy without opposition. But when, in the true imperial spirit, he announced that he had come to serve the nation, and not one or another party, and proved his sincerity by treating both parties alike, all whose selfish hopes were deceived conspired against him. Brescia endured a frightful siege for four months, showing that the national hatred of German rule still survived. At length a union of all his adversaries was formed under King Robert of Naples, the grandson of Charles of Anjou, who put Conradin to death. Meanwhile Henry VII. went to Rome, May 1312, and received the crown of the Caesars from four cardinals, plenipotentiaries of the pope, in the church of St. John Lateran, south of the Tiber, St. Peter's being occupied by the Neapolitan troops. But many of his German soldiers left him, and he retired, with a small army, to Pisa, after an unsuccessful effort to take Florence. From the faithful city of Pisa he proclaimed King Robert under the ban, and, in concert with Frederick of Sicily, prepared for war by land and sea. But the pope, now a mere tool of the King of France, commanded an armistice; and when Henry, in an independent spirit, hesitated to obey, Clement V. pronounced the ban of the Church against him. It never reached the emperor, who died suddenly in the monastery of Buon-Convento: poisoned, as the German annalists assert, by a Dominican monk, in the sacramental cup, August 24, 1313. He was buried at Pisa. Meanwhile his army in Bohemia had been completely successful in establishing King John on the throne."—C. T. Lewis, *A Hist. of Germany*, bk. 3, ch. 10.—See, also, ITALY: A. D. 1310-1313.

A. D. 1314-1347.—Election of rival emperors, Lewis (Ludowic) of Bavaria and Frederic of Austria.—Triumph of Lewis at the Battle of Mühldorf.—Papal interference and excommunication of Lewis.—Germany under interdict.—Unrelenting hostility of the Church.—"The death of Heinric [Henry] replunged Germany into horrors to which, since the extinction of the Swabian line of emperors, it had been a stranger. The Austrian princes, who had never forgiven the elevation of the Luxemburg family, espoused the interests of Frederic, their head; the Bohemians as naturally opposed them. From the accession of John, the two houses were of necessity hostile; and it was evident that there could be no peace in Germany until one of them was subjected to the other. The Bohemians, indeed, could not hope to place their king on the vacant throne, since their project would have found an insurmountable obstacle in the jealousy of the electors; but they were at least resolved to support the pretensions of a prince hostile to the Austrians. . . . The diet being convoked at Frankfurt, the electors repaired thither, but with very different views; for, as their suffrages were already engaged, while the more numerous party proclaimed the duke of Bavaria as Ludowic V., another no less eagerly proclaimed Frederic. Although Ludowic was a member of the Austro-Hapsburg family—his mother being a daughter of Rodolf I.—he had always been the enemy of the Austrian princes, and in the same degree the ally of the Luxemburg faction. The two candidates being respectively crowned kings of the Romans, Ludowic at Aix-la-Chapelle, by the

archbishop of Mentz—Frederic at Bonn, by the metropolitan of Cologne, a civil war was inevitable: neither had virtue enough to sacrifice his own rights to the good of the state. . . . The contest would have ended in favour of the Austrians, but for the rashness of Frederic, who, in September 1322, without waiting for the arrival of his brother Leopold, assailed Ludowic between Mähldorf and Ettingen in Bavaria. . . . The battle was maintained with equal valour from the rising to the setting sun; and was evidently in favour of the Austrians, when an unexpected charge in flank by a body of cavalry under the margrave of Nuremberg decided the fortune of the day. Heinric of Austria was first taken prisoner; and Frederic himself, who disdained to flee, was soon in the same condition. To his everlasting honour, Ludowic received Frederic with the highest assurances of esteem; and though the latter was conveyed to the strong fortress of Trappnitz, in the Upper Palatinate, he was treated with every indulgence consistent with his safe custody. But the contest was not yet decided; the valiant Leopold was still at the head of a separate force; and pope John XXII., the natural enemy of the Ghibelins, incensed at some succours which Ludowic sent to that party in Lombardy, excommunicated the king of the Romans, and declared him deposed from his dignity. Among the ecclesiastics of the empire this iniquitous sentence had its weight; but had not other events been disastrous to the king, he might have safely despised it. By Leopold he was signally defeated; he had the mortification to see the inconstant king of Bohemia join the party of Austria; and the still heavier misfortune to learn that the ecclesiastical and two or three secular electors were proceeding to another choice—that of Charles de Valois, whose interests were warmly supported by the pope. In this emergency, his only chance of safety was a reconciliation with his enemies; and Frederic was released on condition of his renouncing all claim to the empire. But though Frederic sincerely resolved to fulfil his share of the compact, Leopold and the other princes of his family refused; and their refusal was approved by the pope. With the magnanimity of his character, Frederic, unable to execute the engagements which he had made, voluntarily surrendered himself to his enemy. But Ludowic, who would not be outdone in generosity, received him, not as a prisoner, but a friend. 'They ate,' says a contemporary writer, 'at the same table, slept on the same couch;' and when the King left Bavaria, the administration of that duchy was confided to Frederic. Two such men could not long remain even politically hostile; and by another treaty, it was agreed that they should exercise conjointly the government of the empire. When this arrangement was condemned both by the pope and the electors, Ludowic proposed to take Italy as his seat of government, and leave Germany to Frederic. But the death [1326] of the war-like Leopold—the great support of the Austrian cause—and the continued opposition of the states to any compromise, enabled Ludowic to retain the sceptre of the kingdom; and in 1329, that of Frederic strengthened his party. But his reign was destined to be one of troubles. . . . His open warfare against the head of the church did not much improve his affairs, the vindictive pope, in addition to the former sentence, placing all Germany under an interdict.

. . . In 1338, the diet of Frankfort issued a declaration for ever memorable in the annals of freedom. That the imperial authority depended on God alone; that the pope had no temporal influence, direct or indirect, within the empire; . . . it concluded by empowering the emperor (Ludowic while in Italy [see ITALY: A. D. 1313-1330] had received the imperial crown from the anti-pope whom he had created in opposition to John XXII.) to raise, of his own authority, the interdict which, during four years, had oppressed the country. Another diet, held the following year, ratified this bold declaration. . . . But this conduct of the diet was above the comprehension of the vulgar, who still regarded Ludowic as under the curse of God and the church. . . . Unfortunately for the national independence, Ludowic himself contradicted the tenor of his hitherto spirited conduct, by mean submissions, by humiliating applications for absolution. They were unsuccessful; and he had the mortification to see the king of Bohemia, who had always acted an unaccountable part, become his bitter enemy. . . . From this moment the fate of Ludowic was decided. In conjunction with the pope and the French king, Charles of Bohemia, who in 1346 succeeded to his father's kingdom and antipathy, commenced a civil war; and in the midst of these troubled scenes the emperor breathed his last [October 11, 1347]. Twelve months before the decease of Ludowic, Charles of Bohemia [son of John, the blind king of Bohemia, who fell, fighting for the French, at the battle of Crécy], assisted by Clement VI., was elected king of the Romans." —S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Germanic Empire*, bk. 1, ch. 4 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: J. I. von Döllinger, *Studies in European History*, ch. 5.—J. C. Robertson, *Hist. of the Christian Church*, bk. 8, ch. 2, v. 7.—M. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation*, introd., ch. 2.

A. D. 1347-1493.—The Golden Bull of Charles IV.—The Luxemburg line of emperors, and the reappearance of the Hapsburgs.—The Holy Roman Empire as it was at the end of the Middle Ages.—"John king of Bohemia did not himself wear the imperial crown; but three of his descendants possessed it, with less interruption than could have been expected. His son Charles IV. succeeded Louis of Bavaria in 1347; not indeed without opposition, for a double election and a civil war were matters of course in Germany. Charles IV. has been treated with more derision by his contemporaries, and consequently by later writers, than almost any prince in history; yet he was remarkably successful in the only objects that he seriously pursued. Deficient in personal courage, insensible of humiliation, bending without shame to the pope, to the Italians, to the electors, so poor and so little revered as to be arrested by a butcher at Worms for want of paying his demand, Charles IV. affords a proof that a certain dexterity and cold-blooded perseverance may occasionally supply, in a sovereign, the want of more respectable qualities. He has been reproached with neglecting the empire. But he never deigned to trouble himself about the empire, except for his private ends. He did not neglect the kingdom of Bohemia, to which he almost seemed to render Germany a province. Bohemia had been long considered as a fief of the empire, and indeed could pretend to an elec-

toral vote by no other title. Charles, however, gave the states by law the right of choosing a king, on the extinction of the royal family, which seems derogatory to the imperial prerogative. . . . He constantly resided at Prague, where he founded a celebrated university, and embellished the city with buildings. This kingdom, augmented also during his reign by the acquisition of Silesia, he bequeathed to his son Wenceslaus, for whom, by pliancy towards the electors and the court of Rome, he had procured, against all recent example, the imperial succession. The reign of Charles IV. is distinguished in the constitutional history of the empire by his Golden Bull [1356]; an instrument which finally ascertained the prerogatives of the electoral college [see above: A. D. 1125-1152]. The Golden Bull terminated the disputes which had arisen between different members of the same house as to their right of suffrage, which was declared inherent in certain definite territories. The number was absolutely restrained to seven. The place of legal imperial elections was fixed at Frankfort; of coronations, at Aix-la-Chapelle; and the latter ceremony was to be performed by the arch-bishop of Cologne. These regulations, though consonant to ancient usage, had not always been observed, and their neglect had sometimes excited questions as to the validity of elections. The dignity of elector was enhanced by the Golden Bull as highly as an imperial edict could carry it; they were declared equal to kings, and conspiracy against their persons incurred the penalty of high treason. Many other privileges are granted to render them more completely sovereign within their dominions. It seems extraordinary that Charles should have voluntarily elevated an oligarchy, from whose pretensions his predecessors had frequently suffered injury. But he had more to apprehend from the two great families of Bavaria and Austria, whom he relatively depressed by giving such a preponderance to the seven electors, than from any members of the college. By his compact with Brandenburg [see BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1168-1417] he had a fair prospect of adding a second vote to his own. . . . The next reign, nevertheless, evinced the danger of investing the electors with such preponderating authority. Wenceslaus [elected in 1378], a supine and voluptuous man, less respected, and more negligent of Germany, if possible, than his father, was regularly deposed by a majority of the electoral college in 1400. . . . They chose Robert count palatine instead of Wenceslaus; and though the latter did not cease to have some adherents, Robert has generally been counted among the lawful emperors. Upon his death [1410] the empire returned to the house of Luxemburg; Wenceslaus himself waiving his rights in favour of his brother Sigismund of Hungary." On the death of Sigismund, in 1437, the house of Austria regained the imperial throne, in the person of Albert, duke of Austria, who had married Sigismund's only daughter, the queen of Hungary and Bohemia. "He died in two years, leaving his wife pregnant with a son, Ladislaus Posthumus, who afterwards reigned in the two kingdoms just mentioned; and the choice of the electors fell upon Frederic duke of Styria, second-cousin of the last emperor, from whose posterity it never departed, except in a single instance, upon the extinction of his male line in 1740. Frederic III. reigned 53 years [1440-1493],

a longer period than any of his predecessors; and his personal character was more insignificant. . . . Frederic, always poor, and scarcely able to protect himself in Austria from the seditions of his subjects, or the inroads of the king of Hungary, was yet another founder of his family, and left their fortunes incomparably more prosperous than at his accession. The marriage of his son Maximilian with the heiress of Burgundy [see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1477] began that aggrandizement of the house of Austria which Frederic seems to have anticipated. The electors, who had lost a good deal of their former spirit, and were grown sensible of the necessity of choosing a powerful sovereign, made no opposition to Maximilian's becoming king of the Romans in his father's lifetime."—H. Hallam, *The Middle Ages*, ch. 5 (v. 2).—"It is important to remark that, for more than a century after Charles IV. had fixed his seat in Bohemia, no emperor appeared, endowed with the vigour necessary to uphold and govern the empire. The bare fact that Charles's successor, Wenceslas, was a prisoner in the hands of the Bohemians, remained for a long time unknown in Germany: a simple decree of the electors sufficed to dethrone him. Rupert the Palatine only escaped a similar fate by death. When Sigismund of Luxemburg, (who, after many disputed elections, kept possession of the field,) four years after his election, entered the territory of the empire of which he was to be crowned sovereign, he found so little sympathy that he was for a moment inclined to return to Hungary without accomplishing the object of his journey. The active part he took in the affairs of Bohemia, and of Europe generally, has given him a name; but in and for the empire, he did nothing worthy of note. Between the years 1422 and 1430 he never made his appearance beyond Vienna; from the autumn of 1431 to that of 1433 he was occupied with his coronation journey to Rome; and during the three years from 1434 to his death he never got beyond Bohemia and Moravia; nor did Albert II., who has been the subject of such lavish eulogy, ever visit the dominions of the empire. Frederic III., however, far outdid all his predecessors. During seven-and-twenty years, from 1444 to 1471, he was never seen within the boundaries of the empire. Hence it happened that the central action and the visible manifestation of sovereignty, in as far as any such existed in the empire, fell to the share of the princes, and more especially of the prince-electors. In the reign of Sigismund we find them convoking the diets, and leading the armies into the field against the Hussites; the operations against the Bohemians were attributed entirely to them. In this manner the empire became, like the papacy, a power which acted from a distance, and rested chiefly upon opinion. . . . The emperor was regarded, in the first place, as the supreme feudal lord, who conferred on property its highest and most sacred sanction. . . . Although he was regarded as the head and source of all temporal jurisdiction, yet no tribunal found more doubtful obedience than his own. The fact that royalty existed in Germany had almost been suffered to fall into oblivion; even the title had been lost. Henry VII. thought it an affront to be called King of Germany, and not, as he had a right to be called before any ceremony of coronation, King of the Romans. In the 15th century the emperor was

regarded pre-eminently as the successor of the ancient Roman Cæsars, whose rights and dignities had been transferred, first to the Greeks, and then to the Germans in the persons of Charlemagne and Otto the Great; as the true secular head of Christendom. . . . The opinion was confidently entertained in Germany that the other sovereigns of Christendom, especially those of England, Spain, and France, were legally subject to the crown of the empire: the only controversy was, whether their disobedience was venial, or ought to be regarded as sinful."—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*, v. 1, pp. 52-56.

ALSO IN: Sir R. Comyn, *Hist. of the Western Empire*, ch. 24 (v. 1).—E. F. Henderson, *Select Hist. Doc's of the Middle Ages*, bk. 2, no. 10.—See, also, AUSTRIA: A. D. 1330-1364, to 1471-1491.

A. D. 1363-1364.—Tyrol acquired by the House of Austria, with the reversion of the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1330-1364.

A. D. 1378.—Final surrender of the Arelate to France. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1127-1378.

A. D. 1386-1388.—Defeat of the Austrians by the Swiss at Sempach and Naefels. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1386-1388.

A. D. 1405-1434.—The Bohemian Reformation and the Hussite wars. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1405-1415, and 1419-1434.

A. D. 1414-1418.—Failure of demands for Church Reform in the Council of Constance. See PAPACY: A. D. 1414-1418.

A. D. 1417.—The Electorate of Brandenburg conferred on the Hohenzollerns.—"The March of Brandenburg is one of those districts which was first peopled by the advance of the German nation towards the east during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It was in the beginning, like Silesia, Mecklenburg, Pomerania, Prussia, and Livonia, a German colony settled upon an almost uncultivated soil: from the very first, however, it seems to have given the greatest promise of vigour. . . . Possession was taken of the soil upon the ground of the rights of the princely Ascanian house—we know not whether these rights were founded upon inheritance, purchase, or cession. The process of occupation was so gradual that the institutions of the old German provinces, like those constituting the northern march, had time to take firm root in the newly-acquired territory; and owing to the constant necessity for unsheathing the sword, the colonists acquired warlike habits which tended to give them spirit and energy. . . . The Ascanians were a warlike but cultivated race, incessantly acquiring new possessions, but generous and openhanded; and new life followed in their footsteps. They soon took up an important political position among the German princely houses: their possessions extended over a great part of Thuringia, Moravia, Lausitz, and Silesia; the electoral dignity which they assumed gave to them and to their country a high rank in the Empire. In the Neumark and in Pomerellen the Poles retreated before them, and on the Pomeranian coasts they protected the towns founded by the Teutonic order from the invasion of the Danes. It has been asked whether this race might not have greatly extended its power; but they were not destined even to make the attempt. It is said that at the beginning of the fourteenth

century nineteen members of this family were assembled on the Margrave's Hill near Rathenau. In the year 1320, of all these not one remained, or had even left an heir. . . . In Brandenburg . . . it really appeared as if the extinction of the ruling family would entail ruin upon the country. It had formed a close alliance with the imperial power—which at that moment was the subject of contention between the two great families of Wittelsbach and Luxemburg—was involved in the quarrels of those two races, injured by all their alternations of fortune, and sacrificed to their domestic and foreign policy, which was totally at variance with the interests of Brandenburg. At the very beginning of the struggle the March of Brandenburg lost its dependencies. . . . At length the Emperor Sigmund, the last of the house of Luxemburg, found himself so fully occupied with the disturbances in the Empire and the dissensions in the Church, that he could no longer maintain his power in the March, and intrusted the task to his friend and relation, Frederick, Burgrave of Nürnberg, to whom he lay under very great obligations, and who had assisted him with money at his need. . . . It was a great point gained, after so long a period of anarchy, to find a powerful and prudent prince ready to undertake the government of the province. He could do nothing in the open field against the revolted nobles, but he assailed and vanquished them in their hitherto impregnable strong-holds surrounded with walls fifteen feet thick, which he demolished with his clumsy but effective artillery. In a few years he had so far succeeded that he was able to proclaim a Landfriede, or public peace, according to which each and every one who was an enemy to him, or to those comprehended in the peace, was considered and treated as the enemy of all. But the effect of all this would have been but transient, had not the Emperor, who had no son, and who was won by Frederick's numerous services and by his talents for action, made the Electorate hereditary in his family. . . . The most important day in the history of the March of Brandenburg and the family of Zollern was the 18th of April, 1417, when in the market-place of Constance the Emperor Sigmund formally invested the Burgrave with the dignity of Elector, placed in his hands the flag with the arms of the March and received from him the oath of allegiance. From this moment a prospect was afforded to the territory of Brandenburg of recovering its former prosperity and increasing its importance, while to the house of Zollern a career of glory and usefulness was opened worthy of powers which were thus called into action."—L. von Ranke, *Memoirs of the House of Brandenburg*, bk. 1, ch. 2.—See, also, BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1168-1417; and HOHENZOLLERN, RISE OF THE HOUSE OF.

A. D. 1467-1471.—Crusade against George Podiebrad, king of Bohemia. See BOHEMIA: A. D. 1458-1471.

A. D. 1467-1477.—Relations of Charles the Bold of Burgundy to the Empire. See BURGUNDY: A. D. 1467, and 1476-1477.

A. D. 1492-1514.—The Bundschuh insurrections of the Peasantry.—Several risings of the German peasantry, in the later part of the 15th and early part of the 16th century, were named from the Bundschuh, or peasants' clog, which the insurgents bore as their emblem or pictured

on their banners. "While the peasants in the Rhetian Alps were gradually throwing off the yoke of the nobles and forming the 'Graubund' [see SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1396-1499], a struggle was going on between the neighbouring peasantry of Kempton (to the east of Lake Constance) and their feudal lord, the Abbot of Kempton. It began in 1423, and came to an open rebellion in 1492. It was a rebellion against new demands not sanctioned by ancient custom, and though it was crushed, and ended in little good to the peasantry (many of whom fled into Switzerland), yet it is worthy of note because in it for the first time appears the banner of the Bundschuh. The next rising was in Elsass (Alsace), in 1493, the peasants finding allies in the burghers of the towns along the Rhine, who had their own grievances. The Bundschuh was again their banner, and it was to Switzerland that their anxious eyes were turned for help. This movement also was prematurely discovered and put down. Then, in 1501, other peasants, close neighbours to those of Kempton, caught the infection, and in 1502, again in Elsass, but this time further north, in the region about Speyer and the Neckar, lower down the Rhine, nearer Franconia, the Bundschuh was raised again. It numbered on its recruit rolls many thousands of peasants from the country round, along the Neckar and the Rhine. The wild notion was to rise in arms, to make themselves free, like the Swiss, by the sword, to acknowledge no superior but the Emperor, and all Germany was to join the League. They were to pay no taxes or dues, and commons, forests, and rivers were to be free to all. Here, again, they mixed up religion with their demands, and 'Only what is just before God' was the motto on the banner of the Bundschuh. They, too, were betrayed, and in savage triumph the Emperor Maximilian ordered their property to be confiscated, their wives and children to be banished, and themselves to be quartered alive. . . . Few . . . really fell victims to this cruel order of the Emperor. The ringleaders dispersed, fleeing some into Switzerland and some into the Black Forest. For ten years now there was silence. The Bundschuh banner was furled, but only for a while. In 1512 and 1513, on the east side of the Rhine, in the Black Forest and the neighbouring districts of Würtemberg, the movement was again on foot on a still larger scale. It had found a leader in Joss Fritz. A soldier, with commanding presence and great natural eloquence, . . . he bided his time. . . . Again the League was betrayed . . . and Joss Fritz, with the banner under his clothes, had to fly for his life to Switzerland. . . . He returned after a while to the Black Forest, went about his secret errands, and again bided his time. In 1514 the peasantry of the Duke Ulrich of Würtemberg rose to resist the tyranny of their lord [in a combination called 'the League of Poor Conrad']. . . . The same year, in the valleys of the Austrian Alps, in Carinthia, Styria, and Crain, similar risings of the peasantry took place, all of them ending in the triumph of the nobles."—F. Seebohm.—*The Era of the Protestant Revolution*, pt. 1, ch. 4.—See, also, below: A. D. 1524-1525.

A. D. 1493.—Maximilian I. becomes emperor.

A. D. 1493-1519.—The reign of Maximilian.—His personal importance and his imperial

powerlessness.—Constitutional reforms in the Empire.—The Imperial Chamber.—The Circles.—The Aulic Council.—“Frederic [the Third] died in 1493, after a protracted and inglorious reign of 53 years. . . . On the death of his father, Maximilian had been seven years king of the Romans; and his accession to the imperial crown encountered no opposition. . . . Scarcely had he ascended the throne, when Charles VIII., king of France, passed through the Milanese into the south of Italy, and seized on Naples without opposition [see ITALY: A. D. 1494-1496]. Maximilian endeavoured to rouse the German nation to a sense of its danger, but in vain. . . . With difficulty he was able to despatch 3,000 men to aid the league, which Spain, the pope, the Milanese, and the Venetians had formed, to expel the ambitious intruders from Italy. To cement his alliance with Fernando the Catholic, he married his son Philip to Juana, the daughter of the Spaniard. The confederacy triumphed; not through the efforts of Maximilian, but through the hatred of the Italians to the Gallic yoke. . . . Louis XII., who succeeded to Charles (1498), . . . forced Philip to do homage for Flanders; surrendering, indeed, three inconsiderable towns, that he might be at liberty to renew the designs of his house on Lombardy and Naples. . . . The French had little difficulty in expelling Ludovico Moro, the usurper of Milan, and in retaining possession of the country during the latter part of Maximilian's reign [see ITALY: A. D. 1499-1500]. Louis, indeed, did homage for the duchy to the Germanic head; but such homage was merely nominal: it involved no tribute, no dependence. The occupation of this fine province by the French made no impression on the Germans; they regarded it as a *fief* of the house of Austria, not of the empire: but even if it had stood in the latter relation, they would not have moved one man, or voted one florin, to avert its fate. That the French did not obtain similar possession of Naples, and thereby become enabled to oppose Maximilian with greater effect, was owing to the valour of the Spanish troops, who retained the crown in the house of Aragon. His disputes with the Venetians were inglorious to his arms; they defeated his armies, and encroached considerably on his Italian possessions. He was equally unsuccessful with the Swiss, whom he vainly persuaded to acknowledge the supremacy of his house. . . . For many of his failures . . . he is not to be blamed. To carry on his vast enterprises he could command only the resources of Austria: had he been able to wield those of the empire, his name would have been more formidable to his enemies; and it is no slight praise, that with means so contracted he could preserve the Netherlands against the open violence, no less than the subtle duplicity, of France. But the internal transactions of Maximilian's reign are those only to which the attention of the reader can be directed with pleasure. In 1495 we witness the entire abolition of the right of diffidation [private warfare, see LAND-FRIEDE],—a right which from time immemorial had been the curse of the empire. . . . The passing of the decree which for ever secured the public peace, by placing under the ban of the empire, and fining at 2,000 marks in gold, every city, every individual that should hereafter send or accept a defiance, was nearly unanimous. In regard to the long-proposed tribunal [to take

cognizance of all violations of the public tranquillity], which was to retain the name of the Imperial chamber, Maximilian relaxed much from the pretensions of his father. . . . It was solemnly decreed that the new court should consist of one grand judge, and of 16 assessors, who were presented by the states, and nominated by the emperor. . . . Though a new tribunal was formed, its competency, its operation, its support, its constitution, the enforcement of its decisions, were left to chance; and many successive diets—even many generations—were passed before anything like an organised system could be introduced into it. For the execution of its decrees the Swabian league was soon employed; then another new authority, the Council of Regency. . . . But these authorities were insufficient to enforce the execution of the decrees emanating from the chamber; and it was found necessary to restore the proposition of the circles, which had been agitated in the reign of Albert II. . . . Originally they comprised only—1. Bavaria, 2. Franconia, 3. Saxony, 4. the Rhine, 5. Swabia, and 6. Westphalia; thus excluding the states of Austria and the electorates. But this exclusion was the voluntary act of the electors, who were jealous of a tribunal which might encroach on their own privileges. In 1512, however, the opposition of most appears to have been removed; for four new circles were added. 7. The circle of Austria comprised the hereditary dominions of that house. 8. That of Burgundy contained the states inherited from Charles the Rash in Franche-Comté and the Netherlands. 9. That of the Lower Rhine comprehended the three ecclesiastical electorates and the Palatinate. 10. That of Upper Saxony extended over the electorate of that name and the march of Brandenburg. . . . Bohemia and Prussia . . . refused to be thus partitioned. Each of these circles had its internal organisations, the elements of which were promulgated in 1512, but which was considerably improved by succeeding diets. Each had its hereditary president, or director, and its hereditary prince convoker, both offices being frequently vested in the same individual. . . . Each circle had its military chief, elected by the local states, whose duty it was to execute the decrees of the Imperial Chamber. Generally this office was held by the prince director. . . . The establishment of the Imperial Chamber was . . . disagreeable to the emperor. To rescue from its jurisdiction such causes as he considered lay more peculiarly within the range of his prerogative, and to encroach by degrees on the jurisdiction of this odious tribunal, Maximilian, in 1501, laid the foundation of the celebrated Aulic Council. But the competency of this tribunal was soon extended; from political affairs, investitures, charters, and the numerous matters which concerned the Imperial chancery, it immediately passed to judicial crimes. . . . By an imperial edict of 1518, the Aulic Council was to consist of 18 members, all nominated by the emperor. Five only were to be chosen from the states of the empire, the rest from those of Austria. About half were legists, the other half nobles, but all dependent on their chief. . . . When he [Maximilian] laboured to make this council as arbitrary in the empire as in Austria, he met with great opposition. . . . But his purpose was that of encroachment no less than of defence; and his example was so well imitated by his successors, that in

most cases the Aulic Council was at length acknowledged to have a concurrent jurisdiction with the Imperial Chamber, in many the right of prevention over its rival."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Germanic Empire*, bk. 3, ch. 1 (v. 2).—"The received opinion which recognises in [Maximilian] the creative founder of the later constitution of the empire, must be abandoned. . . . He had not the power of keeping the princes of the empire together; . . . on the contrary, everything about him split into parties. It followed of necessity that abroad he rather lost than gained ground. . . . The glory which surrounds the memory of Maximilian, the high renown which he enjoyed even among his contemporaries, were therefore not won by the success of his enterprises, but by his personal qualities. Every good gift of nature had been lavished upon him in profusion. . . . He was a man . . . formed to excite admiration, and to inspire enthusiastic attachment; formed to be the romantic hero, the exhaustless theme of the people."—L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*, v. 1, pp. 379-381.

ALSO IN: The same, *Hist. of the Latin and Teutonic Nations from 1494 to 1514*, bk. 1, ch. 3, and bk. 2, ch. 2 and 4.—See, also, AUSTRIA: A. D. 1477-1495.

A. D. 1496-1499.—The Swabian war.—Practical separation of the Swiss Confederacy from the Empire. See SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1396-1499.

A. D. 1508-1509.—The League of Cambrai against Venice. See VENICE: A. D. 1508-1509.

A. D. 1513-1515.—The emperor in the pay of England.—Peace with France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1513-1515.

A. D. 1516.—Abortive invasion of Milaness by Maximilian. See FRANCE: A. D. 1516-1517.

A. D. 1517-1523.—Beginning of the movement of Religious Reformation.—Papal Indulgences, and Luther's attack on them.—"The Reformation, like all other great social convulsions, was long in preparation [see PAPACY: 15TH-16TH CENTURIES]. It was one part of that general progress, complex in its character, which marked the . . . period of transition from the Middle Ages to modern civilization. . . . But while the Reformation was one part of a change extending over the whole sphere of human knowledge and activity, it had its own specific origin and significance. These are still, to some extent, a subject of controversy. . . . One of its causes, as well as one of the sources of its great power, was the increasing discontent with the prevailing corruption and misgovernment in the Church, and with papal interference in civil affairs. . . . The misconduct of the popes in the last half of the fifteenth century was not more flagrant than that of their predecessors in the tenth century. But the fifteenth century was an age of light. What was done by the pontiffs was not done in a corner, but under the eyes of all Europe. Besides, there was now a deep-seated craving, especially in the Teutonic peoples, who had so long been under the tutelage of a legal, judaizing form of Christianity, for a more spiritual type of religion. . . . The Reformation may be viewed in two aspects. On the one hand it is a religious revolution affecting the beliefs, the rites, the ecclesi-

astical organization of the Church, and the form of Christian life. On the other hand, it is a great movement in which sovereigns and nations are involved; the occasion of wars and treaties; the close of an old, and the introduction of a new, period in the history of culture and civilization. Germany, including the Netherlands and Switzerland, was the stronghold of the Reformation. It was natural that such a movement should spring up and rise to its highest power among a people in whom a love of independence was mingled with a yearning for a more spiritual form of religion than was encouraged by mediæval ecclesiasticism. Hegel has dwelt with eloquence upon the fact that while the rest of the world was gone out to America or to the Indies, in quest of riches and a dominion that should encircle the globe, a simple monk, turning away from empty forms and the things of sense, was finding him whom the disciples once sought in a sepulchre of stone. Unquestionably the hero of the Reformation was Martin Luther. . . . As an English writer has pointed out, Luther's whole nature was identified with his great work, and while other leaders, like Melancthon and even Calvin, can be separated in thought from the Reformation, 'Luther, apart from the Reformation, would cease to be Luther.' . . . In 1517 John Tetzel, a hawker of indulgences, the proceeds of which were to help pay for the building of St. Peter's Church, appeared in the neighborhood of Wittenberg. To persuade the people to buy his spiritual wares, he told them, as Luther himself testifies, that as soon as their money clinked in the bottom of the chest the souls of their deceased friends forthwith went up to heaven. Luther was so struck with the enormity of this traffic that he determined to stop it. He preached against it, and on October 31, 1517, he posted on the door of the Church of All Saints, at Wittenberg, his ninety-five theses [for the full text of these, see PAPACY: A. D. 1517], relating to the doctrine and practice of selling indulgences. Indulgences . . . were at first commutations of penance by the payment of money. The right to issue them had gradually become the exclusive prerogative of the popes. The eternal punishment of mortal sin being remitted or commuted by the absolution of the priest, it was open to the pope or his agents, by a grant of indulgences, to remove the temporal or terminable penalties, which might extend into purgatory. For the benefit of the needy he could draw upon the treasury of merit stored up by Christ and the saints. Although it was expressly declared by Pope Sixtus IV., that souls are delivered from purgatorial fires in a way analogous to the efficacy of prayer, and although contrition was theoretically required of the recipient of an indulgence, it often appeared to the people as a simple bargain, according to which, on payment of a stipulated sum, the individual obtained a full discharge from the penalties of sin, or procured the release of a soul from the flames. Luther's theses assailed the doctrines which made this baneful traffic possible. . . . Unconsciously to their author, they struck a blow at the authority of Rome and of the priesthood. Luther had no thought of throwing off his allegiance to the Roman Church. Even his theses were only propositions, propounded for academic debate, according to the custom in mediæval universities. He concluded them with the solemn declaration

that he affirmed nothing, but left all to the judgment of the Church. . . . The theses stirred up a commotion all over Germany. . . . A controversy arose between the new champion of reform and the defenders of indulgences. It was during this dispute that Luther began to realize that human authority was against him and to see the necessity of planting himself more distinctly on the Scriptures. His clear arguments and resolute attitude won the respect of the Elector of Saxony, who, though he often sought to restrain his vehemence, nevertheless protected him from his enemies. This the elector was able to do because of his political importance, which became still greater when, after the death of Maximilian, he was made regent of Northern Germany."—G. P. Fisher, *History of the Christian Church*, pp. 287-293.—"At first neither Luther, nor others, saw to what the contest about the indulgences would lead. The Humanists believed it to be only a scholastic disputation, and Hutten laughed to see theologians engaged in a fight with each other. It was not till the Leipzig disputation (1519), where Luther stood forward to defend his views against Eck, that the matter assumed a grave aspect, took another turn, and after the appearance of Luther's appeals 'To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation,' 'On the Babylonian Captivity,' and against Church abuses, that it assumed national importance. All the combustible materials were ready, the spark was thrown among them, and the flames broke out from every quarter. Hundreds of thousands of German hearts glowed responsive to the complaints which the Wittenberg monk flung against Papal Rome, in a language whose sonorous splendour and iron strength were now first heard in all the fulness, force, and beauty of the German idiom. That was an imperishable service rendered to his country by Luther. He wrote in German, and he wrote such German. The papal ban hurled back against him in 1520 was disregarded. He burnt it outside the gate of Wittenberg by the leper hospital, in the place where the rags and plague-stained garments of the lepers were wont to be consumed. The nobility, the burghers, the peasants, all thrilled at his call. Now the moment had come for a great emperor, a second Charlemagne, to stand forward and regenerate at once religion and the empire. There was, however, at the head of the state, only Charles V., the grandson of Maximilian, a man weak where he ought to have been strong, and strong where he ought to have been weak, a Spanish Burgundian prince, of Romance stock, who despised and disliked the German tongue, the tongue of the people whose imperial crown he bore, a prince whose policy was to combat France and humble it. It was convenient for him, at the time, to have the pope on his side, so he looked with dissatisfied eyes on the agitation in Germany. The noblest hearts among the princes bounded with hope that he would take the lead in the new movement. The lesser nobility, the cities, the peasantry, all expected of the emperor a reformation of the empire politically and religiously. . . . But all hopes were dashed. Charles V. as little saw his occasion as had Maximilian. He took up a hostile position to the new movement at once. He was, however, brought by the influential friends of Luther, among whom first of all was the Elector of Saxony, to hear what the reformer had to say for

himself, before he placed him under the ban of the empire. Luther received the imperial safe-conduct, and was summoned to the Diet of Worms, there to defend himself. He went, notwithstanding that he was warned and reminded of the fate of Huss. 'I will go to Worms,' said he, 'even were as many devils set against me as there are tiles on the roofs.' It was probably on this journey that the thoughts entered his mind which afterwards (1530) found their expression in that famous chorale, 'Eine feste Burg ist unser Gott,' which became the battle-song of Protestants. Those were memorable days, the 17th and 18th of April, 1521, in which a poor monk stood up before the emperor and all the estates of the empire, undazzled by their threatening splendour, and conducted his own case. At that moment when he closed his defence with the stirring words, 'Let me be contradicted out of Holy Scripture—till that is done I will not recant. Here stand I. I can do no other, so help me God, amen!' then he had reached the pinnacle of his greatness. The result is well known. The emperor and his papal adviser remained unmoved, and the ban was pronounced against the heretic. Luther was carried off by his protector, the Elector of Saxony, and concealed in the Warthburg, where he worked at his translation of the Bible. . . . Brandenburg, Hesse, and Saxony declared in favour of reform. In 1523 Magdeburg, Wismar, Rostock, Stettin, Danzig, Riga, expelled the monks and priests, and appointed Lutheran preachers. Nürnberg and Breslau hailed the Reformation with delight."—S. Baring-Gould, *The Church in Germany*, ch. 18.—See PAPACY: A. D. 1516-1517, to 1522-1525.

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*.—L. Häusser, *The Period of the Reformation*.—J. H. Merle d'Aubigne, *Hist. of the Reformation*.—M. J. Spaulding, *Hist. of the Protestant Reformation*.—F. Seebohm, *The Era of the Protestant Revolution*.—P. Bayne, *Martin Luther*.—C. Beard, *Martin Luther and the Reformation*.—J. Köstlin, *Life of Luther*.

A. D. 1519.—Contest for the imperial crown.—Three royal candidates in the field.—Election of Charles V., the Austro-Spanish monarch of many thrones.—In his last years, Maximilian made great efforts to secure the Imperial Crown for his grandson Charles, who had already inherited, through his mother Joanna, of Spain, the kingdoms of Castile, Aragon, and the Two Sicilies, and through his father, Philip of Austria, the duchy of Burgundy and the many lordships of the Netherlands. "In 1518 he obtained the consent of the majority of the electors to the Roman crown being bestowed on that prince. The electors of Trèves and Saxony alone opposed the project, on the ground that, as Maximilian had never received the Imperial crown [but was styled Emperor Elect] he was himself still King of the Romans, and that consequently Charles could not assume a dignity that was not vacant. To obviate this objection, Maximilian pressed Leo to send the golden crown to Vienna; but this plan was defeated by the intrigues of the French court. Francis, who intended to become a candidate for the Imperial crown, intreated the Pope not to commit himself by such an act; and while these negotiations were pending, Maximilian died at Wels, in Upper Austria, January 12th 1519. . . . Three candidates for the Imperial crown

appeared in the field: the Kings of Spain, France, and England. Francis I. [of France] was now at the height of his reputation. His enterprises had hitherto been crowned with success, the popular test of ability, and the world accordingly gave him credit for a political wisdom which he was far from possessing. He appears to have gained three or four of the Electors by the lavish distribution of his money, which his agent, Bonnivet, was obliged to carry through Germany on the backs of horses; for the Fuggers, the rich bankers of Augsburg, were in the interest of Charles, and refused to give the French any accommodation. But the bought votes of these venal Electors could not be depended on, some of whom sold themselves more than once to different parties. The infamy of Albert, Elector of Mentz, in these transactions, was particularly notorious. The chances of Henry VIII. [of England] were throughout but slender. Henry's hopes, like those of Francis, were chiefly founded on the corruptibility of the Electors, and on the expectation that both his rivals, from the very magnitude of their power, might be deemed ineligible. Of the three candidates the claims of Charles seemed the best founded and the most deserving of success. The House of Austria had already furnished six emperors, of whom the last three had reigned eighty years, as if by an hereditary succession. Charles's Austrian possessions made him a German prince, and from their situation constituted him the natural protector of Germany against the Turks. The previous canvass of Maximilian had been of some service to his cause, and all these advantages he seconded, like his competitors, by the free use of bribery. . . . Leo X., the weight of whose authority was sought both by Charles and Francis, though he seemed to favour each, desired the success of neither. He secretly advised the Electors to choose an emperor from among their own body; and as this seemed an easy solution of the difficulty, they unanimously offered the crown to Frederick the Wise, Elector of Saxony. But Frederick magnanimously refused it, and succeeded in uniting the suffrages of the Electors in favour of Charles; principally on the ground that he was the sovereign best qualified to meet the great danger impending from the Turk. . . . The new Emperor, now in his 20th year, assumed the title of Charles V. . . . He was proclaimed as 'Emperor Elect,' the title borne by his grandfather, which he subsequently altered to that of 'Emperor Elect of the Romans,' a designation adopted by his successors, with the omission of the word 'elect,' down to the dissolution of the empire."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 2, ch. 2 (v. 1).—On his election to the Imperial throne, Charles ceded to his younger brother, Ferdinand, all the German possessions of the family. The latter, therefore, became Archduke of Austria, and the German branch of the House of Austria was continued through him; while Charles himself became the founder of a new branch of the House—the Spanish.—See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1496-1526.

ALSO IN: W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 1.—J. S. Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, ch. 11 (v. 1).—J. Van Praet, *Essays on the Pol. Hist. of the 15th-17th Centuries*, ch. 2 (v. 1).

A. D. 1520-1521.—The Capitulation of Charles V.—His first Diet, at Worms, and its political measures.—The election of Charles V.

"was accompanied with a new and essential alteration in the constitution of the empire. Hitherto a general and verbal promise to confirm the Germanic privileges had been deemed a sufficient security; but as the enormous power and vast possessions of the new emperor rendered him the object of greater jealousy and alarm than his predecessors, the electors digested into a formal deed or capitulation all their laws, customs, and privileges, which the ambassadors of Charles signed before his election, and which he himself ratified before his coronation; and this example has been followed by his successors. It consisted of 36 articles, partly relating to the Germanic body in general, and partly to the electors and states in particular. Of those relating to the Germanic body in general, the most prominent were, not to confer the escheated fiefs, but to re-unite and consolidate them, for the benefit of the emperor and empire; not to intrust the charges of the empire to any but Germans; not to grant dispensations of the common law; to use the German language in the proceedings of the chancery; and to put no one arbitrarily to the ban, who had not been previously condemned by the diet or imperial chamber. He was to maintain the Germanic body in the exercise of its legislative powers, in its right of declaring war and making peace, of passing laws on commerce and coinage, of regulating the contingents, imposing and directing the perception of ordinary contributions, of establishing and superintending the superior tribunals, and of judging the personal causes of the states. Finally, he promised not to cite the members of the Germanic body before any tribunal except those of the empire, and to maintain them in their legitimate privileges of territorial sovereignty. The articles which regarded the electors were of the utmost importance, because they confirmed the rights which had been long contested with the emperors. . . . Besides these concessions, he promised not to make any attempt to render the imperial crown hereditary in his family, and to re-establish the council of regency, in conformity with the advice of the electors and great princes of the empire. On the 6th of January, 1521, Charles assembled his first diet at Worms, where he presided in person. At his proposition the states passed regulations to terminate the troubles which had already arisen during the short interval of the interregnum, and to prevent the revival of similar disorders. . . . The imperial chamber was re-established in all its authority, and the public peace again promulgated, and enforced by new penalties. In order to direct the affairs of the empire during the absence of Charles, a council of regency was established. . . . It was to consist of a lieutenant-general, appointed by the emperor, and 22 assessors, of whom 18 were nominated by the states, and four by Charles, as possessor of the circles of Burgundy and Austria. . . . At the same time an aid of 20,000 foot and 4,000 horse was granted, to accompany the emperor in his expedition to Rome; but the diet endeavoured to prevent him from interfering, as Maximilian had done, in the affairs of Italy, by stipulating that these troops were only to be employed as an escort, and not for the purpose of aggression."—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 26 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*, bk. 2, ch. 4 (v. 1).

A. D. 1522-1525.—Systematic organization and adoption in northern Germany of the Lutheran Reformation.—The Diets at Nuremberg.—The Catholic League of Ratisbon. See PAPACY: A. D. 1522-1525.

A. D. 1524-1525.—The Peasants' War.—"A political ferment, very different from that produced by the Gospel, had long been troubling the empire. The people, weighed down under civil and ecclesiastical oppression, attached in many places to the lands belonging to the lords, and sold with them, threatened to rise, and furiously burst their chains. In Holland, at the end of the preceding century, the peasants had mustered around standards inscribed with the words 'bread' and 'cheese,' to them the two necessities of life. In 1503 the 'Cobblers' League' ['*Bundschuh*']—see above: A. D. 1492-1514] had burst forth in the neighbourhood of Spire. In 1513 this was renewed in Brisgau, and encouraged by the priests. In 1514 Wurtemberg had witnessed 'the League of poor Conrad,' the object of which was to uphold 'the justice of God' by revolt. In 1515 terrible commotions had taken place in Carinthia and Hungary. These insurrections were stifled by torrents of blood, but no relief had been given to the peoples. A political reform was as much wanted as a religious one. The people had a right to it, but they were not ripe to enjoy it. Since the commencement of the Reformation these popular agitations had been suspended, the minds of men being absorbed with other thoughts. . . . But everything showed that peace would not last long. . . . The main dykes which had hitherto kept the torrent back were broken, and nothing could restrain its fury. Perhaps it must be admitted that the movement communicated to the people by the Reform gave new force to the discontent which was fermenting in the nation. . . . Erasmus did not hesitate to say to Luther: 'We are now reaping the fruits of the seed you have sown.' . . . The evil was augmented by the pretensions of certain fanatical men, who laid claim to celestial inspirations. . . . The most distinguished of these enthusiasts was Thomas Münzer. . . . His first appearance was at Zwickau. He left Wittenberg after Luther's return [from his concealment at Wartburg, 1522], dissatisfied with the inferior part he had played, and he became pastor of the little town of Alstadt in Thuringia. There he could not long be at rest, and he accused the reformers of founding a new papacy by their attachment to the letter, and of forming churches which were not pure and holy. He regarded himself as called of God to bear a remedy for so great an evil. . . . He maintained that to obey princes, 'destitute of reason,' was to serve God and Belial at the same time. Then, marching at the head of his parishioners, to a chapel which was visited by pilgrims from all quarters, he pulled it to the ground. After this exploit he was obliged to quit the country, wandered over Germany, and came to Switzerland, spreading as he went, wherever people would hear him, his plan for a universal revolution. In every place he found elements ready for his purpose. He threw his powder upon the burning coals, and a violent explosion soon followed. . . . The revolt commenced in those regions of the Black Forest, and the sources of the Danube, which were so often the scene of popular disturbances. On the 19th of July, 1524, the Thurgovian peasantry rose

against the Abbot of Reichenau, who would not grant them an evangelical preacher. Thousands soon gathered around the little town of Tengen, to liberate an ecclesiastic who was imprisoned there. The revolt spread, with inconceivable rapidity, from Suabia to the Rhine countries, to Franconia, to Thuringia, and to Saxony. In January, 1525, the whole of these countries were in insurrection. Towards the end of that month the peasants published a declaration in twelve articles, asking the liberty to choose their own pastors, the abolition of petty tithes, serfdom, the duties on inheritance, and liberty to hunt, fish, cut wood, &c., and each demand was supported by a passage of Scripture."—J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, *The Story of the Reformation*, pt. 3, ch. 8 (*Hist. of the Reformation*, bk. 10, ch. 10-11).—"Had the feudal lords granted proper and fair reforms long ago, they would never have heard of these twelve articles. But they had refused reform, and they now had to meet revolution. And they knew of but one way of meeting it, namely, by the sword. The lords of the Swabian League sent their army of foot and horsemen, under their captain, George Truchsess. The poor peasants could not hold out against trained soldiers and cavalry. Two battles on the Danube, in which thousands of peasants were slain, or drowned in the river, and a third equally bloody one in Algau, near the Boden See, crushed this rebellion in Swabia, as former rebellions had so often been crushed before. This was early in April 1525. But in the meantime the revolution had spread further north. In the valley of the Neckar a body of 6,000 peasants had come together, enraged by the news of the slaughter of their fellow peasants in the south of Swabia." They stormed the castle of the young Count von Helfenstein, who had recently cut the throats of some peasants who met him on the road, and put the Count to death, with 60 of his companions. "A yell of horror was raised through Germany at the news of the peasants' revenge. No yell had risen when the Count cut peasants' throats, or the Swabian lords slew thousands of peasant rebels. Europe had not yet learned to mete out the same measure of justice to noble and common blood. . . . The revolution spread, and the reign of terror spread with it. North and east of the valley of the Neckar, among the little towns of Franconia, and in the valleys of the Maine, other bands of peasants, mustering by thousands, destroyed alike cloisters and castles. Two hundred of these lighted the night with their flames during the few weeks of their temporary triumph. And here another feature of the revolution became prominent. The little towns were already . . . passing through an internal revolution. The artisans were rising against the wealthier burghers, overturning the town councils, and electing committees of artisans in their place, making sudden changes in religion, putting down the Mass, unfrocking priests and monks, and in fact, in the interests of what they thought to be the gospel, turning all things upside down. . . . It was during the Franconian rebellion that the peasants chose the robber knight Goetz von Berlichingen as their leader. It did them no good. More than a robber chief was needed to cope with soldiers used to war. . . . While all this was going on in the valleys of the Maine, the revolution had crossed the Rhine into Elsass and Lothringen, and the Palatinate about Spire and

Worms, and in the month of May had been crushed in blood, as in Swabia and Franconia. South and east, in Bavaria, in the Tyrol, and in Carinthia also, castles and monasteries went up in flames, and then, when the tide of victory turned, the burning houses and farms of the peasants lit up the night and their blood flowed freely. Meanwhile Münzer, who had done so much to stir up the peasantry in the south to rebel, had gone north into Thuringia, and headed a revolution in the town of Mülhausen, and became a sort of Savonarola of a madder kind. . . . But the end was coming. The princes, with their disciplined troops, came nearer and nearer. What could Münzer do with his 8,000 peasants? He pointed to a rainbow and expected a miracle, but no miracle came. The battle, of course, was lost; 5,000 peasants lay dead upon the field near the little town of Frankenhausen, where it was fought. Münzer fled and concealed himself in a bed, but was found and taken before the princes, thrust into a dungeon, and afterwards beheaded. So ended the wild career of this misguided, fanatical, self-deceived, but yet, as we must think, earnest and in many ways heroic spirit. . . . The princes and nobles now everywhere prevailed over the insurgent peasants. Luther, writing on June 21, 1525, says:—"It is a certain fact, that in Franconia 11,000 peasants have been slain. Markgraf Casimir is cruelly severe upon his peasants, who have twice broken faith with him. In the Duchy of Wurtemberg, 6,000 have been killed; in different places in Swabia, 10,000. It is said that in Alsace the Duke of Lorraine has slain 20,000. Thus everywhere the wretched peasants are cut down." . . . Before the Peasants' War was ended at least 100,000 perished, or twenty times as many as were put to death in Paris during the Reign of Terror in 1793. . . . Luther, throughout the Peasants' War, sided with the ruling powers. . . . The reform he sought was by means of the civil power; and in order to clear himself and his cause from all participation in the wild doings of the peasantry, he publicly exhorted the princes to crush their rebellion."—F. Seebohm, *The Era of the Protestant Revolution*, pt. 2, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*, bk. 3, ch. 6 (v. 2).—P. Bayne, *Martin Luther: His Life and Work*, bk. 11 (v. 2).—J. Köstlin, *Life of Luther*, pt. 4, ch. 5.—C. W. C. Oman, *The German Peasant War of 1525* (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, v. 5).

A. D. 1525-1529.—League of Torgau.—The Diets at Spire.—Legal recognition of the Reformed Religion, and the withdrawal of it.—The Protest which gave rise to the name "Protestants." See PAPACY: A. D. 1525-1529.

A. D. 1529.—Turkish invasion of Austria.—Siege of Vienna. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1526-1567.

A. D. 1530.—The Diet at Augsburg.—The signing and reading of the Protestant Confession of Faith.—The condemnatory decree.—Breach between the Protestants and the emperor. See PAPACY: A. D. 1530-1531.

A. D. 1530-1532.—The Augsburg Decree.—Alarm of the Protestants.—Their League of Smalkalde and alliance with the king of France.—Pacification of Nuremberg with the emperor.—Expulsion of the Turks from Hungary.—The decree issued by the Diet at Augsburg was condemnatory of most of the tenets

peculiar to the protestants, "forbidding any person to protect or tolerate such as taught them, enjoining a strict observance of the established rites, and prohibiting any farther innovation, under severe penalties. All orders of men were required to assist with their persons and fortunes in carrying this decree into execution; and such as refused to obey it were declared incapable of acting as judges, or of appearing as parties in the imperial chamber, the supreme court of judicature in the empire. To all which was subjoined a promise, that an application should be made to the pope, requiring him to call a general council within six months, in order to terminate all controversies by its sovereign decisions. The severity of this decree, which was considered as a prelude to the most violent persecution, alarmed the protestants, and convinced them that the emperor was resolved on their destruction." Under these circumstances, the protestant princes met at Smalkalde, December 22, 1530, and there "concluded a league of mutual defence against all aggressors, by which they formed the protestant states of the empire into one regular body, and, beginning already to consider themselves as such, they resolved to apply to the kings of France and England, and to implore them to patronise and assist their new confederacy. An affair not connected with religion furnished them with a pretence for courting the aid of foreign princes." This was the election of the emperor's brother, Ferdinand, to be King of the Romans, against which they had protested vigorously. "When the protestants, who were assembled a second time at Smalkalde [February, 1531], received an account of this transaction, and heard, at the same time, that prosecutions were commenced in the imperial chamber against some of their number, on account of their religious principles, they thought it necessary, not only to renew their former confederacy, but immediately to despatch their ambassadors into France and England." The king of France "listened with the utmost eagerness to the complaints of the protestant princes; and, without seeming to countenance their religious opinions, determined secretly to cherish those sparks of political discord which might be afterwards kindled into a flame. For this purpose he sent William de Bellay, one of the ablest negotiators in France, into Germany, who, visiting the courts of the malecontent princes, and heightening their ill-humour by various arts, concluded an alliance between them and his master, which, though concealed at that time, and productive of no immediate effects, laid the foundation of a union fatal on many occasions to Charles's ambitious projects. . . . The king of England [Henry VIII.], highly incensed against Charles, in complaisance to whom, the pope had long retarded, and now openly opposed, his divorce [from Catharine of Aragon], was no less disposed than Francis to strengthen a league which might be rendered so formidable to the emperor. But his favourite project of the divorce led him into such a labyrinth of schemes and negotiations, and he was, at the same time, so intent on abolishing the papal jurisdiction in England, that he had no leisure for foreign affairs. This obliged him to rest satisfied with giving general promises, together with a small supply in money, to the confederates of Smalkalde. Meanwhile, many circumstances convinced Charles that this was not a juncture in which he could

afford to let his zeal for the church push him to extremities with the protestants. "Negotiations were, accordingly, carried on by his direction with the elector of Saxony and his associates; after many delays . . . terms of pacification were agreed upon at Nuremberg [July 23], and ratified solemnly in the diet at Ratisbon [August 3]. In this treaty it was stipulated: that universal peace be established in Germany, until the meeting of a general council, the convocation of which within six months the emperor shall endeavour to procure; that no person shall be molested on account of religion; that a stop shall be put to all processes begun by the imperial chamber against protestants, and the sentences already passed to their detriment shall be declared void. On their part, the protestants engaged to assist the emperor with all their forces in resisting the invasion of the Turks. . . . The protestants of Germany, who had hitherto been viewed only as a religious sect, came henceforth to be considered as a political body of no small consequence. The intelligence which Charles received of Solymán's having entered Hungary, at the head of 300,000 men, brought the deliberations of the diet at Ratisbon to a period. . . . The protestants, as a testimony of their gratitude to the emperor, exerted themselves with extraordinary zeal, and brought into the field forces which exceeded in number the quota imposed on them; and the catholics imitating their example, one of the greatest and best-appointed armies that had ever been levied in Germany, assembled near Vienna. . . . It amounted in all to 90,000 disciplined foot, and 30,000 horse, besides a prodigious swarm of irregulars. Of this vast army . . . the emperor took the command in person; and mankind waited in suspense the issue of a decisive battle between the two greatest monarchs in the world. But each of them dreading the other's power and good fortune, they both conducted their operations with such excessive caution, that a campaign for which such immense preparations had been made ended without any memorable event. Solymán, finding it impossible to gain ground upon an enemy always attentive and on his guard, marched back to Constantinople towards the end of autumn. . . . About the beginning of this campaign, the elector of Saxony died, and was succeeded by his son John Frederick. . . . Immediately after the retreat of the Turks, Charles, impatient to revisit Spain, set out, on his way thither, for Italy."—W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 5.

ALSO IN: L. von Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation in Germany*, bk. 6, ch. 1-8 (v. 3).—H. Stebbing, *Hist. of the Reformation*, ch. 12-13 (v. 2).

A. D. 1532-1536.—Fanaticism of the Anabaptists of Münster.—Siege and capture of the city. See ANABAPTISTS OF MÜNSTER.

A. D. 1533-1546.—Mercenary aspects of the Reformation.—Protestant intolerance.—Union with the Swiss Reformers.—The Catholic Holy League.—Preparations for war.—"During the next few years [after the peace concluded at Nuremberg] there was no open hostility between the two religious parties. . . . But there was dissension enough. In the first place there was much disputation as to the meaning of the articles concluded at Nuremberg. The catholic princes, under the pretext that, if no man was to be disturbed for his faith, or for things depending on faith, he was still amenable for certain

offences against the church, which were purely of a civil nature, were eager that the imperial chamber should take cognisance of future cases, at least, where protestants should seek to invade the temporalities of the church. . . . But nothing was effected; the tribunal was too powerless to enforce its decrees. In 1534, the protestants, in a public assembly, renounced all obedience to the chamber; yet they did not cease to appropriate to themselves the property of such monasteries and churches as, by the conversion of catholics to their faith—and that faith was continually progressive—lay within their jurisdiction. We need scarcely observe, that the prospect of spoliation was often the most powerful inducement with the princes and nobles to change their religion. When they, or the magistracy of any particular city, renounced the faith hitherto established, the people were expected to follow the example: the moment Lutheranism was established in its place, the ancient faith was abolished; nobody was allowed to profess it; and, with one common accord, all who had any prospect of benefiting by the change threw themselves on the domains of the expelled clergy. That the latter should complain before the only tribunal where justice could be expected, was natural; nor can we be surprised that the plunderers should soon deny, in religious affairs, the jurisdiction of that tribunal. From the departure of the emperor to the year 1538, some hundreds of domains were thus seized, and some hundreds of complaints addressed to him by parties who resolved to interpret the articles of Nuremberg in their own way. The protestants declared, in a letter to him, that their consciences would not allow them to tolerate any papist in their states. . . . By espousing the cause of the exiled duke of Wittemberg, they procured a powerful ally. . . . But a greater advantage was the union of the sacramentarians [the Swiss reformers, who accepted the doctrine of Zwingli respecting the purely symbolical significance of the commemoration of the Lord's Supper—see SWITZERLAND: A. D. 1528-1531] with the Lutherans. Of such a result, at the diet of Augsburg, there was not the least hope; but Bucer, being deputed by the imperial cities to ascertain whether a union might not be effected, laboured so zealously at the task that it was effected. He consented to modify some of his former opinions; or at least to wrap them in language so equivocal that they might mean anything or nothing at the pleasure of the holder. The Swiss, indeed, especially those of Zurich, refused to sanction the articles on which Luther and Bucer had agreed. Still, by the union of all protestant Germany under the same banners, much was gained. . . . In the meantime, the dissensions between the two great parties augmented from day to day. To pacify them, Charles sent fruitless embassies. Roused by the apparent danger, in 1538, the catholic princes formed, at Nuremberg, a counter league to that of Smalcald [calling it the Holy League]. . . . The death of Luther's old enemy, George, duke of Saxony [1539], transferred the dominion of that prince's states into the hands of [his brother Henry] a Lutheran. Henry, duke of Brunswick, was now the only great secular prince in the north of Germany who adhered to the Roman catholic faith. . . . A truce was concluded at Frankfort, in 1539; but it could not remove the existing animosity, which was daily

augmented. Both parties were in the wrong. . . . At the close of 1540, Worms was the scene of a conference very different from that where, 20 years before, Luther had been proscribed. There was an interminable theological disputation. . . . As little good resulted, Charles, who was hastening from the Low Countries to his German dominions, evoked the affair before a diet at Ratisbon, in April, 1541. . . . The diet of Ratisbon was well attended; and never did prince exert himself more zealously than Charles to make peace between his angry subjects. But . . . all that could be obtained was, that things should be suffered to remain in their present state until a future diet or a general council. The reduction of Buda, however, by the Turks, rendered king Ferdinand, his brother, and the whole of Germany, eager for an immediate settlement of the dispute. . . . Hence the diet of Spire in 1542. If, in regard to religion, nothing definitive was arranged, except the selection of Trent as the place most suitable for a general council, one good end was secured—supplies for the war with the Turks. The campaign, however, which passed without an action, was inglorious to the Germans, who appear to have been in a lamentable state of discipline. Nor was the public satisfaction much increased by the disputes of the Smalcald league with Henry of Brunswick. The duke was angry with his subjects of Brunswick and Breslau, who adhered to the protestant league; and though he had reason enough to be dissatisfied with both, nothing could be more vexatious than his conduct towards them. In revenge, the league of Smalcald sent 19,000 men into the field,—a formidable display of protestant power!—and Henry was expelled from his hereditary states, which were seized by the victors. He invoked the aid of the imperial chamber, which cited the chiefs of the league; but as, in 1538, the competency of that tribunal had been denied in religious, so now it was denied in civil matters. . . . The following years exhibit on both sides the same jealousy, the same duplicity, often the same violence where the mask was no longer required, with as many ineffectual attempts to procure a union between them. . . . The progress of events continued to favour the reformers. They had already two votes in the electoral college,—those of Saxony and Brandenburg; they were now to have the preponderance; for the elector palatine and Herman archbishop of Cologne abjured their religion, thus placing at the command of the reformed party four votes against three. But this numerical superiority did not long remain. . . . The pope excommunicated the archbishop, deposed him from his dignity, and ordered the chapter to proceed to a new election; and when Herman refused to obey, Charles sent troops to expel him, and to instal the archbishop elect, Count Adolf of Nassau. Herman retired to his patrimonial estates, where he died in the profession of the reformed religion. These events mortified the members of the Smalcald league; but they were soon partially consoled by the capture of Henry duke of Brunswick [1546], who had the temerity to collect troops and invade his patrimonial dominions. Their success gave umbrage to the emperor. . . . He knew that the confederates had already 20,000 men under arms, and that they were actively, however secretly, augmenting their forces. His first care was to cause troops to be as secretly

collected in his hereditary states; his second, to seduce, if possible, some leaders of the protestants. With Maurice duke of Saxony he was soon successful; and eventually with the two margraves of Brandenburg, who agreed to make preparations for a campaign and join him at the proper moment. . . . His convocation of the diet at Ratisbon [1546], which after a vain parade ended in nothing, was only to hide his real designs. As he began to throw off the mask, the reformed theologians precipitately withdrew; and both parties took the field, but not until they had each published a manifesto to justify this extreme proceeding. In each there was much truth, and more falsehood.”—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Germanic Empire*, bk. 3, ch. 2 (v. 3).

A. D. 1542-1544.—War with Francis I. of France.—Battle of Cerisoles.—Treaty of Crespy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1532-1547.

A. D. 1542-1563.—The beginning of the Roman Catholic reaction.—The Council of Trent. See PAPACY: A. D. 1537-1563.

A. D. 1546-1552.—War of Charles against the Protestants.—The treachery of Maurice of Saxony.—The battle of Muhlberg.—The emperor's proposed "Interim" and its failure.—His reverse of fortune.—Protestantism triumphant.—The Treaty of Passau.—"Luther's death [which occurred in 1546] made no change in the resolution which Charles had at last taken to crush the Reformation in his German dominions by force of arms; on the contrary, he was more than ever stimulated to carry out his purpose by two occurrences: the adoption of the new religion by one who was not only an Elector of the Empire, but one of the chief prelates of the Church, the Prince-Archbishop of Cologne. . . . The other event that influenced him was the refusal of the Protestants to accept as binding the decrees of the Council of Trent, which was composed of scarcely any members but a few Italian and Spanish prelates, and from which they appealed to either a free general Council or a national Council of the Empire; offering, at the same time, if Charles should prefer it, to submit the whole question of religion to a joint Commission, composed of divines of each party. These remonstrances, however, the Emperor treated with contempt. He had been for some time secretly raising troops in different quarters; and, early in 1546, he made a fresh treaty with the Pope, by which he bound himself instantly to commence warlike operations, and which, though it had been negotiated as a secret treaty, Paul instantly published, to prevent any retraction or delay on his part. War therefore now began, though Charles professed to enter upon it, not for the purpose of enforcing a particular religious belief on the recusants, but for that of re-establishing the Imperial authority, which, as he affirmed, many of the confederate princes had disowned. Such a pretext he expected to sow disunion in the body, some members of which were far from desirous to weaken the great confederacy of the Empire; and, in effect, it did produce a hesitation in their early steps that had the most important consequences on the first campaign; for, in spite of the length of time during which he had secretly been preparing for war, when it came they were more ready than he. They at once took the field with an army of 90,000 men and 120 guns, while he, for the first few weeks after the declaration of war, had hardly

10,000 men with him in Ratisbon. . . . But the advantage of a single over a divided command was perhaps never more clearly exemplified than in the first operations of the two armies. He, as the weaker party, took up a defensive position near Ingolstadt; but, though they advanced within sight of his lines, they could not agree on the mode of attack, or even on the prudence of attacking him at all. . . . At last, the confederates actually drew off, and Charles, advancing, made himself master of many important towns, which their irresolution alone had enabled him to approach." Meanwhile the Emperor had won an important ally. This was Duke Maurice, of the Albertine line of the House of Saxony (see SAXONY: A. D. 1180-1553), to whom several opportune deaths had given the ducal seat unexpectedly, in 1541, and whose ambition now hungered for the Electorate, which was held by the other (the Ernestine) branch of the family. He conceived the idea of profiting by the troubles of the time to win possession of it. "With this view, though he also was a Protestant, he tendered his services to the Emperor, who, in spite of his youth, discerned in him a promise of very superior capacity, gladly accepted his aid, and promised to reward him with the territories which he coveted. The advantages which Protestantism eventually derived from Maurice's success has blinded some historians to the infamy of the conduct by which he achieved it. . . . The Elector [John Frederick] was his [second] cousin; the Landgrave of Hesse was his father-in-law. Pleading an unwillingness while so young (he was barely 21) to engage in the war, he volunteered to undertake the protection of his cousin's dominions during his absence in the field. His offer was thankfully accepted; but he was no sooner installed in his charge than he began to negotiate with the enemy to invade the territories which he had bound himself to protect. And on receiving from Charles a copy of a decree, called the Ban of the Empire, which had just been issued against both the Elector and the Landgrave, he at once raised a force of his own, with which he overran one portion of [the Elector's] dominions, while a division of the Imperial army attacked the rest; and he would probably have succeeded at once in subduing the whole Electorate, had the main body of the Protestants been able to maintain the war on the Danube." But Charles's successes there brought about a suspension of hostilities which enabled the Elector to return and "chastise Maurice for his treachery; to drive him not only from the towns and districts which he had seized, but to strip him also of the greater part of the territory which belonged to him by inheritance." Charles was unable, at first, to give any assistance to his ally. The Elector, however, who was the worst of generals, so scattered his forces that when, "on the 23d of April [1547], Charles reached the Elbe and prepared to attack him, he had no advantage over his assailant but that of position. That indeed was very strong. He lay at Muhlberg, on the right bank of the river, which at that point is 300 yards wide and more than four feet deep, with a stream so rapid as to render the passage, even for horsemen, a task of great difficulty and danger." Against the remonstrances of his ablest general, the Duke of Alva, Charles, favored by a heavy fog, led his army across the river and boldly attacked. The Elector attempted to retreat, but his retreat be-

came a rout. Many fell, but many more were taken prisoners, including the Elector and the Landgrave of Hesse. The victory was decisive for the time, and Charles used it without moderation or generosity. He declared a forfeiture of the whole Electorate of Saxony by John Frederick, and conferred it upon the treacherous Maurice; and, "though Maurice was son-in-law of the Landgrave of Hesse, he stripped that prince of his territories, and, by a device scarcely removed from the tricks of a kidnapper, threw him also into prison." Charles seemed now to be completely master of the situation in Germany, and there was little opposition to his will in a diet which he convened at Augsburg.—C. D. Yonge, *Three Centuries of Modern History*, ch. 4.—"He opened the Diet of Augsburg (September 1, 1547), in the hope of finally bringing about the union so long desired and so frequently attempted, but which he despaired of effecting through a council which the Protestants had rejected in advance. . . . By the famous 'Interim' of Augsburg—the joint production of Julius von Pflug, Bishop of Naumburg; Michael Helding, coadjutor of Mentz; and the wily and subtle John Agricola, preacher to the Elector of Brandenburg—Protestants were permitted to receive the Holy Eucharist under both kinds; the Protestant clergy already married to retain their wives; and a tacit approval given to the retention of property already taken from the Church. This instrument was, from beginning to end, a masterpiece of duplicity, and as such satisfied no party. The Catholics of Germany, the Protestants, and the Court of Rome, each took exception to it. . . . Maurice, the new Elector of Saxony, unwilling to give the Interim an unconditional approval, consulted with a number of Protestant theologians, headed by Melancthon, as to how far he might accept its provisions with a safe conscience. In reply they drew up what is known as the *Leipsig Interim* (1548), in which they stated that questions of ritual and ceremony, and others of minor importance, which they designated by the generic word *adiaphora*, might be wholly overlooked; and even in points of a strictly doctrinal character, they expressed themselves favourable to concession and compromise. . . . Such Lutheran preachers as professed to be faithful followers of their master, made a determined opposition to the 'Interim,' and began a vigorous assault upon its *adiaphoristic* clauses. The *Anti-adiaphorists*, as they were called, were headed by Flacius Illyricus, who being an ardent disciple of Luther's, and possessing somewhat of his courage and energy, repaired to Magdeburg, whose bold citizens were as defiant of imperial power as they were contemptuous of papal authority. But in spite of this spirited opposition, the Interim was gradually accepted by several Protestant countries and cities—a fact which encouraged the emperor at the Diet of Augsburg, in 1550, to make a final effort to have the Protestants attend the sessions of the Council of Trent, again opened by Pope Julius III. . . . After a short delay, deputies from Brandenburg, Württemberg, and Saxony began to appear at Trent; and even the Wittenberg theologians, headed by Melancthon, were already on their way to the Council, when Maurice of Saxony, having secured all the advantages he hoped to obtain by an alliance with the Catholic party, and regardless of the obligations by which he was bound, proceeded to betray both the emperor and his country. Having

received a commission to carry into effect the ban of the empire passed upon Magdeburg, he was in a position to assemble a large body of troops in Germany without exciting suspicion, or revealing his ulterior purposes. Besides uniting to himself, as confederates in his plot, John Albert, Duke of Mecklenburg; Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg; and William, Landgrave of Hesse, eldest son of Philip of Hesse, he entered into a secret treaty (Oct. 5, 1551) with Henry II., King of France, who, as was pretended, coming into Germany as the saviour of the country, seized the cities of Metz, Toul, and Verdun. Maurice also held out to Henry the prospect of securing the imperial crown. Everything being in readiness for action, Maurice advancing through Thuringia, seized the city of Augsburg, and suddenly made his appearance before Innspruck, whence the emperor, who lay sick of a severe attack of the gout, was hastily conveyed on a litter, through the passes of the mountains, to Villach, in Carinthia. While Maurice was thus making himself master of Innspruck, the King of the French was carrying out his part of the programme by actively prosecuting the war in Lorraine. Charles V., now destitute of the material resources necessary to carry on a successful campaign against the combined armies of the French king and the German princes, and despairing of putting an end to the obstinate conflict by his personal endeavours, resolved to re-establish, if possible, his waning power by peaceful negotiations. To this end, he commissioned his brother Ferdinand to conclude the Treaty of Passau (July 30, 1552), which provided that Philip of Hesse should be set at liberty, and gave pledges for the speedy settlement of all religious and political differences by a Diet, to be summoned at an early day. It further provided that neither the emperor nor the Protestant princes should put any restraint upon freedom of conscience, and that all questions arising in the interval between the two parties should be referred for settlement to an Imperial Commission, composed of an equal number of Catholics and Protestants. In consequence of the war then being carried on by the empire against France for the recovery of the three bishoprics of Lorraine of which the French had taken possession, the Diet did not convene until February 5, 1555."—J. Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church History*, v. 3, pp. 276-279.

ALSO IN: W. Robertson, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles V.*, bk. 8-10 (v. 2-3).—L. von Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*, ch. 6.—E. E. Crowe, *Cardinal Granvelle and Maurice of Saxony (Eminent Foreign Statesmen, v. 1)*.—L. Häusser, *The Period of the Reformation*, ch. 15-17.—G. P. Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, ch. 5.—F. Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 20.

A. D. 1547.—Pragmatic Sanction of Charles V., changing the relations of the Netherland provinces to the Empire. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1547.

A. D. 1552-1561.—Battle of Sievershausen and death of Maurice.—The Religious Peace of Augsburg.—Abdication of Charles V.—Succession of Ferdinand I.—The halting of the Reformation and the rally of Catholic resistance.—By the treaty of Passau, Maurice of Saxony bound himself to defend the empire against the French and the Turks. "He accord-

ingly took the field against the latter, but with little success, the imperial commander, Castaldo, contravening all his efforts by plundering Hungary and drawing upon himself the hatred of the people. Charles, meanwhile, marched against the French, and, without hesitation, again deposed the corporative governments reinstated by Maurice, on his way through Augsburg, Ulm, Esslingen, etc. Metz, valiantly defended by the Duke de Guise, was vainly besieged for some months, and the Emperor was at length forced to retreat. The French were, nevertheless, driven out of Italy. The aged emperor now sighed for peace. Ferdinand, averse to open warfare, placed his hopes on the imperceptible effect of a consistently pursued system of suppression and Jesuitical obscurantism. Maurice was answerable for the continuance of the peace, the terms of which he had prescribed. . . . Albert the Wild [of Brandenburg] was the only one among the princes who was still desirous of war. Indifferent to aught else, he marched at the head of some thousand followers through central Germany, murdering and plundering as he passed along, with the intent of once more laying the Franconian and Saxon bishoprics waste in the name of the gospel. The princes at length formed the Heidelberg confederacy against this monster and the emperor put him under the ban of the empire, which Maurice undertook to execute, although he had been his old friend and companion in arms. Albert was engaged in plundering the archbishopric of Magdeburg, when Maurice came up with him at Sievershausen. A murderous engagement took place (A. D. 1553). Three of the princes of Brunswick were slain. Albert was severely wounded, and Maurice fell at the moment when victory declared in his favour, in the 33d year of his age, in the midst of his promising career. . . . Every obstacle was now removed, and a peace, known as the religious peace of Augsburg, was concluded by the diet held in that city, A. D. 1555. This peace was naturally a mere political agreement provisionally entered into by the princes for the benefit, not of religion, but of themselves. Popular opinion was dumb, knights, burgesses, and peasants bending in lowly submission to the mandate of their sovereigns. By this treaty, branded in history as the most lawless ever concerted in Germany, the principle 'eujus regio, ejus religio,' the faith of the prince must be that of the people, was laid down. By it not only all the Reformed subjects of a Catholic prince were exposed to the utmost cruelty and tyranny, but the religion of each separate country was rendered dependent on the caprice of the reigning prince; of this the Pfalz offered a sad example, the religion of the people being thus four times arbitrarily changed. . . . Freedom of belief, confined to the immediate subjects of the empire, for instance, to the reigning princes, the free nobility, and the city councillors, was monopolized by at most 20,000 privileged persons. . . . The false peace concluded at Augsburg was immediately followed by Charles V.'s abdication of his numerous crowns [see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1555]. He would willingly have resigned that of the empire to his son Philip, had not the Spanish education of that prince, his gloomy and bigoted character, inspired the Germans with an aversion as unconquerable as that with which he beheld them. Ferdinand had, moreover, gained

the favour of the German princes. Charles, nevertheless, influenced by affection towards his son, bestowed upon him one of the finest of the German provinces, the Netherlands, besides Spain, Milan, Naples, and the West Indies (America). Ferdinand received the rest of the German hereditary possessions of his house, besides Bohemia and Hungary. . . . Ferdinand I., opposed in his hereditary provinces by a predominating Protestant party, which he was compelled to tolerate, was politically overbalanced by his nephew, Philip II., in Spain and Italy, where Catholicism flourished. The preponderance of the Spanish over the Austrian branch of the house of Habsburg exercised the most pernicious influence on the whole of Germany, by securing to the Catholics a support which rendered reconciliation impossible. . . . The religious disputes and petty egotism of the several estates of the empire had utterly stifled every sentiment of patriotism, and not a dissentient voice was raised against the will of Charles V., which bestowed the whole of the Netherlands, one of the finest of the provinces of Germany, upon Spain, the division and consequent weakening of the powerful house of Habsburg being regarded by the princes with delight. At the same time that the power of the Protestant party was shaken by the peace of Augsburg, Cardinal Caraffa mounted the pontifical throne as Paul IV., the first pope who, following the plan of the Jesuits, abandoned the system of defence for that of attack. The Reformation no sooner ceased to progress, than a preventive movement began [see PAPACY: A. D. 1537-1563]. . . . Ferdinand I. was in a difficult position. Paul IV. refused to acknowledge him on account of the peace concluded between him and the Protestants, whom he was unable to oppose, and whose tenets he refused to embrace, notwithstanding the expressed wish of the majority of his subjects. Like his brother, he intrigued and diplomatized until his Jesuitical confessor, Bobadilla, and the new pope, Pius IV., again placed him on good terms with Rome, A. D. 1559. . . . Augustus, elector of Saxony, the brother of Maurice, alarmed at the fresh alliance between the emperor and pope, convoked a meeting of the Protestant leaders at Naumberg. His fears were, however, allayed by the peaceful proposals of the emperor (A. D. 1561). . . . A last attempt to save the unity of the German church, in the event of its separation from that of Rome, was made by Ferdinand, who convoked the spiritual electoral princes, the archbishops and bishops, for that purpose to Vienna, but the consideration with which he was compelled to treat the pope rendered his efforts weak and ineffectual. . . . The Protestants, blind to the unity and strength resulting from the policy of the Catholics, weakened themselves more and more by division."—W. Menzel, *Hist. of Germany*, sect. 197-198 (v. 2).

A. D. 1556-1558.—Abdication of the emperor, Charles V., and election of his brother, Ferdinand. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1555.

A. D. 1556-1609.—The degeneracy of the Reformation.—Internal hostilities of Protestantism.—Tolerant reigns of Ferdinand I. and Maximilian II.—Renewed persecution under Rudolf II.—The risings against him.—Hiscessions and abdications.—"Germany was externally at peace. When the peace was broken in Protestant states, the Protestants themselves,

that is, a part of their divines, were the cause of the disturbance. These were 'frantic' Lutherans. The theologian Flacius, at Jena, openly attacked Melancthon as a 'traitor to the church,' on account of his strivings for peace. The religious controversies in the bosom of the adherents of the Augsburg Confession had been since Luther's death inflamed to madness by a strict Lutheran party, by slaves of the letter, who raged not only against the Zwinglian and Calvinistic reformations, but against Melancthon and those who sympathized with him. The theological pugilists disgraced Protestantism, and aroused such a spirit of persecution that Melancthon died on the 19th of April, 1560, 'weary and full of anxiety of soul about the future of the Reformation and the German nation.' His followers, 'Lutheran' preachers and professors, were persecuted, banished, imprisoned, on account of suspicion of being inclined to the 'Reformed' [Calvinistic] as distinguished from 'Evangelical' views; prayers for the 'extirpation of heresy' were offered in the churches of Saxony, and a medal struck 'to commemorate the victory of Christ over the Devil and Reason,' that is, over Melancthon and his moderate party. . . . Each parson and professor held himself to be a divinely inspired watchman of Zion, who had to watch over purity of doctrine. . . . The universal prevalence of 'trials for witchcraft' in Protestant districts, with their chambers of torture and burnings at the stake, marked the new priestcraft of Lutheran Protestantism in its debasement into a dogmatizing church. This quickly degenerating Protestant Church comprised a mass of separate churches, because the vanity and selfishness of the court clergy at every court, and the professors of every university, would have a church of their own. . . . Every misfortune to the 'Reformed' churches caused a malevolent joy in the Lutheran camp, and every common measure against the common enemy was rejected by the Lutheran clergy from hatred to the 'Reformed.' . . . The emperor Ferdinand I. had long been convinced that some change was required in the Church of Rome. As he wrote to his ambassador in Trent, 'If a reform of the Church did not proceed from the Church herself, he would undertake the charge of it in Germany.' He never ceased to offer his mediation between the two religious parties. He thought, and thought justly, that a compromise was possible in Germany. . . . The change which gradually took place in the head and heart of Ferdinand had not extended to those who sat in St. Peter's chair. Ferdinand I., to improve the moral state of the old Church, insisted most strongly on the abolition of the celibacy of the clergy; this the Pope declared the most indispensable prop of the Papacy. As thus his proposals came to naught, he attempted to introduce the proposed reformation into his hereditary domains; but just as he was beginning to be the Reformer of these provinces, death removed him from the world, on the 25th of July, 1564. . . . His oldest son and successor, Maximilian II., . . . was out and out German. Growing up in the great movement of the time, the Emperor Maximilian II. was warmly devoted to the new ideas. He hated the Jesuits and the Papacy. . . . He remained in the middle between Protestants and Catholics, but really above both. . . . He favored the Reformation in his Austrian dominions;

at the very time when Philip II. of Spain, the son of Charles V., had commenced the bloodiest persecution against the Reformed Church in the Netherlands . . . ; at the very time when the French court, ruled and led by Jesuits, put into execution the long-prepared conspiracy of St. Bartholomew. . . . He never ceased to call the kings of France and Spain to gentleness and toleration. . . . 'I have no power,' said the emperor, 'over consciences, and may constrain no man's faith.' The princes unanimously elected the son of Maximilian as King of the Romans, and Max received another gratification: he was elected king by the gallant nation of the Poles. Thus the house of Austria was again powerfully strengthened. Hungary, Poland, Bohemia, and Germany, united under one ruler, formed a power which could meet Turkey and Russia. The Turks and the Russians were pressing forward. The Turkish wars, more than anything else, prevented Max from carrying out his long-cherished plan and giving a constitution to the empire and church of the Germans. He who towered high above the Papal party and the miserable controversies of Protestant divines, and whose clear mind saw what the times required, would have had every qualification for such a task. But in the midst of his great projects, Maximilian II. died, in his 49th year, on the 12th of October, 1576; as emperor, honest, mild and wise, and elevated above all religious controversies to a degree that no prince has ever reached. He had always been a rock of offence to the Catholic party. . . . But Rudolf [son of Maximilian II.], when he became emperor [1576], surrounded by secret Jesuits who had been his teachers and advisers, became the humblest slave of the order and let it do what it would. Rudolf had been sent by his father for the interests of his own house to the Spanish court; a terrible punishment now followed this self-seeking. Rudolf confirmed liberty of conscience only to the nobles, not to the citizens or peasants. He forbade the two latter classes to visit the Evangelical churches, he closed their schools, ordered them to frequent Catholic churches, threatened disobedience with banishment, and even in the case of nobles he dismissed from his court charges all who were not strict papists. The people of Vienna and Austria hated him for these orders. . . . Without any judicial investigation he threatened free cities with 'execution.' Aix la Chapelle expelled his troops. Gebhard, the elector of Cologne, married a Countess von Mansfeld and went over to Protestantism. . . . The Protestants supported him badly; Lutherans and Calvinists were at bitter feud with each other [see PAPACY: A. D. 1570-1597]. . . . It was a croaking of ravens, and a great field of the dead was not far off. . . . The Emperor Rudolf, . . . on a return journey from Rome, vowed to Our Lady of Loretto, 'his Generalissima,' to extirpate heretics at the risk of his life. In his hereditary estates he ordered all who were not papists to leave the territory. Soon afterwards he pulled down the Evangelical churches, and dispersed the citizens by arms. He intended soon to begin the same proceedings in Hungary and Bohemia; but in Hungary the nation rose in defence of its liberty and faith. The receipt of the intelligence that the Hungarian malcontents were progressing victoriously produced—what there had been symptoms of before—insanity. The members

of the house of Austria assembled, and declared 'The Emperor Rudolf can be no longer head of the house, because unfortunately it is too plain that his Roman Imperial Majesty . . . was not competent or fit to govern the kingdoms.' The Archduke Matthias [eldest brother of Rudolf] was elected head of the Austrian house [1606]. He collected an army of 20,000 men, and made known that he would depose the emperor from the government of his hereditary domains. Rudolf's Jesuitical flatterers had named him the 'Bohemian Solomon.' He now, in terror, without drawing sword, ceded Hungary and Austria to Matthias, and gave him also the government of Moravia. Matthias guaranteed religious liberty to the Austrians. Rudolf did the same to the Bohemians and Silesians by the 'Letters of Majesty.' Rudolf, to escape deposition by Matthias, abdicated the throne of Bohemia."—W. Zimmerman, *Popular Hist. of Germany*, bk. 5, ch. 2 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: F. Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 21.

A. D. 1608-1618.—The Evangelical Union and the Catholic League.—The Jülich-Cleve contest.—Troubles in Bohemia.—The beginning of the Thirty Years War.—'Many Protestants were alarmed by the attempts Rudolf had made to put them down, and especially by his allowing the Duke of Bavaria to seize the free city of Donauwörth, formerly a Bavarian town, and make it Catholic. In 1608 a number of Protestants joined together and formed, for ten years, a league called The Union. Its formation was due chiefly to the exertions of Prince Christian of Anhalt, who had busily intrigued with Henry IV. of France; but its head was the Elector Palatine. As the latter belonged to the Reformed Church, the Lutherans for the most part treated the Union coldly; and the Elector of Saxony would have nothing to do with it. It soon had an opportunity of acting. Duke William of Jülich, who held Jülich, Cleve, and other lands, died in 1609. John Sigmund, Elector of Brandenburg, and the Palsgrave of Neuberg, both members of the Union, claimed to be his heirs, and took possession of his lands. The Emperor Rudolf sent his brother, the Archduke Leopold, Bishop of Passau, to drive out these princes. The Union thereupon formed an alliance with Henry IV. of France [see FRANCE: A. D. 1599-1610], and, coming to the aid of its members, scattered the forces of the Archduke in 1610. The Catholics now took fright, and hastened to form a League which should hold the Union in check. It was formed for nine years, and the supreme command was given to Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria. The death of Henry IV. took away from the Union its chief source of strength, so that it shrank from a general war. The two princes, however, who had given rise to the quarrel, kept for a time the Jülich-Cleve territory. In 1611 [1618] the power of the Elector of Brandenburg was further increased by his succeeding to the Duchy of Prussia. From this time East Prussia was always joined to Brandenburg. It was now, therefore, that the house of Brandenburg laid the foundations of its future greatness [see PRUSSIA]. Matthias, in order to pacify the Austrian States, granted them full religious liberty. In 1609 the Bohemian States also obtained from Rudolf a Royal Charter, called 'The Letter of

Majesty,' conceding to nobility, knights and towns perfect freedom in religious matters, and the right to build Protestant churches and schools on their own and on the royal lands. Bohemia showed no gratitude for this favour. Suspecting his designs, the Bohemians even shut Rudolf up in his castle at Prague in 1611, and asked Matthias to come to their aid. He did so, and seized the supreme power. Next year Rudolf died. Matthias was crowned at Frankfurt with great pomp, but he was no better fitted for the throne than his brother. He was compelled to yield much to the Protestants, yet favoured the Jesuits in their continued efforts to convert Germany. His government was so feeble that his brothers at length made him accept Ferdinand, Duke of Styria, as his coadjutor. In 1617 Ferdinand was elected as Rudolf's successor to the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary, and from this time all real power in the Habsburg possessions was wielded by him. Ferdinand was a young man, but had already given proof of great energy of character. . . . The Protestants looked forward with dread to his reign if he should receive the Imperial crown. Styria had become almost wholly Lutheran. When Ferdinand succeeded his father, he had driven out the Protestant families, and made the land altogether Catholic. No Catholic prince had ever shown himself more reckless as to the means by which he served his church. The Protestants, therefore, had good reason to fear that if he became Emperor he would renew the policy of Charles V., and try to bring back the old state of things, in which there was but one Church as there was but one Empire. Events proved that these fears were well founded. The last days of Matthias were very troubled. Two Protestant churches were built in Bohemia, one in the territory of the Archbishop of Prague, the other in that of the Abbot of Braunau. These princes, with permission of the Emperor, pulled down one of the churches and shut up the other. The Protestants complained; but their appeal was met by the reply that the Letter of Majesty did not permit them to build churches on the lands of ecclesiastics. This answer excited great indignation in Bohemia; and a rumour was got up that it had not come from the Emperor, but had been written in Prague. On May 23, 1618, a number of Protestants, headed by Count Thurn, marched to the Council Hall of the Royal Castle, and demanded to be told the real facts. When the councillors hesitated, two of them, with the private secretary, were seized and thrown out of the window [see BOHEMIA: A. D. 1611-1618]. The Protestants then took possession of the Royal Castle, drove the Jesuits out of Bohemia, and appointed a council of thirty nobles to carry on the government." These events formed the beginning of the "Thirty Years War."—J. Sime, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 14.—"The Thirty Years' War was the last struggle which marked the progress of the Reformation. This war, whose direction and object were equally undetermined, may be divided into four distinct portions, in which the Elector Palatine, Denmark, Sweden, and France played in succession the principal part. It became more and more complicated, until it spread over the whole of Europe. It was prolonged indefinitely by various causes. I. The intimate union between the two branches of the house of Austria and of the Catholic party—their oppo-

nents, on the other hand, were not homogeneous. II. The inaction of England, the tardy intervention of France, the poverty of Denmark and Sweden, &c. The armies which took part in the Thirty Years' War were no longer feudal militias, they were permanent armies. . . . They lived at the expense of the countries which they laid waste."—J. Michelet, *Summary of Modern Hist.*, ch. 12.

ALSO IN: A. Gindely, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, ch. 1-3 (v. 1).—T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Frederick the Great*, bk. 3, ch. 14 (v. 1).

A. D. 1612.—Election of the Emperor Matthias.

A. D. 1615.—The first newspaper. See PRINTING AND PRESS: A. D. 1612-1650.

A. D. 1618-1620.—The Thirty Years War: Hostilities in Bohemia precipitated by Ferdinand.—His election to the imperial throne and his deposition in Bohemia.—Acceptance of the Bohemian crown by Frederick, the Palatine Elector.—His unsupported situation.—The Treaty of Ulm.—"The emperor was not a little disconcerted when he received the news of what was passing [in Bohemia]. For whence could he receive the aid necessary to put down these revolutionary acts and restore order in Bohemia? Discontent, indeed, was scarcely less formidably expressed even in his Austrian territories, whilst in Hungary its demonstration was equally as serious. Conciliation appeared to be the only means of preserving to the house of Austria that important country, and even the confessor and usual counsellor of the emperor, Cardinal Klesel, the most zealous opponent of the Protestants, advised that course. But such considerations were most strenuously opposed by young Ferdinand. . . . At his instigation, and that of the other archdukes, backed by the pope, the pacific Cardinal Klesel was unexpectedly arrested, and charged with a variety of crimes. The intention was to remove him from the presence of the old and weak emperor, who was now without support, and obliged to resign all to the archdukes. From this moment the impotency of the emperor was complete, and all hopes of an amicable pacification of Bohemia lost. The Bohemians, likewise, took to arms, and possessed themselves of every city in their country as far as Budweis and Pilsen, which were still occupied by the imperial troops. They obtained assistance, quite unlooked for, in the person of one who may be regarded as one of the most remarkable heroes of that day. . . . Count Ernest of Mansfield, a warrior from his youth, was of a bold and enterprising spirit; he had already encountered many dangers, and had just been raising some troops for the Duke of Savoy against the Spaniards. The duke, who now no longer required them, gave him permission to serve in the cause of the Evangelical Union in Germany; and by that body he was despatched with 3,000 men to Bohemia, as having apparently received his appointment from that country. He appeared there quite unexpectedly, and immediately took from the imperial army the important city of Pilsen [November 21, 1618]. . . . The Emperor Matthias died on the 10th of March, 1619 . . . and the Bohemians, who acknowledged his sovereignty while living, now resolved to renounce his successor Ferdinand, whose hostile intentions were already too clearly expressed. Ferdinand attained the throne under circumstances the most

perplexing. Bohemia in arms, and threatening Vienna itself with invasion; Silesia and Moravia in alliance with them; Austria much disposed to unite with them; Hungary by no means firmly attached, and externally menaced by the Turks; besides which, encountering in every direction the hatred of the Protestants, against whom his zeal was undisguised. . . . Count Thurn advanced upon Vienna with a Bohemian army. . . . He came before Vienna, and his men fired, even upon the imperial castle itself, where Ferdinand, surrounded by open and secret foes, had taken up his quarters. He dared not leave his capital, for by so doing Austria, and with it the preservation of the empire itself, must have been sacrificed. But his enemies looked upon him as lost; and they already spoke of confining him in a convent, and educating his children in the Protestant faith. . . . Count Thurn was obliged soon to return to Bohemia, as Prague was menaced by the armies of Austria, and Ferdinand availed himself of this moment in order to undertake another hazardous and daring project. . . . He . . . resolved to proceed to Frankfort to attend the election of emperor. The spiritual electors had been gained over; Saxony also adhered closely to the house of Austria; Brandenburg was not unfriendly; hence the opposition of the palatinate alone against him could accomplish nothing; accordingly Ferdinand was unanimously chosen emperor on the 28th of August, 1619." Just two days previously, on the 26th of August, the Bohemians, at a general assembly of the states, had formally deposed Ferdinand from the kingship of their nation, and proceeded to elect another king in his place. "The Catholics proposed the Duke of Savoy and Maximilian of Bavaria, whilst, in the Protestant interest, the Elector John George of Saxony, and Frederick V., of the palatinate, were put forward. The latter obtained the election, being a son-in-law of King James I. of England, from whom they expected assistance, and who personally was regarded as resolute, magnanimous, and generous. The incorporated provinces of Moravia, Silesia and Lusatia supported the election, and even the Catholic states of Bohemia pledged their fidelity and obedience. Frederick was warned against accepting so dangerous a crown by Saxony, Bavaria, and even by his father-in-law; but his chaplain, Scultetus, and his own consort, Elizabeth, who as the daughter of a king aspired to a royal crown, persuaded him with all their influence to accept it. Frederick was accordingly ruled by them, received the regal dignity in Bohemia, and was crowned at Prague with great pomp on the 25th of October, 1619. . . . Ferdinand in returning from Frankfort passed on to Munich, and there concluded with the Duke of Bavaria that important treaty which secured to him the possession of Bohemia. These two princes had been companions in youth, and the Evangelical Union had by several incautious proceedings irritated the duke. Maximilian undertook the chief command in the cause of the Catholic party, and stipulated with the house of Austria that he should be indemnified for every outlay and loss incurred, to the extent even, if necessary, of the surrender of the territories of Austria itself into his hands. With Spain, also, the emperor succeeded in forming an alliance, and the Spanish general, Spinola, received orders to invade the countries of the palatinate from

the Netherlands. Subsequently the Elector of Mentz arranged a convention at Mülhausen with the Elector John George of Saxony, the Elector of Cologne, and the Landgrave Lewis of Darmstadt, wherein it was determined to render all possible assistance to the emperor for the maintenance of his kingdom and the imperial dignity. Frederick, the new Bohemian king, was now left with no other auxiliary but the Evangelical Union; for the Transylvanian prince, Bethlen Gabor, was, notwithstanding all his promises, a very dubious and uncertain ally, whilst the troops he sent into Moravia and Bohemia were not unlike a horde of savage banditti. Meanwhile the union commenced its preparations for war, as well as the league. The whole of Germany resembled a grand depot for recruiting. Every eye was directed to the Swabian district, where the two armies were to meet; there, however, at Ulm, on the 3rd of July, 1620, they unexpectedly entered into a compact, in which the forces of the union engaged to lay down their arms, and both parties pledged each other to preserve peace and tranquillity. The unionists felt themselves too weak to maintain the contest, since Saxony was now likewise against them, and Spinola threatened them from the Netherlands. It was, however, a great advantage for the emperor, that Bohemia was excluded from this treaty, for now the forces of the league were at liberty to aid him in subjugating his royal adversary. Maximilian of Bavaria, therefore, immediately took his departure, and on his way reduced the states of Upper Austria to the obedience due to Ferdinand, joined the imperial army, and made a spirited attack upon Bohemia. On the other side, the Elector of Saxony took possession of Lusatia in the name of the emperor."—F. Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 22.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *Hist. of England*, 1603-1642, ch. 29-32 (v. 3).—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 46-48 (v. 2).

A. D. 1618-1700.—The Rise of Prussia. See PRUSSIA: A. D. 1618-1700.

A. D. 1620.—The Thirty Years War: Disappointment of the Bohemians in their elected king.—Frederick's offensive Calvinism.—Defeat of his army before Prague.—Loss of Bohemian liberties.—Prostration of Protestantism.—"The defection of the Union accelerated the downfall of Frederick; but its cordial support could scarcely have hindered it. For the Bohemians had been disappointed in their king, disappointed in the strength they had expected from him through his connexions, equally disappointed in the man, and in the hopes of protection and sympathy which they had expected from him in the exercise of their religion. Within a month of his coronation the metropolitan church was spoiled of its images, the crucifix cut in pieces, the statues of the saints cast out, broken, and burnt, the ornaments used in divine service, and venerable in the eyes of Catholics and Lutherans alike, scattered here and there, and turned upside down with contempt and execration. These proceedings, which were presumed, not without reason, to have the king's authority—for during their enactment the court chaplain addressed the people in praise of this purgation of the temple—called forth loud complaints and increased the disaffection which, more than any external force brought against Frederick, produced his ruin. Early in November

Maximilian appeared before Prague, and found the Bohemians, under Christian van Anhalt, skilfully and strongly posted on the Weissenberg [White Mountain] to offer battle. The cautious Bucquoi would have declined the offer, and attacked the city from another point; but an enthusiastic friar who broke in upon the conference of the leaders, and, exhibiting a mutilated image of the Virgin, reproached them with their hesitation, put to flight all timid counsels. The battle began at twelve o'clock. It was a Sunday, the octave of the festival of All Saints [November 8, 1620]. . . . In the Catholic army Bucquoi was at the head of the Imperial division. Tilly commanded in chief, and led the front to the battle. He was received with a heavy fire; and for half an hour the victory trembled in the balance: then the Hungarians, who had been defeated by the Croats the day before, fled, and all the efforts of the Duke of Saxe Weimar to rally them proved fruitless. Soon the whole Bohemian army, Germans, English, horse and foot, fled in disorder. One gallant little band of Moravians only, under the Count of Thurn and the young Count of Schlick, maintained their position, and, with the exception of their leaders, fell almost to a man. The battle lasted only an hour; but the victory was not the less complete. A hundred banners, ten guns, and a rich spoil fell into the hands of the victors. Four thousand of the Bohemian army, but scarcely as many hundreds of their opponents (if we may believe their account), lay dead upon the field. . . . Frederick had returned from the army the day before, with the intelligence that the Bavarians were only eight (English) miles distant; but relying on the 28,000 men which he had to cover his capital, he felt that night no uneasiness. . . . He had invited the English ambassadors to dine; and he remained to entertain them. After dinner he mounted his horse to ride to the Star Park; but before he could get out of the city gate, he was met with the news of the total overthrow of his army. His negotiations with Maximilian failing, or receiving no answer, the next morning he prepared for flight. . . . Accompanied by his queen, Van Anhalt, the Prince of Hohenlohe, and the Count of Thurn, he made a precipitate retreat from Prague, leaving behind him the insignia of that monarchy which he had not the wisdom to firmly establish, nor resolution to defend to the last. It must be confessed, however, that his position, after the defeat at Prague, was not altogether so promising, and consequently his abandonment of his capital not altogether so pusillanimous, as some have represented."—B. Chapman, *Hist. of Gustavus Adolphus*, ch. 5.—"Frederick fled for his life through North Germany, till he found a refuge at the Hague. The reign of the Bohemian aristocracy was at an end. . . . The chiefs perished on the scaffold. Their lands were confiscated, and a new German and Catholic nobility arose. . . . The Royal Charter was declared to have been forfeited by rebellion, and the Protestant churches in the towns and on the royal estates had nothing to depend on but the will of the conqueror. The ministers of one great body—the Bohemian Brethren—were expelled at once. The Lutherans were spared for a time."—S. R. Gardiner, *The Thirty Years' War*, ch. 3, sect. 1.

ALSO IN: C. A. Peschek, *Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia*, v. 1, ch. 9.—See, also,

BOHEMIA: A. D. 1621-1648; and HUNGARY: A. D. 1606-1660.

A. D. 1621-1623.—The Thirty Years War: The Elector Palatine placed under the ban.—Dissolution of the Evangelical Union.—Invasion and conquest of the Palatinate.—Transfer of the electoral dignity to the Duke of Bavaria.—"Ferdinand, though firm, patient, and resigned in adversity, was stern, vengeful, and overbearing in prosperity. He was urged by many motives of resentment, policy, and zeal to complete the ruin of the elector Palatine, and he did not possess sufficient magnanimity to resist the temptation. Having squandered away the confiscated property among his Jesuits and favourites, he had still many allies and adherents whose fidelity he was desirous to reward; he was anxious to recover Upper Austria, which he had mortgaged to the duke of Bavaria, as a pledge for the expenses of the war; he wished to regain possession of Lusatia; and he was bound in honour to satisfy the elector of Saxony for his opportune assistance. . . . These motives overbearing all considerations of justice and prudence, Ferdinand published the ban of the empire [January 22, 1621], of his own authority, against the elector Palatine and his adherents the prince of Anhalt, the count of Hohenlohe, and the duke of Jaegendorf. The execution of this informal sentence he intrusted to the archduke Albert, as possessor of the circle of Burgundy, and to the duke of Bavaria, commanding the former to occupy the Lower, and the latter the Upper Palatinate. This vigorous act was instantly followed by the most decisive effects; for the Protestants were terrified by the prospect of sharing the fate of the unfortunate elector. The members of the union now felt the fatal consequences of their own indecision and want of foresight. . . . Threatened at once by Spinola [commanding the Spanish auxiliaries from the Netherlands] and the duke of Bavaria, and confounded by the growing power of the emperor, they vied in abandoning a confederacy which exposed them to his vengeance. On the 12th of April, 1621, they concluded at Mentz a treaty of neutrality, by which they promised not to interfere in the affairs of the Palatinate, agreed to disband their troops within a month, and to enter into no new confederacy to the disadvantage of the emperor. This dishonourable treaty was followed by the dissolution of the union, which, on its expiration, was not renewed. During these events, Spinola, having completed the reduction of the Lower Palatinate, was occupied in the siege of Frankendahl, which was on the point of surrendering, and its capture must have been followed by the submission of Heidelberg and Mannheim. The duke of Bavaria had been still more successful in the Upper Palatinate, and had rapidly subjugated the whole province, together with the district of Cham. The elector Palatine, deserted by the Protestant union, and almost abandoned by his relatives, the kings of England and Denmark, owed the first revival of his hopes of restoration to Mansfeld, an illegitimate adventurer, with no other resources than plunder and devastation. Christian of Brunswick, administrator of Halberstadt, distinguished indeed by illustrious birth, but equally an adventurer, and equally destitute of territory or resources, espoused his cause, as well from ties of affinity [he was the cousin of Elizabeth, the electress Palatine, or

queen of Bohemia, as she preferred to be called] as from a chivalrous attachment to his beautiful consort; and George Frederic, margrave of Baden, even abdicated his dignity to devote himself to his support." Mansfeld, who had held his ground in Bohemia for nearly a year after the battle of the White Mountain, now became hard pressed there by Tilly, and suddenly escaped by forced marches (October, 1621,) into the Lower Palatinate. "Here he found a more favourable field of action; for Spinola being recalled with the greater part of the Spanish forces, had left the remainder to Gonzales de Cordova, who, after reducing several minor fortresses, was pressing the siege of Frankendahl. The name of the brave adventurer drew to his standard multitudes of the troops, who had been disbanded by the Protestant union, and he was joined by a party of English, who had been sent for the defence of the Palatinate. Finding himself at the head of 20,000 men, he cleared the country in his passage, relieved Frankendahl, and provided for the safety of Heidelberg and Mannheim. Unable, however, to subsist in a district so recently the seat of war, he turned into Alsace, where he increased his forces; from thence he invaded the neighbouring bishoprics of Spire and Strasburgh, levying heavy contributions, and giving up the rich domains of those sees to the devastations of his troops. Encouraged by this gleam of hope, the elector Palatine quitted his asylum in Holland, passed in disguise through Loraine and Alsace, joined Mansfeld, and gave his name and countenance to this predatory army." Mansfeld, recrossing the Rhine, effected a junction with the margrave of Baden; and Christian of Brunswick, after pillaging the rich sees of Lower Saxony, was on his way with a considerable force to unite with both. "At the same time the duke of Wirtemberg, the landgrave of Hesse, and other Protestant princes, began to arm, and hopes were even entertained of the revival of the Protestant union. Tilly, who had followed Mansfeld from Bohemia, had in vain endeavoured to prevent his junction with the margrave of Baden. Defeated at Mingelsheim by Mansfeld, on the 29th of April, 1622, he had been reduced to the defensive, and in this situation saw a powerful combination rising on every side against the house of Austria. He waited therefore for an opportunity of attacking those enemies singly, whom he could not resist when united, and that opportunity was presented by the separation of the margrave of Baden from Mansfeld, and his attempt to penetrate into Bavaria. Tilly suddenly drew together the Spanish troops, and with this accession of force defeated, on the 6th of May, the margrave at Wimpfen, with the loss of half his army, and took his whole train of artillery and military chest. Leaving Mansfeld employed in the siege of Ladenburgh, he next directed his attention to Christian of Brunswick, routed him on the 20th of June, at Hoechst [Höchst], as he was crossing the Main, pursued him till his junction with Mansfeld, and drove their united forces beyond the Rhine, again to seek a refuge and subsistence in Alsace. These successes revived the cause of Ferdinand; the margrave of Baden retired from the contest; the duke of Wirtemberg and the other Protestant princes suspended their armaments; and although Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick laid siege to Saverne, and evinced a resolution to maintain

the contest to the last extremity, yet the elector Palatine again gave way to that weakness which had already lost him a crown." He was persuaded by his witless father-in-law, James I. of England, to trust his cause to negotiations in which the latter was being duped by the emperor. He consented, accordingly, "to disavow his intrepid defenders, to dismiss them from his service, to retire again into Holland, and wait the mercy of the emperor. By this disavowal, Mansfeld and Christian were left without a name to countenance their operations; and after various negotiations, feigned or real, for entering into the service of the emperor, Spain, or France, they accepted the overtures of the Prince of Orange and forced their way through the Spanish army which attempted to oppose their passage, to join at Breda the troops of the United Provinces. The places in Alsace and the bishopric of Spire which had been occupied by the enemy were recovered by the archduke Leopold; and Tilly, having completed the conquest of the Palatinate by the capture of Heidelberg and Mannheim, directed his attacks against the forces which Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick had again assembled. After a short continuance in Holland, Mansfeld, in November, had led his predatory army into the rich province of East Friesland, conquered the principal fortresses, and extorted enormous contributions from the duke, who was in alliance with Spain. On the other hand, Christian, passing into Lower Saxony, persuaded the states of the circle to collect an army of observation amounting to 12,000 men, and intrust him with the command; and he soon increased this army to almost double that number, by the usual incitements of pillage and plunder. These levies attracting the attention of the emperor, his threats, together with the advance of Tilly, compelled the Saxon states to dismiss Christian and his army. Thus left a second time without authority, he pushed towards Westphalia, with the hope of joining Mansfeld and renewing hostilities in the Palatinate; his design was however anticipated by Tilly, who overtook him at Loen [or Stadtlohn], in the district of Munster, and defeated him with the loss of 6,000 killed and 4,000 prisoners, in August, 1623. The victorious general then turned towards East Friesland; but Mansfeld, who had hitherto maintained himself in that country, avoided an unequal contest by disbanding his troops, and withdrawing into Holland, in January, 1624. . . . Having despoiled the elector Palatine of all his dominions, and delivered himself from his enemies in Germany, Ferdinand had proceeded to carry his plans into execution, by transferring the electoral dignity to the duke of Bavaria, and dividing the conquered territories among his adherents. . . . He gained the elector of Saxony, by promising him the revenues and perhaps the cession of Lusatia; and the landgrave of Hesse Darmstadt, by offering to favour his pretensions to the succession of Marburgh, which he was contesting with the landgrave of Hesse Cassel. . . . Having thus gained those whose opposition was most likely to frustrate his design, he paid little regard to the feeble threats of James, and to the remonstrances of the king of Denmark. . . . He summoned, on the 25th of February, 1623, a meeting of the electors and princes who were most devoted to his cause at Ratisbon, and, in concurrence with the majority of this irregular

assembly, transferred the Palatine electorate, with all its honours, privileges, and offices, to Maximilian, duke of Bavaria. To keep up, however, the hopes of the elector Palatine and his adherents, and not to drive his family and connections to desperation, the whole extent of the plan was not developed; the partition of his territories was deferred, the transfer of the electorate was made only for the life of Maximilian, and the rights of the sons and collateral heirs of the unfortunate elector were expressly reserved."—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 49 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: A. Gindely, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, v. 1, ch. 7.—F. Schiller, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, bk. 2.—C. R. Markham, *The Fighting Veres*, pt. 2, ch. 3.

A. D. 1624-1626.—The Thirty Years War: Alliance of England, Holland, and Denmark to support the Protestant cause.—Creation of the imperial army of Wallenstein, and its first campaigns.—"Had the Emperor been as wise as he was resolute, it is probable that, victorious in every direction, he might have been able to conclude a permanent peace with the Protestant Party. But the bigotry which was a very part of his nature was spurred on by his easy triumphs to refuse to sheathe the sword until heresy had been rooted out from the land. In vain did the Protestant princes, who had maintained a selfish and foolish neutrality, remonstrate against the continuance of hostilities after the avowed object for which those hostilities were undertaken had been gained. In the opinion of Ferdinand II. the real object still remained to be accomplished. Under these critical circumstances the emigrants, now grown numerous [see **BOHEMIA: A. D. 1621-1648**], and the awakened Protestant princes, earnestly besought the aid of a foreign power. It was their representations which at length induced three nations of the reformed faith—England, Holland, and Denmark—to ally themselves to assist their oppressed brethren [see, also, **FRANCE: A. D. 1624-1626**]. England agreed to send subsidies, Holland to supply troops. The command of the delivering army was confided to Christian IV., King of Denmark (1625). He was to be supported in Germany by the partisan Mansfeldt, by Prince Christian of Brunswick, and by the Protestants of Lower Saxony, who had armed themselves to resist the exactions of the Emperor. Ferdinand II., after vainly endeavouring to ward off hostilities by negotiations, despatched Tilly to the Weser to meet the enemy. Tilly followed the course of that river as far as Minden, causing to be occupied, as he marched, the places which commanded its passage. Pursuing his course northwards, he crossed the river at Neuburg (midway between Minden and Bremen), and occupied the principality of Kalenberg. The King of Denmark was near at hand, in the Duchy of Brunswick, anxious, for the moment, to avoid a battle. Tilly, superior to him in numbers, was as anxious to fight one. As though the position of the King of Denmark were not already sufficiently embarrassing, the Emperor proceeded at this period to make it almost unendurable by launching upon him likewise an imperial army. . . . Up to the period of the complete overthrow and expulsion from the Palatinate of Frederic V., ex-King of Bohemia, Ferdinand had been indebted for all his successes to Maximilian of Bavaria. It was Maximilian who, as head of the

Holy League, had reconquered Bohemia for the Emperor: it was Maximilian's general, Tilly, who had driven the Protestant armies from the Palatinate; and it was the same general who was now opposing the Protestants of the north in the lands watered by the Weser. Maximilian had been rewarded by the cession to him of the Palatinate, but it was not advisable that so near a neighbour of Austria should be made too strong. It was this feeling, this jealousy of Maximilian, which now prompted Ferdinand to raise, for the first time in this war, an imperial army, and to send it to the north. This army was raised by and at the expense of Albert Wenzel Eusebius of Waldstein, known in history as Wallenstein. A Czech by nationality, born in 1583 of noble parents, who belonged to one of the most advanced sects of the reformers but who died whilst their son was yet young, Wallenstein had, when yet a child, been committed to the care of his uncle, Albert Slavata, an adherent of the Jesuits, and by him educated at Olmütz in the strictest Catholic faith." By marrying, first, a rich widow, who soon died, and then an heiress, daughter of Count Harrach, and by purchasing with the fortune thus acquired many confiscated estates, he had become possessed of enormous wealth. He had already won distinction as a soldier. "For his faithful services, Ferdinand in 1623 nominated Wallenstein to be Prince, a title changed, the year following, into that of Duke of Friedland. At this time the yearly income he derived from his various estates, all economically managed, was calculated to be 30,000,000 florins—little short of £2,500,000." Wallenstein now, in 1625, "divining his master's wishes, and animated by the ambition born of natural ability, offered to raise and maintain, at his own cost, an army of 50,000 men, and to lead it against the enemy. Ferdinand eagerly accepted the offer. Named Generalissimo and Field Marshal in July of the same year, Wallenstein marched at the head of 30,000 men, a number which increased almost daily, first to the Weser, thence, after noticing the positions of Tilly and of King Christian, to the banks of the Elbe, where he wintered. . . . In the spring . . . Mansfeldt, with the view to prevent a junction between Tilly and Wallenstein, marched against the latter, and, though his troops were fewer in number, took up a position at Dessau in full view of the imperial camp, and there intrenched himself. Here Wallenstein attacked (25 April 1626) and completely defeated him. Not discouraged by this overthrow, and still bearing in mind the main object of the campaign, Mansfeldt fell back into Brandenburg, recruited there his army, called to himself the Duke of Saxe-Weimar and then suddenly dashed, by forced marches, towards Silesia and Moravia, with the intention of reaching Hungary, where Bethlen Gabor had promised to meet him." Wallenstein followed and "pressed him so hard that, though Mansfeldt did effect a junction with Bethlen Gabor, it was with but the skeleton of his army. Despairing of success against numbers vastly superior, Bethlen Gabor withdrew from his new colleague, and Mansfeldt, reduced to despair, disbanded his remaining soldiers, and sold his camp-equipage to supply himself with the means of flight (September) [see **HUNGARY: A. D. 1606-1660**]. He died soon after (30th November). . . . Wallenstein then retraced his steps to the north. Meanwhile Tilly,

left to deal with Christian IV., had followed that prince into Lower Saxony, had caught, attacked, and completely defeated him at Lutter (am Barenberge), the 27th July 1626. This victory gave him complete possession of that disaffected province, and, despite a vigorous attempt made by the Margrave George Frederic of Baden to wrest it from him, he held it till the return of Wallenstein from the pursuit of Mansfeldt. As two stars of so great a magnitude could not shine in the same hemisphere, it was then decided that Tilly should carry the war into Holland, whilst to Wallenstein should be left the honour of dealing with the King of Denmark and the Protestant princes of the north."—G. B. Malleon, *The Battle-fields of Germany*, ch. 1.

ALSO IN: W. Zimmermann, *Popular Hist. of Germany*, bk. 5, ch. 2 (v. 4).

A. D. 1627-1629.—The Thirty Years War: Wallenstein's campaign against the Danes.—His power and his oppression in Germany.—The country devoured by his army.—Unsuccessful siege of Stralsund.—First succor from the king of Sweden.—The Peace of Lubeck.—The Edict of Restitution.—"Wallenstein opened the campaign of 1627 at the head of a refreshed and well-equipped army of 40,000 men. His first effort was directed against Silesia; and the Danish troops, few in number, and ill commanded, gave way at his approach. To prevent the fugitives from infringing on the neutrality of Brandenburg, he occupied the whole electorate. Mecklenburg and Pomerania soon shared the same fate. Remonstrances and assurances of perfect neutrality were treated with absolute scorn; and Wallenstein declared, in his usual haughty style, that 'the time had arrived for dispensing altogether with electors; and that Germany ought to be governed like France and Spain, by a single and absolute sovereign.' In his rapid march towards the frontiers of Holstein, he acted fully up to the principle he had laid down, and naturally exercised despotic power, as the representative of the absolute monarch of whom he spoke. . . . He . . . followed up the Danes, defeated their armies in a series of actions near Heiligenhausen, overran the whole peninsula of Jutland before the end of the campaign, and forced the unhappy king to seek shelter, with the wrecks of his army, in the islands beyond the Belt. . . . Brilliant as the campaign of 1627 proved in its general result, few very striking feats of arms were performed during its progress. . . . Now it was that the princes and states of Lower Germany began to feel the consequences of their pusillanimous conduct; and the very provinces which had just before refused to raise troops for their own protection, were obliged to submit, without a murmur, to every species of insult and exaction. Wallenstein's army, augmented to 100,000 men, occupied the whole country; and the lordly leader following, on a far greater scale, the principle on which Mansfeldt had acted, made the war maintain the war, and trampled alike on the rights of sovereigns and of subjects. And terrible was the penalty now paid for the short-sighted policy which avarice and cowardice had suggested, and which cunning had vainly tried to disguise beneath affected philanthropy, and a generous love of peace. Provided with imperial authority, and at the head of a force that could no longer be resisted, Wallenstein made the empire serve as a vast

storehouse, and wealthy treasury for the benefit of the imperial army. He forbade even sovereigns and electors to raise supplies in their own countries, and was justly termed 'the princes' scourge, and soldiers' idol.' The system of living by contributions had completely demoralised the troops. Honour and discipline were entirely gone; and it was only beneath the eye of the stern and unrelenting commander, that anything like order continued to be observed. Dissipation and profligacy reigned in all ranks; bands of dissolute persons accompanied every regiment, and helped to extinguish the last sparks of morality in the breast of the soldier. The generals levied arbitrary taxes; the inferior officers followed the example of their superiors; and the privates, soon ceasing to obey those whom they ceased to respect, plundered in every direction; while blows, insults, or death awaited all who dared to resist. . . . The sums extorted, in this manner, prove that Germany must have been a wealthy country in the 17th century; for the money pressed out of some districts, by the imperial troops, far exceeds anything which the same quarters could now be made to furnish. Complaints against the author of such evils were, of course, not wanting; but the man complained of had rendered the Emperor all-powerful in Germany: from the Adriatic to the Baltic, Ferdinand reigned absolute, as no monarch had reigned since the days of the Othos. This supremacy was due to Wallenstein alone; and what could the voice of the humble and oppressed effect against such an offender? Or when did the voice of suffering nations, arrest the progress of power and ambition? During the winter that followed on the campaign of 1627, Wallenstein repaired to Prague, to claim [and to receive] from the Emperor, who was residing in the Bohemian capital, additional rewards for the important services so lately rendered. The boon solicited was nothing less than the Duchy of Mecklenburg, which was to be taken from its legitimate princes, on the ground of their having joined the King of Denmark, and bestowed on the successful general. . . . Hitherto the ocean had alone arrested the progress of Wallenstein: a fleet was now to be formed, which should enable him to give laws beyond the Belts, and perhaps beyond the Baltic also. Every seaport in Mecklenburg and Pomerania is ordered to be taken possession of and fortified. . . . The siege of Stralsund, which was resolved upon early in 1628, constitutes one of the most memorable operations of the war. Not merely because it furnishes an additional proof of what may be effected by skill, courage and resolution, against vastly superior forces, but because its result influenced, in an eminent degree, some of the most important events that followed. When Wallenstein ordered the seaports along the coast of Pomerania to be occupied, Stralsund, claiming its privilege as an imperial and Hanseatic free town, refused to admit his troops. . . . After a good deal of negotiation, which only cost the people of Stralsund some large sums of money, paid away in presents to the imperial officers, Arnheim invested the place on the 7th of May with 8,000 men. . . . The town . . . unable to obtain assistance from the Duke of Pomerania, the lord superior of the province, who, however willing, had no means of furnishing relief, placed itself under the protection of Sweden: and

Gustavus Adolphus, fully sensible of the importance of the place, immediately dispatched the celebrated David Leslie, at the head of 600 men, to aid in its defence. Count Brahe, with 1,000 more, soon followed; so that when Wallenstein reached the army on the 27th of June, he found himself opposed by a garrison of experienced soldiers, who had already retaken all the out-works which Arnheim had captured in the first instance. . . . Rain began to fall in such torrents that the trenches were entirely filled, and the flat moor ground, on which the army was encamped, became completely inundated and untenable. The proud spirit of Friedland, unused to yield, still persevered; but sickness attacked the troops, and the Danes having landed at Jasmund, he was obliged to march against them with the best part of his forces; and in fact to raise the siege. . . . The Danes having effected their object, in causing the siege of Stralsund to be raised, withdrew their troops from Jasmund, and landed them again at Wolgast. Here, however, Wallenstein surprised, and defeated them with great loss. . . . There being on all sides a willingness to bring the war to an end, peace was . . . concluded at Lubeck in January 1629. By this treaty the Danes recovered, without reserve or indemnity, all their former possessions; only pledging themselves not again to interfere in the affairs of the Empire. . . . The peace of Lubeck left Wallenstein absolute master in Germany, and without an equal in greatness: his spirit seemed to hover like a storm-charged cloud over the land, crushing to the earth every hope of liberty and successful resistance. Mansfeld and Christian of Brunswick had disappeared from the scene; Frederick V. had retired into obscurity. Tilly and Pappenheim, his former rivals, now condescended to receive favours, and to solicit pensions and rewards through the medium of his intercession. Even Maximilian of Bavaria was second in greatness to the all-dreaded Duke of Friedland: Europe held no crowned head that was his equal in fame, and no crowned head that surpassed him in power. . . . Ferdinand, elated with success, had neglected the opportunity, again afforded him by the peace of Lubeck, for restoring tranquillity to the empire. . . . Instead of a general peace, Ferdinand signed the fatal Edict of Restitution, by which the Protestants were called upon to restore all the Catholic Church property they had sequestered since the religious pacification of 1555: such sequestration being, according to the Emperor's interpretation, contrary to the spirit of the treaty of Passau. The right of long-established possession was here entirely overlooked; and Ferdinand forgot, in his zeal for the church, that he was actually setting himself up as a judge, in a case in which he was a party also. It was farther added, that, according to the same treaty, freedom of departure from Catholic countries, was the only privilege which Protestants had a right to claim from Catholic princes. This decree came like a thunder-burst over Protestant Germany. Two archbishopricks, 12 bishopricks, and a countless number of convents and clerical domains, which the Protestants had confiscated, and applied to their own purposes, were now to be surrendered. Imperial commissioners were appointed to carry the mandate into effect, and, to secure immediate obedience, troops were placed at the disposal of the new

officials. Wherever these functionaries appeared, the Protestant service was instantly suspended; the churches deprived of their bells; altars and pulpits pulled down; all Protestant books, bibles and catechisms were seized; and gibbets were erected to terrify those who might be disposed to resist. All Protestants who refused to change their religion were expelled from Augsburg; summary proceedings of the same kind were resorted to in other places. Armed with absolute power, the commissioners soon proceeded from reclaiming the property of the church to seize that of individuals. The estates of all persons who had served under Mansfeld, Baden, Christian of Brunswick; of all who had aided Frederick V., or rendered themselves obnoxious to the Emperor, were seized and confiscated. . . . The Duke of Friedland, who now ruled with dictatorial sway over Germany, had been ordered to carry the Edict of Restitution into effect, in all the countries occupied by his troops. The task, if we believe historians, was executed with unbending rigour."—J. Mitchell, *Life of Wallenstein*, ch. 2-3.

ALSO IN: L. Häusser, *The Period of the Reformation*, 1517 to 1648, ch. 33.

A. D. 1627-1631.—War of the Emperor and Spain with France, over the succession to the duchy of Mantua. See ITALY: A. D. 1627-1631.

A. D. 1630.—The Thirty Years War: Universal hostility to Wallenstein.—His dismissal by the Emperor.—The rising of a new champion of Protestantism in Sweden.—"Wallenstein had ever shown great toleration in his own domains; but it is not to be denied that . . . he aided to carry out the edict [of Restitution] in the most barbarous and relentless manner. It would be as tedious as painful to dwell upon all the cruelties which were committed, and the oppression that was exercised, by the imperial commissioners; but a spirit of resistance was aroused in the hearts of the German people, which only waited for opportunity to display itself. Nor was it alone against the emperor that wrath and indignation was excited. Wallenstein drew down upon his head even more dangerous enmity than that which sprung up against Ferdinand. He ruled in Germany with almost despotic sway; for the emperor himself seemed at this time little more than a tool in his hands. His manners were unpopular, stern, reserved, and gloomy. . . . Princes were kept waiting in his ante-chamber; and all petitions and remonstrances against his stern decrees were treated with the mortifying scorn which adds insult to injury. The magnificence of his train, the splendor of his household, the luxury and profusion that spread every where around him, afforded continual sources of envy and jealous hate to the ancient nobility of the empire. The Protestants throughout the land were his avowed and implacable enemies; and the Roman Catholic princes viewed him with fear and suspicion. Maximilian of Bavaria, whose star had waned under the growing luster of Wallenstein's renown, who had lost that authority in the empire which he knew to be due to his services and his genius, solely by the rise and influence of Wallenstein, and whose ambitious designs of ruling Germany through an emperor dependent upon him for power, had been frustrated entirely by the genius which placed the imperial throne upon a firm and

independent basis, took no pains to conceal his hostility to the Duke of Friedland. . . . Though the soldiery still generally loved him, their officers hated the hand that put a limit to the oppression by which they thrived, and would fain have resisted its power. . . . While these feelings were gathering strength in Germany; while Wallenstein, with no friends, though many supporters, saw himself an object of jealousy or hatred to the leaders of every party throughout the empire; and while the suppressed but cherished indignation of all Protestant Germany was preparing for the emperor a dreadful day of reckoning, events were taking place in other countries which hurried on rapidly the dangers that Wallenstein had foreseen. In France, a weak king, and a powerful, politic, and relentless minister, appeared in undissembled hostility to the house of Austria; and the famous Cardinal de Richelieu busied himself, successfully, to raise up enemies to the German branch of that family. . . . In Poland, Sigismund, after vainly contending with Gustavus Adolphus, and receiving an inefficient aid from Germany, was anxious to conclude the disastrous war with Sweden. Richelieu interfered; Oxenstiern negotiated on the part of Gustavus; and a truce of six years was concluded in August, 1629, by which the veteran and victorious Swedish troops were set free to act in any other direction. A great part of Livonia was virtually ceded to Gustavus, together with the towns and territories of Memel, Braunsberg and Elbingen, and the strong fortress of Pillau. At the same time, Richelieu impressed upon the mind of Gustavus the honor, the advantage, and the necessity of reducing the immense power of the emperor, and delivering the Protestant states of Germany from the oppression under which they groaned. . . . Confident in his own powers of mind and warlike skill, supported by the love and admiration of his people, relying on the valor and discipline of his troops, and foreseeing all the mighty combinations which were certain to take place in his favor, Gustavus hesitated but little. He consulted with his ministers, indeed heard and answered every objection that could be raised; and then applied to the Senate at Stockholm to insure that his plans were approved, and that his efforts would be seconded by his people. His enterprise met with the most enthusiastic approbation; and then succeeded all the bustle of active preparation. . . . While this storm was gathering in the North, while the towns of Sweden were bristling with arms, and her ports filled with ships, Ferdinand was driven or persuaded to an act the most fatal to himself, and the most favorable to the King of Sweden. A Diet was summoned to meet at Ratisbon early in the year 1630; and the chief object of the emperor in taking a step so dangerous to the power he had really acquired, and to the projects so boldly put forth in his name, seems to have been to cause his son to be elected King of the Romans. . . . The name of the archduke, King of Hungary, is proposed to the Diet for election as King of the Romans, and a scene of indescribable confusion and murmuring takes place. A voice demands that, before any such election is considered, the complaints of the people of Germany against the imperial armies shall be heard; and then a perfect storm of accusations pours down. Every sort of tyranny and oppression, every sort of cruelty and exaction,

every sort of licentiousness and vice is attributed to the emperor's troops; but the hatred and the charges all concentrate themselves upon the head of the great commander of the imperial forces; and there is a shout for his instant dismissal. . . . Ferdinand hesitated, and affected much surprise at the charges brought against his general and his armies. He yielded in the end, however; and it is said, upon very good authority, that his ruinous decision was brought about by the arts of the same skillful politician who had conjured up the storm which now menaced the empire from the north. Richelieu had sent an ambassador to Ratisbon. . . . In the train of the ambassador came the well-known intriguing friar, Father Joseph, the most unscrupulous and cunning of the cardinal's emissaries; and he, we are assured, found means to persuade the emperor that, by yielding to the demand of the electors and removing Wallenstein for a time, he might obtain the election of the King of Hungary, and then reinstate the Duke of Friedland in his command as soon as popular anger had subsided. However that might be, Ferdinand, as I have said, yielded, openly expressing his regret at the step he was about to take, and the apprehensions which he entertained for the consequences. Count Questenberg and another nobleman, who had been long on intimate terms with Wallenstein, were sent to the camp to notify to him his removal from command, and to soften the disgrace by assuring him of the emperor's gratitude and affection."—G. P. R. James, *Dark Scenes of History: Wallenstein*, ch. 3-4.

ALSO IN: S. R. Gardiner, *The Thirty Years' War*, ch. 7, sect. 3.—A. Gindely, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, v. 2, ch. 1.

A. D. 1630-1631.—The Thirty Years War: The Coming of Gustavus Adolphus.—His occupation of Pomerania and Brandenburg.—The horrible fate of Magdeburg at the hands of Tilly's ruffians.—"On June 24, 1630, one hundred years, to a day, after the Augsburg Confession was promulgated, Gustavus Adolphus landed on the coast of Pomerania, near the mouth of the river Peene, with 13,000 men, veteran troops, whose rigid discipline was sustained by their piety, and who were simple-minded, noble, and glowing with the spirit of the battle. He had reasons enough for declaring war against Ferdinand, even if 10,000 of Wallenstein's troops had not been sent to aid Sigismund against him. But the controlling motive, in his own mind, was to succor the imperiled cause of religious freedom in Germany. Coming as the protector of the evangelic Church, he expected to be joined by the Protestant princes. But he was disappointed. Only the trampled and tortured people of North Germany, who in their despair were ready for revolts and conspiracies of their own, welcomed him as their deliverer from the bandits of Wallenstein and the League. Gustavus Adolphus appeared before Stettin, and by threats compelled the old duke, Bogislaw XIV., to open to him his capital city. He then took measures to secure possession of Pomerania. His army grew rapidly, while that of the emperor was widely dispersed, so that he now advanced into Brandenburg. George William, the elector, was a weak prince, though a Protestant, and a brother of the Queen of Sweden; he was guided by his Catholic chancellor, Schwarzenberg, and had painfully striven to keep neutral throughout the war, neither side,

however, respecting his neutrality. In dread of the plans of Gustavus Adolphus concerning Pomerania and Prussia, he held aloof from him. Meanwhile Tilly, general-in-chief of the troops of the emperor and the League, drew near, but suddenly turned aside to New Brandenburg, in the Mecklenburg territory, now occupied by the Swedes, captured it after three assaults, and put the garrison to the sword (1631). He then laid siege to Magdeburg. Gustavus Adolphus took Frankfort-on-the-Oder, where there was an imperial garrison, and treated it, in retaliation, with the same severity. Thence, in the spring of 1631, he set out for Berlin. . . . In Potsdam he heard of the fall of Magdeburg. He then marched with flying banners into Berlin, and compelled the elector to become his ally. Magdeburg was the strong refuge of Protestantism, and the most important trading centre in North Germany. It had resisted the Augsburg Interim of 1548, and now resisted the Edict of Restitution, rejected the newly appointed prince bishop, Leopold William, son of the emperor himself, and refused to receive the emperor's garrison. The city was therefore banned by the emperor, and was besieged for many weeks by Pappenheim, a general of the League, who was then reinforced by Tilly himself with his army. Gustavus Adolphus was unable to make an advance, in view of the equivocal attitude of the two great Protestant electors, without exposing his rear to garrisoned fortresses. From Brandenburg as well as Saxony he asked in vain for help to save the Protestant city. Thus Magdeburg fell, May 10, 1631. The citizens were deceived by a pretended withdrawal of the enemy. But suddenly, at early dawn, the badly guarded fortifications were stormed."—C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 18, sect. 3-4.—Two gates of the city having been opened by the storming party, "Tilly marched in with part of his infantry. Immediately occupying the principal streets, he drove the citizens with pointed cannon into their dwellings, there to await their destiny. They were not long held in suspense; a word from Tilly decided the fate of Magdeburg. Even a more humane general would in vain have recommended mercy to such soldiers; but Tilly never made the attempt. Left by their general's silence masters of the lives of all the citizens, the soldiery broke into the houses to satiate their most brutal appetites. The prayers of innocence excited some compassion in the hearts of the Germans, but none in the rude breasts of Pappenheim's Walloons. Scarcely had the savage cruelty commenced, when the other gates were thrown open, and the cavalry, with the fearful hordes of the Croats, poured in upon the devoted inhabitants. Here commenced a scene of horrors for which history has no language—poetry no pencil. Neither innocent childhood, nor helpless old age; neither youth, sex, rank, nor beauty, could disarm the fury of the conquerors. Wives were abused in the arms of their husbands, daughters at the feet of their parents; and the defenceless sex exposed to the double sacrifice of virtue and life. No situation, however obscure, or however sacred, escaped the rapacity of the enemy. In a single church fifty-three women were found beheaded. The Croats amused themselves with throwing children into the flames; Pappenheim's Walloons with stabbing infants at the mother's breast. Some officers of the League, horror-struck at this dreadful

scene, ventured to remind Tilly that he had it in his power to stop the carnage. 'Return in an hour,' was his answer; 'I will see what I can do; the soldier must have some reward for his danger and toils.' These horrors lasted with unabated fury, till at last the smoke and flames proved a check to the plunderers. To augment the confusion and to divert the resistance of the inhabitants, the Imperialists had, in the commencement of the assault, fired the town in several places. The wind rising rapidly, spread the flames, till the blaze became universal. Fearful, indeed, was the tumult amid clouds of smoke, heaps of dead bodies, the clash of swords, the crash of falling ruins, and streams of blood. The atmosphere glowed; and the intolerable heat forced at last even the murderers to take refuge in their camp. In less than twelve hours, this strong, populous, and flourishing city, one of the finest in Germany, was reduced to ashes, with the exception of two churches and a few houses. . . . The avarice of the officers had saved 400 of the richest citizens, in the hope of extorting from them an exorbitant ransom. But this humanity was confined to the officers of the League, whom the ruthless barbarity of the Imperialists caused to be regarded as guardian angels. Scarcely had the fury of the flames abated, when the Imperialists returned to renew the pillage amid the ruins and ashes of the town. Many were suffocated by the smoke; many found rich booty in the cellars, where the citizens had concealed their more valuable effects. On the 13th of May, Tilly himself appeared in the town, after the streets had been cleared of ashes and dead bodies. Horrible and revolting to humanity was the scene that presented itself. The living crawling from under the dead, children wandering about with heart-rending cries, calling for their parents; and infants still sucking the breasts of their lifeless mothers. More than 6,000 bodies were thrown into the Elbe to clear the streets; a much greater number had been consumed by the flames. The whole number of the slain was reckoned at not less than 30,000. The entrance of the general, which took place on the 14th, put a stop to the plunder, and saved the few who had hitherto contrived to escape. About a thousand people were taken out of the cathedral, where they had remained three days and two nights, without food, and in momentary fear of death."—F. Schiller, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, bk. 2.

ALSO IN: Sir E. Cust, *Lives of the Warriors of the Thirty Years' War*, pt. 1.

A. D. 1631 (January).—The Thirty Years War: The Treaty of Bärwalde between Gustavus Adolphus and the king of France.—"On the 13th of January, 1631, the Treaty of Bärwalde was concluded between France and Sweden. Hard cash had been the principal subject of the negotiation, and Louis XIII. had agreed to pay Gustavus a lump sum of \$120,000 in consideration of his recent expenditure,—a further sum of \$400,000 a year for six years to come. Until that time, or until a general peace, if such should supervene earlier, Sweden was to keep in the field an army of 30,000 foot and 6,000 horse. The object of the alliance was declared to be 'the protection of their common friends, the security of the Baltic, the freedom of commerce, the restitution of the oppressed members of the Empire, the destruction of the newly erected fortresses in the Baltic, the North Sea, and in the

Grisons territory, so that all should be left in the state in which it was before the German war had begun.' Sweden was not to 'violate the Imperial constitution' where she conquered; she was to leave the Catholic religion undisturbed in all districts where she found it existing. She was to observe towards Bavaria and the League—the spoil darlings of Richelieu's anti-Austrian policy—friendship or neutrality, so far as they would observe it towards her. If, at the end of six years, the objects were not accomplished, the treaty was to be renewed."—C. R. L. Fletcher, *Gustavus Adolphus and the Struggle of Protestantism for Existence*, ch. 9.

A. D. 1631.—The Thirty Years War: The elector of Brandenburg brought to terms by the king of Sweden.—The elector of Saxony frightened into line.—Defeat of Tilly at Leipsig (Breitenfeld).—Effects of the great victory.—"Loud were the cries against Gustavus for not having relieved Magdeburg. To answer them he felt himself bound to publish a careful apology. In this document he declared, among other things, that if he could have obtained from the Elector of Brandenburg the passage of Küstrin he might not only have raised the siege of Magdeburg but have destroyed the whole of the Imperial army. The passage, however, had been denied him; and though the preservation of Magdeburg so much concerned the Elector of Saxony, he could obtain from him a passage toward it neither by Wittemberg, nor the Bridge of Dessau, nor such assistance in provision and shipping as was necessary for the success of the enterprise. . . . Something more than mere persuasion had induced the Elector of Brandenburg, after the capture of Francfort, to grant Gustavus possession of Spandau for a month. The month expired on the 8th of June; and the elector demanded back his stronghold. The king, fettered by his promise, surrendered it; but the next day, having marched to Berlin and pointed his guns against the palace, the ladies came forth as mediators, and the elector consented both to surrender Spandau again and to pay, for the maintenance of the Swedish troops, a monthly subsidy of 30,000 rix-dollars. At the end of May Tilly removed from Magdeburg and the Elbe to Ascherleben. This enabled the king to take Werben, on the confluence of the Elbe and Havel, where, after the reduction of Tangermünde and Havelberg, he established his celebrated camp." In the latter part of July, Tilly made two attacks on the king's camp at Werben, and was repulsed on both occasions with heavy loss. "In the middle of August, Gustavus broke up his camp. His force at that time, according to the muster-rolls, amounted to 13,000 foot, and 8,850 cavalry. He drew towards Leipsig, then threatened by Tilly, who, having been joined at Eisleben by 15,000 men under Fürstenburg, now possessed an army 40,000 strong to enforce the emperor's ban against the Leipsig decrees [or resolutions of a congress of Protestant princes which had assembled at Leipsig in February, 1631, moved to some organized common action by the Edict of Restitution] within the limits of the electorate. The Elector of Saxony was almost frightened out of his wits by the impending danger. . . . His grief and rage at the fall of Magdeburg had been so great that, for two days after receiving the news, he would admit no one into his presence. But that dire event only added to his perplexity; he

could resolve neither upon submission, nor upon vengeance. In May, indeed, terrified by the threats of Ferdinand, he discontinued his levies, and disbanded a part of his troops already enlisted: but in June he sent Arnim to Gustavus with such overtures that the king drank his health, and seemed to have grown sanguine in the hope of his alliance. In July, his courage still rising, he permitted Gustavus to recruit in his dominions. In August, his courage falling again at the approach of Fürstenburg, he gave him and his troops a free passage through Thuringia." But now, later in the same month, he sent word to Gustavus Adolphus "that not only Wittemberg but the whole electorate was open to him; that not only his son, but himself, would serve under the king; that he would advance one month's payment for the Swedish troops immediately, and give security for two monthly payments more. . . . Gustavus rejoiced to find the Duke of Saxony in this temper, and, in pursuance of a league now entered into with him, and the Elector of Brandenburg, crossed the Elbe at Wittemberg on the 4th of September. The Saxons, from 16,000 to 20,000 strong, moving simultaneously from Torgau, the confederated armies met at Düben on the Mulda, three leagues from Leipsig. At a conference held there, it was debated whether it would be better to protract the war or to hazard a battle. The king took the former side, but yielded to the strong representations of the Duke of Saxony. . . . On the 6th of September the allies came within six or eight miles of the enemy, where they halted for the night. . . . Breitenfeld, the place at which Tilly, urged by the importunity of Pappenheim, had chosen to offer battle, was an extensive plain, in part recently ploughed, about a mile from Leipsig and near the cemetery of that city. Leipsig had surrendered to Tilly two days before. The Imperial army, estimated at 44,000 men, occupied a rising ground on the plain. . . . The army was drawn up in one line of great depth, having the infantry in the centre, the cavalry on the wings, according to the Spanish order of battle. The king subdivided his army, about 20,000 strong, into centre and wings, each of which consisted of two lines and a reserve. . . . To this disposition is attributed, in a great degree, the success of the day. . . . The files being so comparatively shallow, artillery made less havoc among them. Then, again, the division of the army into small maniples, with considerable intervals between each, gave space for evolutions, and the power of throwing the troops with rapidity wherever their services or support might be found requisite. . . . The battle began at 12 o'clock." It only ended with the setting of the sun; but long before that time the great army of Tilly was substantially destroyed. It had scattered the Saxons easily enough, and sent them flying, with their worthless elector; but Gustavus and his disciplined, brave, powerfully handled Swedes had broken and ruined the stout but clumsy imperial lines. "It is scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of this success. On the event of that day, as Gustavus himself said, the whole (Protestant) cause, 'summa rei', depended. The success was great in itself. The numbers engaged on either side had been nearly equal. Not so their loss. The Imperial loss in killed and wounded, according to Swedish computation, was from 8,000 to 10,000; according to the enemy's own

account, between 6,000 and 7,000; while all seem to agree that the loss on the side of the allies was only 2,700, of which 2,000 were Saxon, 700 Swedes. Besides, Gustavus won the whole of the enemy's artillery, and more than 100 standards. Then the army of Tilly being annihilated left him free to choose his next point of attack, almost his next victory."—B. Chapman, *Hist. of Gustavus Adolphus*, ch. 8.—"The battle of Breitenfeld was an epoch in war, and it was an epoch in history. It was an epoch in war, because first in it was displayed on a great scale the superiority of mobility over weight. It was an epoch in history, because it broke the force upon which the revived Catholicism had relied for the extension of its empire over Europe. . . . 'Germany might tear herself and be torn to pieces for yet another half-generation, but the actual result of the Thirty-Years' War was as good as achieved.'"—C. R. L. Fletcher, *Gustavus Adolphus and the Struggle of Protestantism for Existence*, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: G. B. Malleson, *The Battle-fields of Germany*, ch. 1.

A. D. 1631-1632.—The Thirty Years War: Movements and plans of the Swedish king in southern Germany.—Temporary recovery of the Palatinate.—Occupation of Bavaria.—The Saxons in Bohemia.—Battle of the Lech.—Death of Tilly.—Wallenstein's recall.—Siege and relief of Nuremberg.—Battle of Lützen, and death of Gustavus Adolphus.—"This battle, sometimes called Breitenwald [Breitenfeld], sometimes the First Battle of Leipsic, . . . was the first victory on the Protestant side that had been achieved. It was Tilly's first defeat after thirty battles. It filled with joy those who had hitherto been depressed and hopeless. Cities which had dreaded to declare themselves for fear of the fate of Magdeburg began to lift up their heads, and vacillating princes to think that they could safely take the part which they preferred. Gustavus knew, however, that he must let the Germans do as much as possible for themselves, or he should arouse their national jealousy of him as a foreign conqueror. So he sent the Elector of Saxony to awaken the old spirit in Bohemia. As for himself, his great counsellor, Oxenstierna, wanted him to march straight on Vienna, but this was not his object. He wanted primarily to deliver the northern states, and to encourage the merchant cities, Ulm, Augsburg, Nuremberg, which had all along been Protestant, and to deliver the Palatinate from its oppressors. And, out of mortification, a strange ally offered himself, namely, Wallenstein, who wanted revenge on the Catholic League which had insisted on his dismissal, and the Emperor who had yielded to them. . . . He said that if Gustavus would trust him, he would soon get his old army together again, and chase Ferdinand and the Jesuits beyond the Alps. But Gustavus did not trust him, though he sat quiet at Prague while the Saxons were in possession of the city, plundering everywhere, and the Elector sending off to Dresden fifty waggon-loads filled with the treasures of the Emperor Rudolf's museum. . . . Many exiles returned, and there was a general resumption of the Hussite form of worship. Gustavus had marched to Erfurt, and then turned towards the Maine, where there was a long row of those prince bishoprics established on the frontier by the policy of Charlemagne—Wurtzburg, Bamberg, Fulda,

Köln, Triers, Mentz, Wurms, Spiers. These had never been secularised and were popularly called the Priests' Lane. They had given all their forces to the Catholic League, and Gustavus meant to repay himself upon them. He permitted no cruelties, no persecutions; but he levied heavy contributions, and his troops made merry with the good Rhenish wine when he kept his Christmas at Mentz. He invited the dispossessed Elector Palatine to join him, and Frederick started for the camp, after the christening of his thirteenth child. . . . The suite was numerous enough to fill forty coaches, escorted by seventy horse—pretty well for an exiled prince dependent on the bounty of Holland and England. . . . There was the utmost enthusiasm for the Swede in England, and the Marquess of Hamilton obtained permission to raise a body of volunteers to join the Swedish standards, and in the August of 1631 brought 6,000 English and Scots in four small regiments; but they proved of little use . . . many dying. . . . So far as the King's plans can be understood, he meant to have formed a number of Protestant principalities, and united them in what he called 'Corpus Evangelicorum' around the Baltic and the Elbe, as a balance to the Austrian Roman Catholic power in southern Germany. Frederick wanted to raise an army of his own people and take the command, but to this Gustavus would not consent, having probably no great confidence in his capacity. All the Palatinate was free from the enemy except the three fortresses of Heidelberg, Frankenthal, and Kreuznach, and the last of these was immediately besieged. . . . In the midst of the exultation Frederick was grieved to learn that his beautiful home at Heidelberg had been ravaged by fire, probably by the Spanish garrison in expectation of having to abandon it. But as Tilly was collecting his forces again, Gustavus would not wait to master that place or Frankenthal, and recrossed the Rhine. Sir Harry Vane had been sent as ambassador from Charles I. to arrange for the restoration of the Palatinate, the King offering £10,000 a month for the expense of the war, and proposing that if, as was only too probable, he should be prevented from performing this promise, some of the fortresses should be left as guarantees in the hands of the Swedes. Frederick took great and petulant offence at this stipulation, and complained, with tears in his eyes, to Vane and the Marquess of Hamilton. . . . He persuaded them to suppress this article, though they warned him that if the treaty failed it would be by his own fault. It did in fact fail, for, as usual, the English money was not forthcoming, and even if it had been, Gustavus declared that he would be no man's servant for a few thousand pounds. Frederick also refused the King's own stipulation, that Lutherans should enjoy equal rights with Calvinists. Moreover, the Swedish success had been considerably more than was desired by his French allies. . . . Louis XIII. was distressed, but Richelieu silenced him, only attempting to make a treaty with the Swedes by which the Elector of Bavaria and the Catholic League should be neutral on condition of the restoration of the bishops. To this, however, Gustavus could not fully consent, and imposed conditions which the Catholics could not accept. Tilly was collecting his forces and threatening Nuremberg, but the Swedes advanced, and he was forced to retreat, so that it was as a

deliverer that, on the 31st March [1632], Gustavus was received in beautiful old Nuremberg with a rapture of welcome. . . . Tilly had taken post on the Lech, and Maximilian was collecting an army in Bavaria. The object of Gustavus was now to beat one or other of them before they could join together: so he marched forward, took Donauwerth, and tried to take Ingoldstadt, but found it would occupy too much time, and, though all the generals were of a contrary opinion, resolved to attack Tilly and force the passage of the Lech. The Imperialists had fortified it to the utmost, but in their very teeth the Swedes succeeded in taking advantage of a bend in the river to play on them with their formidable artillery, construct a pontoon bridge, and, after a desperate struggle, effect a passage. Tilly was struck by a cannon-shot in the knee," and died soon afterwards. "On went Gustavus to Augsburg . . . where the Emperor had expelled the Lutheran pastors and cleared the municipal council of Protestant burgomasters. In restoring the former state of things, Gustavus took a fresh step, making the magistrates not only swear fidelity to him as an ally till the end of the war, but as a sovereign. This made the Germans begin to wonder what were his ulterior views. Then he marched on upon Bavaria, intending to bridge the Danube and take Ratisbon, but two strong forts prevented this. . . . He, however, made his way into the country between the Inn and the Lech, Maximilian retreating before him. . . . At Munich the inhabitants brought him their keys. As they knelt he said, 'Rise, worship God, not man.' . . . To compensate the soldiers for not plundering the city, the King gave them each a crown on the day of their entrance. . . . Catholic Germany was in despair. There was only one general in whom there was any hope, and that was the discarded Wallenstein. . . . He made himself be courted. He would not come to Vienna, only to Znaim in Moravia, where he made his terms like an independent prince. . . . At last he undertook to collect an army, but refused to take the command for more than three months. His name was enough to bring his Friedlanders flocking to his standard. Not only Catholics, but Protestants came, viewing Gustavus as a foreign invader. . . . Wallenstein received subsidies not only from the Emperor, but from the Pope and the King of Spain, towards levying and equipping them, and by the end of the three months he had the full 40,000 all in full order for the march. Then he resigned the command. . . . He affected to be bent only on going back to his tower and his stars at Prague [the study of astrology being his favorite occupation], and to yield slowly to the proposals made him. He was to be Generalissimo, neither Emperor nor Archduke was ever to enter his camp; he was to name all his officers, and have absolute control. . . . Moreover, he might levy contributions as he chose, and dispose as he pleased of lands and property taken from the enemy; Mecklenburg was to be secured to him, together with further rewards yet unspecified; and when Bohemia was freed from the enemy, the Emperor was to live there, no doubt under his control. . . . There was no help for it, and Wallenstein thus became the chief power in the Empire, in fact a dictator. The power was conferred on him in April. The first thing he did was to turn the Saxons out of Bohemia,

which was an easy matter." At Egra, Wallenstein was joined by the Elector of Bavaria, which raised the Catholic force to 60,000. "The whole army marched upon Nuremberg, and Gustavus, with only 20,000 men, dashed back to its defence. Wallenstein had intrenched himself on an eminence called Fürth." As Nuremberg was terribly distressed, his own army suffering, and being infected with the lawless habits of German warfare, Gustavus found it necessary to attempt (August 24) the storming of the Imperialists' camp. He was repulsed, after losing 3,000 of his Swedes and thrice as many Germans. He then returned to Bavaria, while Wallenstein, abandoning his hope of taking Nuremberg, moved into Saxony and began ravaging the country. The Swedish king followed him so quickly that he had no time to establish the fortified camp he had intended, but was forced to take up an intrenched position at Lützen. There he was attacked on the 6th of November, 1632, and defeated in a desperate battle, which became one of the memorable conflicts in history because it brought to an end the great and splendid career of Gustavus Adolphus, the Swede. The king fell as he was leading a charge, and the fierce fight went on over his body until the enemy had been driven from the field.—C. M. Yonge, *Cameos from English History*, 6th series, c. 19.

ALSO IN: G. B. Malleon, *Battle-fields of Germany*, ch. 2-3.—R. C. Trench, *Gustavus Adolphus in Germany*.—J. L. Stevens, *Hist. of Gustavus Adolphus*, ch. 15-18.

A. D. 1631-1641.—The Thirty Years War: The war in Lorraine.—Possession of the duchy taken by the French. See LORRAINE: A. D. 1624-1663.

A. D. 1632-1634.—The Thirty Years War: Retirement of Wallenstein to Bohemia.—Oxenstiern in the leadership of the Protestant cause.—Union of Heilbronn.—Inaction and suspicious conduct of Wallenstein.—The Ban pronounced against him.—His assassination.—"The account of the battle [of Lützen] transmitted by Wallenstein to the Imperial Court, led Ferdinand to think that he had gained the day. . . . But . . . the reputed conqueror was glad to shelter himself behind the mountains of the Bohemian frontier. After the battle, Wallenstein found it necessary to evacuate Saxony in all haste; and, leaving garrisons at Leipsic, Plauen, Zwickau, Chemnitz, Freiberg, Meissen, and Frauenstein, he reached Bohemia without further loss, and put his army into winter-quarters. After his arrival at Prague, he caused many of his officers to be executed for their conduct at Lützen, among whom were several who belonged to families of distinction, nor would he allow them to plead the Emperor's pardon. A few he rewarded. The harshness of his proceedings increased the hatred already felt for him by many of his officers, and especially the Italian portion of them. . . . Axel Oxenstiern, the Swedish Chancellor, succeeded, on the death of Gustavus Adolphus, to the supreme direction of the affairs of Sweden in Germany, and was invested by the Council at Stockholm with full powers both to direct the army and to negotiate with the German courts. Duke Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar retained the military command of the Swedish-German army, divisions of which were cantoned from the Baltic to the Danube. After driving the Imperialists from Saxony, Bernhard

had hastened into Franconia, the bishoprics of which, according to a promise of Gustavus, were to be erected in his favour into a duchy; but, after taking Bamberg, his assistance was invoked by General Horn, on the Upper Danube. One of the first cares of Oxenstiern was to consolidate the German alliance; and, in March 1633, he summoned a meeting at Heilbronn of the States of the four Circles of the Upper and Lower Rhine, Franconia, and Suabia, as well as deputies from Nuremberg, Strasburg, Frankfort, Ulm, Augsburg, and other cities of the empire. The assembly was also attended by ambassadors from France, England, and Holland; and on April 9th was effected the Union of Heilbronn. Brandenburg and Saxony stood aloof; nor was France, though she renewed the alliance with Sweden, included in the Union. The French minister at Heilbronn assisted, however, in the formation of the Union, although he endeavoured to limit the power of Oxenstiern, to whom the conduct of the war was intrusted. At the same time, the Swedes also concluded a treaty with the Palatinate, now governed, or rather claimed to be governed, by Louis Philip, brother of the Elector Frederick V., as guardian and regent for the latter's youthful son Charles Louis. The unfortunate Frederick had expired at Mentz in his 37th year, not many days after the death of Gustavus Adolphus. . . . Swedish garrisons were to be maintained in Frankenthal, Bacharach, Kaub, and other places; Mannheim was to be at the disposal of the Swedes so long as the war should last. . . . After the junction of Duke Bernhard with Horn, the Swedish army, — for so we shall continue to call it, though composed in great part of Germans, — endeavoured to penetrate into Bavaria; but the Imperial General Altringer, aided by John von Werth, a commander of distinction, succeeded in covering Munich, and enabled Maximilian to return to his capital. The Swedish generals were also embarrassed by a mutiny of their mercenaries, as well as by their own misunderstandings and quarrels; and all that Duke Bernhard was able to accomplish in the campaign of 1633, besides some forays into Bavaria, was the capture of Ratisbon in November." — T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 4, ch. 6 (v. 2). — Wallenstein, meantime, had been doing little. "After a long period of inaction in Bohemia, he marched during the summer of 1633, with imperial pomp and splendor, into Silesia. There he found a mixed army of Swedes, Saxons, and Brandenburgers, with Matthias Thurn, who began the war, among them. Wallenstein finally shut in this army [at Steinau] so that he might have captured it; but he let it go, and went back to Bohemia, where he began to negotiate with Saxony for peace. Meanwhile the alliance formed at Heilbronn had brought Maximilian of Bavaria into great distress. Regensburg [Ratisbon], hitherto occupied by him, and regarded as an outwork of Bavaria and Austria, had been taken by Bernard of Weimar. But Wallenstein, whom the emperor sent to the rescue, only went into the Upper Palatinate, and then returned to Bohemia. He seemed to look upon that country as a strong and commanding position from which he could dictate peace. He carried on secret negotiations with France, Sweden, and all the emperor's enemies. He had, indeed, the power to do this under his commission; but his attitude toward his master became

constantly more equivocal. The emperor was anxious to be rid of him without making him an enemy, and wished to give to his own son, the young King of Hungary, the command in chief. But the danger of losing his place drove Wallenstein to bolder schemes. At his camp at Pilsen, all his principal officers were induced by him to unite in a written request that he should in no case desert them — a step which seemed much like a conspiracy. But some of the generals, as Gallas, Aldringer, and Piccolomini, soon abandoned Wallenstein, and gave warning to the emperor. He secretly signed a patent deposing Wallenstein, and placed it in the hands of Piccolomini and Gallas, January 24, 1634, but acted with the profoundest dissimulation until he had made sure of most of the commanders who served under him. Then, suddenly, on February 18, Wallenstein, his brother-in-law Tertzski, Ilow, Neumann, and Klnsky were put under the ban, and the general's possessions were confiscated. Now, at length, Wallenstein openly revolted, and began to treat with the Swedes for desertion to them; but they did not fully trust him. Attended only by five Slavonic regiments, who remained faithful to him, he went to Eger, where he was to meet troops of Bernard of Weimar; but before he could join them, he and the friends named above were assassinated, February 25, by traitors who had remained in his intimate companionship, and whom he trusted, under the command of Colonel Butler, an Irishman, employed by Piccolomini." — C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 18, sect. 10.

ALSO IN: F. Schiller, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, bk. 4. — J. Mitchell, *Life of Wallenstein*, ch. 8-10. — Sir E. Cust, *Lives of the Warriors of the Thirty Years' War*, pt. 1.

A. D. 1634-1639. — The Thirty Years War: Successes of the Imperialists. — Their victory at Nördlingen. — Richelieu and France become active in the war. — Duke Bernhard's conquest of Alsace. — Richelieu's appropriation of the conquest for France. — "Want of union among the Protestants prevented them from deriving all the benefit which they had at first anticipated from Wallenstein's death. The King of Hungary assumed the command of the army, and by the aid of money, which was plentifully distributed, the soldiers were, without difficulty, kept in obedience; not the slightest attempt was any where made to resist the Emperor's orders. On the other hand, Bernhard of Weimar and Field-Marshal Horn were masters of Bavaria. In July 1634, they gained a complete victory at Landshut, over General Altringer, who was slain in the action. . . . The Swedes, who had so long been victorious, were, in their turn, destined to taste the bitterness of defeat. 15,000 Spaniards, under the Cardinal Infant, son of Philip III., entered Germany [see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1621-1633, and 1635-1638], and in conjunction with the imperial army, under the King of Hungary, laid siege to Nördlingen. Field-Marshal Horn, and Bernhard of Weimar, hurried to the relief of the place. Owing to the superiority of the enemy, who was besides strongly intrenched, the Swedish commanders had no intention to hazard a battle, before the arrival of the Rhin-graff Count Otho, with another division of the army, which was already close at hand; but the impetuosity of the Duke of Weimar lost every thing. Horn had succeeded in carrying a hill,

called the Amsberg, a strong point, which placed him in communication with the town, and almost secured the victory. Bernhard, thinking that so favourable an opening should not be neglected, hurried on to the attack of another post. It was taken and retaken; both armies were gradually, and without method, drawn into the combat, which, after eight hours' duration, ended in the complete defeat of the Swedes. Horn was made prisoner; and Bernhard escaped on a borrowed horse. . . . The defeat of Nördlingen almost ruined the Swedish cause in Germany; the spell of invincibility was gone, and the effects of the panic far surpassed those which the sword had produced. Strong fortresses were abandoned before the enemy came in sight; provinces were evacuated, and armies, that had been deemed almost unconquerable, deserted their chiefs, and broke into bands of lawless robbers, who pillaged their way in every direction. Bavaria, Suabia and Franconia were lost; and it was only behind the Rhine that the scattered fugitives could again be brought into something like order. . . . The Emperor refused to grant the Swedes any other terms of peace than permission to retire from the empire. The Elector of Saxony, forgetful of what was due to his religion, and forgetful of all that Sweden had done for his country, concluded, at Prague, a separate peace with the Emperor; and soon afterwards joined the Imperialists against his former allies. The fortunes of the Protestants would have sunk beneath this additional blow, had not France come to their aid. Richelieu had before only nourished the war by means of subsidies, and had, at one time, become nearly as jealous of the Swedes as of the Austrians; but no sooner was their power broken, than the crafty priest took an active share in the contest."—J. Mitchell, *Life of Wallenstein*, ch. 10. —"Richelieu entered resolutely into the contest, and in 1635 displayed enormous diplomatic activity. He wished not only to reduce Austria, but, at the same time, Spain. Spanish soldiers, Spanish treasure, and Spanish generals made in great part the strength of the imperial armies, and Spain besides never ceased to ferment internal troubles in France. Richelieu signed the treaty of Compiègne with the Swedes against Ferdinand II. By its conditions he granted them considerable subsidies in order that they should continue the war in Germany. He made the treaty of St. Germain en Laye with Bernard of Saxe Weimar, to whom he promised an annual allowance of money as well as Alsace, provided that he should remain in arms to wrest Franche-Comté from Philip IV. He made the treaty of Paris with the Dutch, who were to help the King of France to conquer Flanders, which was to be divided between France and the United Provinces. He made the treaty of Rivoli with the dukes of Savoy, of Parma, and of Mantua, who were to undertake in concert with France the invasion of the territories of Milan and to receive a portion of the spoils of Spain. At the same time he declared war against the Spanish Government, which had arrested and imprisoned the Elector of Trèves, the ally of France, and refused to surrender him when demanded. Hostilities immediately began on five different theatres of war—in the Low Countries, on the Rhine, in Eastern Germany, in Italy, and in Spain. The army of the Rhine, commanded by Cardinal de la Valette, was to operate in conjunction with the

corps of Bernard of Saxe Weimar against the Imperialists, commanded by Count Gallas. To this army Turenne was attached. It consisted of 20,000 infantry, 5,000 cavalry, and 14 guns. This was the army upon which Richelieu mainly relied. . . . Valette was to annoy the enemy without exposing himself, and was not to approach the Rhine; but induced by Bernard, who had a dashing spirit and wished to reconquer all he had lost, encouraged by the terror of the Imperialists who raised the siege of Mayence, he determined to pass the river. He was not long in repenting of that step. He established his troops round Mayence and revictualled this place, which was occupied by a Swedish garrison, throwing in all the supplies of which the town had need. The Imperialists, who had calculated on this imprudence, immediately took to cutting off his supplies, so that soon everything was wanting in the French camp. . . . The scourge of famine threatened the French; it was necessary to retreat, to recross the Rhine, to pass the Sarre, and seek a refuge at Metz. Few retreats have been so difficult and so sad. The army was in such a pitiable condition that round Mayence the men had to be fed with roots and green grapes, and the horses with branches of trees. . . . The sick and the weary were abandoned, the guns were buried, villages were burnt to stay the pursuit of the enemy, and to prevent the wretched soldiers who would fall out of the ranks from taking refuge in them."—H. M. Hozier, *Turenne*, ch. 2.—"Meanwhile, Saxony had concluded with the Emperor at Pirna, at the close of 1634, a convention which ripened into a treaty of alliance, to which almost all the princes of Northern Germany subscribed, at Prague, in the month of May following. The Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg were thus changed into enemies of Sweden. The Swedish General, Banner [or Baner], who, at the period of the battle of Nördlingen, had been encamped side by side with the Saxon army on the White Hill near Prague, had, on the first indication of wavering on the part of its Elector, managed skilfully to withdraw his troops from the dangerous proximity. On the 22nd October 1635, he defeated the Saxon army, at Dömitz on the Elbe, then invaded Brandenburg, took Havelberg, and even threatened Berlin. Compelled by the approach of a Saxon and Imperialist army to quit his prey, he turned and beat the combined army at Wittstock (24th September 1636). After that battle, he drew the reinforced Imperialists, commanded by Gallas, after him into Pomerania; there he caused them great losses by cutting off their supplies, then forced them back into Saxony, and, following them up closely, attacked and beat them badly at Chemnitz (4th April, 1639)." In the south, Duke Bernhard had gained meantime some solid successes. After his retreat from Mayence, in 1635, he had concluded his secret treaty with Richelieu, placing himself wholly at the service of France, and receiving the promise of 4,000,000 francs yearly, for the support of his army, and the ultimate sovereignty of Alsace for himself. "Having concerted measures with La Valette [1636], . . . he invaded Lorraine, drove the enemy thence, taking Saarburg and Pfalzburg, and then, entering Alsace, took Saverne. His career of conquest in Alsace was checked by the invasion of Burgundy by Gallas, with an army of 40,000 men. Duke Bernhard marched with all

haste to Dijon, and forced Gallas to fall back, with great loss, beyond the Saone (November 1636). Pursuing his advantages, early the following year he forced the passage of the Saone at Gray, despite the vivid resistance of Prince Charles of Lorraine (June 1637), and pursued that commander as far as Besançon. Reinforced during the autumn, he marched towards the Upper Rhine, and, undertaking a winter campaign, captured Lauffenburg, after a skirmish with John of Werth; then Säckingen and Waldshut, and laid siege to Rheinfelden. The Imperialist army, led by John of Werth, succeeded, indeed, after a very hot encounter, in relieving that place; but three days later Duke Bernhard attacked and completely defeated it (21st February 1638), taking prisoners not only John of Werth himself, but the generals, Savelli, Enkefort, and Spereuter. The consequences of this victory were the fall of Rheinfelden, Rötteln, Neuenberg, and Freiburg. Duke Bernhard then laid siege to Breisach (July 1638). . . . The Imperial general, Götz, advanced at the head of a force considerably outnumbering that of Duke Bernhard. Leaving a portion of his army before the place, Duke Bernhard then drew to himself Turenne, who was lying in the vicinity with 3,000 men, fell upon the Imperialists at Wittenweiber (30th July), completely defeated them, and captured their whole convoy. Another Imperialist army, led by the Duke of Lorraine in person, shared a similar fate at Thann, in the Sundgau, on the 4th October following. Götz, who was hastening with a strengthened army to support the Duke of Lorraine, attacked Duke Bernhard ten days later, but was repulsed with great loss. Breisach capitulated on the 7th December. Duke Bernhard took possession of it in his own name, and foiled all the efforts of Richelieu to secure it for France, by garrisoning it with German soldiers. To compensate the French Cardinal Minister for Breisach, Duke Bernhard undertook a winter campaign to drive the Imperialists from Franche-Comté. Entering that province at the end of December, he speedily made himself master of its richest part. He then returned to Alsace with the resolution to cross the Rhine and carry the war once again into Bavaria," and then, in junction with Banner, to Vienna. "He had made all the necessary preparations for this enterprise, had actually sent his army across the Rhine, when he died very suddenly, not without suspicion of poison, at Neuenberg am Rhein (8th July, 1639). The lands he had conquered he bequeathed to his brother. . . . But Richelieu paid no attention to the wishes of the dead general. Before any of the family could interfere, he had secured all the fortresses in Alsace, even Breisach, which was its key, for France."—G. B. Malleon, *The Battle-fields of Germany*, ch. 5.—"During [1639] Piccolomini, at the head of the Imperialist and Spanish troops, gave battle to the French at Diedenhofen. The battle took place on the 7th of June, and the French were beaten and suffered great losses."—A. Gindely, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: Sir E. Cust, *Lives of the Warriors of the Thirty Years' War*, pt. 2.—S. R. Gardiner, *The Thirty Years' War*, ch. 9, sect. 5.

A. D. 1635-1638.—The Thirty Years War: Campaigns in the Netherlands.—The Dutch and French against the Spaniards. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1635-1638.

A. D. 1636-1637.—Diet at Ratisbon.—Attempted negotiations of peace.—Death of the Emperor Ferdinand II.—"An electoral diet was assembled at Ratisbon, by the emperor in person, on the 15th of September, 1636, for the ostensible purpose of restoring peace, for which some vague negotiations had been opened under the mediation of the pope and the king of Denmark, and congresses appointed at Hamburg and Cologne; but with the real view of procuring the election of his son Ferdinand as king of the Romans. . . . Ferdinand was elected with only the fruitless protest of the Palatine family, and the dissenting voice of the elector of Treves. . . . The emperor did not long survive this happy event. He died on the 15th of February, 1637. . . . Ferdinand . . . seems to have been the first who formally established the right of primogeniture in all his hereditary territories. By his testament, dated May 10th, 1621, he ordered that all his Austrian dominions should devolve on his eldest male descendant, and fixed the majority at 18 years."—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 56 (v. 2).

A. D. 1637.—Election of the Emperor Ferdinand III.

A. D. 1640-1645.—The Thirty Years War: Campaigns of Baner and Torstenson.—The second Breitenfeld.—Jankowitz.—Mergentheim.—Allerheim.—War in Denmark.—Swedish army in Austria.—Saxony forced to neutrality.—"The war still went on for eight years, but the only influence that it exerted upon the subsequent Peace was that it overcame the last doubts of the Imperial court as to the indispensable principles of the Peace. . . . The first event of importance on the theatre of war after Bernhard's death was Baner's attempt to join the army of Weimar in central Germany. Not in a condition to pass the winter in Bohemia, and threatened in Saxony and Silesia, he . . . commenced [March, 1640] a retreat amidst fearful devastations, crossed the Elbe at Leitmeritz, and arrived April 3rd at Zwickau. He succeeded in joining with the mercenaries of Weimar and the troops of Lüneburg and Hesse at Saalfeld;" but no joint action was found possible. "Until December, the war on both sides consisted of marches hither and thither, accompanied with horrible devastation; but nothing decisive occurred. In September the Diet met at Ratisbon. While wearisome attempts were being made to bend the obstinacy of Austria, Baner resolved to compel her to yield by a bold stroke, to invade the Upper Palatinate, to surprise Ratisbon, and to put an end to the Diet and Emperor together. . . . Not without difficulty Guebriant [commanding the French in Alsace] was induced to follow, and to join Baner at Erfurt. . . . But the surprise of Ratisbon was a failure. . . . The armies now separated again. Baner exhausted his powers of persuasion in vain to induce Guebriant to go with him. The French went westward. Hard pressed, himself, Baner proceeded by forced marches towards Bohemia, and by the end of March reached Zwickau, where he met Guebriant again, and they had a sharp conflict with the Imperialists on the Saal. There Baner died, on the 21st of May, 1641, leaving his army in a most critical condition. The warfare of the Swedish-French arms was come to a standstill. Both armies were near dissolution, when, in November, Torstenson, the last of the Gustavus Adolphus

school of generals, and the one who most nearly equalled the master, appeared with the Swedish army, and by a few vigorous strokes, which followed each other with unexampled rapidity, restored the supremacy of its arms. . . . After three months of rest, which he mainly devoted to the reorganization and payment of his army, by the middle of January [1642] he had advanced towards the Elbe and the Altmark; and as the Imperial forces were weakened by sending troops to the Rhine, he formed the great project of proceeding through Silesia to the Austrian hereditary dominions. On April 3rd he crossed the Elbe at Werben, between the Imperial troops, increased his army to 20,000 men, stormed Glogau on May 4th, stood before Schweidnitz on the 30th, and defeated Francis Albert of Lauenburg; Schweidnitz, Neisse, and Oppeln fell into his hands. Meanwhile Guebriant, after subduing the defiant and mutinous spirit of his troops by means of money and promises, had, on January 17th, defeated the Imperialists near Kempen, not far from Crefeld [at Hulst], for which he was honoured with the dignity of marshal. But this was a short-lived gleam of light, and was soon followed by dark days, occasioned by want of money and discontent in the camp. . . . He had turned eastward from the Rhine to seek quarters for his murmuring troops in nether Germany, when Torstenson effected a decision in Saxony. After relieving Glogau, and having in vain tried to enter Bohemia, he had joined the detachments of Königsmark and Wrangel, and on October 30th he appeared before Leipzig. On November 2nd there was a battle near Breitenfeld, which ended in a disastrous defeat of the Imperialists and Leipzig surrendered to Torstenson three weeks afterwards. In spite of all the advantages which Torstenson gained for himself, it never came to a united action with the French; and the first victory won by the French in the Netherlands, in May, 1643, did not alter this state of things. Torstenson . . . was suddenly called to a remote scene of war in the north. King Christian IV. of Denmark had been persuaded, by means of the old Danish jealousy of Sweden, to take up arms for the Emperor. He declared war just as Torstenson was proceeding to Austria. Vienna was now saved; but so much the worse for Denmark. In forced marches, which were justly admired, Torstenson set out from Silesia towards Denmark at the end of October, conducted a masterly campaign against the Danes, beat them wherever he met with them, conquered Holstein and Schleswig, pushed on to Jutland, then, while Wrangel and Horn carried on the war (till the peace of Brömsebro, August, 1645), he returned and again took up the war against the Imperialists, everywhere an unvanquished general. The Imperialists under the incompetent Gallas intended to give Denmark breathing-time by creating a diversion; but it did not save Denmark, and brought another defeat upon themselves. Gallas did not bring back more than 2,000 men from Magdeburg to Bohemia, and they were in a very disorganized state. He was pursued by Torstenson, while Ragoczy threatened Hungary. The Emperor hastily collected what forces he could command, and resolved to give battle. Torstenson had advanced as far as Glattau in February, and on March 6th, 1645, a battle was fought near Jankowitz, three miles from Tabor. It was the most brilliant victory ever gained by the Swedes. The

Imperial army was cut to pieces; several of its leaders imprisoned or killed. In a few weeks Torstenson conquered Moravia and Austria as far as the Danube. Not far from the capital itself he took possession of the Wolfsbrücke. As in 1618, Vienna was in great danger." But the ill-success of the French "always counterbalanced the Swedes' advantages. Either they were beaten just as the Swedes were victorious, or could not turn a victory to account. So it was during this year [1645]. The west frontier of the empire was guarded on the imperial side by Mercy, together with John of Werth, after he was liberated from prison. On 26th March, Turenne crossed the Rhine, and advanced towards Franconia. There he encamped near Mergentheim and Rosenberg. On 5th May, a battle near Mergentheim ended with the entire defeat of the French, and Turenne escaped with the greatest difficulty by way of Hammelburg, towards Fulda. The victors pushed on to the Rhine. To avenge this defeat, Enghien was sent from Paris, and, at the beginning of July, arrived at Spire, with 12,000 men. His forces, together with Königsmark's, the remnant of Turenne's and the Hessians, amounted to 30,000 men. At first Mercy dexterously avoided a battle under unfavourable circumstances, but on August 3d the contest was inevitable. A bloody battle was fought between Nördlingen and Donauwörth, near Allerheim [called the battle of Nördlingen, by the French], which was long doubtful, but, after tremendous losses, resulted in the victory of the French. Mercy's fall, Werth's imprudent advance, and a final brave assault of the Hessians, decided the day. But the victors were so weakened that they could not fully take advantage of it. Condé was ill; and in the autumn Turenne was compelled, not without perceptible damage to the cause, to retreat with his army to the Neckar and the Rhine. Neither had Torstenson been able to maintain his position in Austria. He had been obliged to raise the siege of Brunn, and learnt at the same time that Ragoczy had just made peace with the Emperor. Obligated to retire to Bohemia, he found his forces considerably diminished. Meanwhile, Königsmark had won an important advantage. While Torstenson was in Austria he gained a firm footing in Saxony. Then came the news of Allerheim, and of the peace of Brömsebro. Except Dresden and Königstein, all the important points were in the hands of the Swedes; so, on the 6th of September [1645], the Elector John George concluded a treaty of neutrality for six months. Besides money and supplies, the Swedes received Leipzig, Torgau, and the right of passage through the country. Meanwhile, Torstenson had retreated into the north-east of Bohemia, and severe physical sufferings compelled him to give up the command. He was succeeded by Charles Gustavus Wrangel."—L. Häusser, *The Period of the Reformation, 1517 to 1648*, ch. 39.

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 58 (v. 2).

A. D. 1642-1643.—The Thirty Years War: Condé's victory at Rocroi and campaign on the Moselle. See FRANCE: A. D. 1642-1643, and 1643.

A. D. 1643-1644.—The Thirty Years War: Campaigns of Turenne and Condé against Mercy, on the Upper Rhine.—Düllingen.—Freiburg.—Philippsburg.—"After the death of

Bernard of Saxe Weimar, Marshal Guébriant had been placed in command of the troops of Weimar. He had besieged and taken Rottweil in Suabia, but had there been killed. Rantzau, who succeeded him in command of the Weimar army, marched (24-25 Nov., 1643) upon Düttlingen [or Tuttlingen], on the Upper Rhine, was there beaten by Mercy and made prisoner, with the loss of many officers and 7,000 soldiers. This was a great triumph for the Bavarians; a terrible disaster for France. The whole of the German infantry in the French service was dispersed or taken, the cavalry retreated as they best could upon the Rhine. . . . Circumstances required active measures. Plenipotentiaries had just assembled at Münster to begin the negotiations which ended with the peace of Westphalia. It was desired that the French Government should support the French diplomatist by quick successes. . . . Turenne was sent to the Rhine with reinforcements. . . . He re-established discipline, and breathed into [the army] a new spirit. . . . At the same time, by negotiations, the prisoners who had been taken at Düttlingen were restored to France, the gaps in the ranks were filled up, and in the spring of 1644 Turenne found himself at the head of 9,000 men, of whom 5,000 were cavalry, and was in a position to take the field." He "pushed through the Black Forest, and near the source of the Danube gained a success over a Bavarian detachment. For some reason which is not clear he threw a garrison into Freiburg, and retired across the Rhine. Had he remained near the town he would have prevented Mercy from investing it. So soon as Turenne was over the river, Mercy besieged Freiburg, and although Turenne advanced to relieve the place, a stupid error of some of his infantry made him fail, and Freiburg capitulated to Mercy."—H. M. Hozier, *Turenne*, ch. 3 and 5.—"Affairs being in so bad a state about the Black Forest, the Great Condé, at that time Duc d'Enghien, was brought up, with 10,000 men; thus raising the French to a number above the enemy's. He came crowned with the immortal laurels of Rocroi; and in virtue of his birth, as a prince of the blood-royal, took precedence of the highest officers in the service. Merci, a capable and daring general, aware of his inferiority, now posted himself a short distance from Freyburg, in a position almost inaccessible. He garnished it with felled trees and intrenchments, mountains, woods, and marshes, which of themselves defied attack." Turenne advocated a flank movement, instead of a direct assault upon Merci's position; but Condé, reckless of his soldiers' lives, persisted in leading them against the enemy's works. "A terrible action ensued (August 3, 1644). Turenne made a long detour through a defile; Condé, awaiting his arrival on the ground, postponed the assault till three hours before sunset, and then ascended the steep. Merci had the worse, and retreated to a fresh position on the Black Mountain, where he successfully repulsed for one day Condé's columns (August 5). In this action Gaspard Merci was killed. Condé now adopted the flank movement, which, originally recommended by Turenne, would have saved much bloodshed; and Merci, hard pressed, escaped by a rapid retreat, leaving behind him his artillery and baggage (Aug. 9). These are the 'three days of Freyburg.' To retake the captured Freyburg after their victory . . . was the natural suggestion

first heard." But Turenne persuaded Condé that the reduction of Philipsburg was more important. "Philipsburg was taken after a short siege; and its fall was accompanied by the submission of the adjacent towns of Germersheim, Speier, Worms, Mentz, Oppenheim and Landau. Condé at this conjuncture left the Upper Rhine, and took away his regiments with him."—T. O. Cockayne, *Life of Turenne*, pp. 20-22.

ALSO IN: G. B. Malleson, *The Battle-fields of Germany*, ch. 6.

A. D. 1646-1648.—The Thirty Years War: Its final campaigns.—The sufferings of Bavaria.—Truce and peace negotiations initiated by the Elector Maximilian.—The ending of the war at Prague.—"The retreat of the French [after the battle of Allerheim] enabled the enemy to turn his whole force upon the Swedes in Bohemia. Gustavus Wrangel, no unworthy successor of Banner and Torstensohn, had, in 1646, been appointed Commander-in-chief of the Swedish army. . . . The Archduke, after reinforcing his army . . . moved against Wrangel, in the hope of being able to overwhelm him by his superior force before Koenigsmark could join him, or the French effect a diversion in his favour. Wrangel, however, did not await him." He moved through Upper Saxony and Hesse, to Weimar, where he was joined by the flying corps of Koenigsmark. Finally, after much delay, he was joined likewise by Turenne and the French. "The junction took place at Giessen, and they now felt themselves strong enough to meet the enemy. The latter had followed the Swedes into Hesse, in order to intercept their commissariat, and to prevent their union with Turenne. In both designs they had been unsuccessful; and the Imperialists now saw themselves cut off from the Maine, and exposed to great scarcity and want from the loss of their magazines. Wrangel took advantage of their weakness to execute a plan by which he hoped to give a new turn to the war. . . . He determined to follow the course of the Danube, and to break into the Austrian territories through the midst of Bavaria. . . . He moved hastily, . . . defeated a Bavarian corps near Donauwerth, and passed that river, as well as the Lech, unopposed. But by wasting his time in the unsuccessful siege of Augsburg, he gave opportunity to the Imperialists, not only to relieve that city, but also to repulse him as far as Lauingen. No sooner, however, had they turned towards Suabia, with a view to remove the war from Bavaria, than, seizing the opportunity, he repassed the Lech, and guarded the passage of it against the Imperialists themselves. Bavaria now lay open and defenceless before him; the French and Swedes quickly overran it; and the soldiery indemnified themselves for all dangers by frightful outrages, robberies, and extortions. The arrival of the Imperial troops, who at last succeeded in passing the Lech at Thierhaupten, only increased the misery of this country, which friend and foe indiscriminately plundered. And now, for the first time during the whole course of this war, the courage of Maximilian, which for eight-and-twenty years had stood unshaken amidst fearful dangers, began to waver. Ferdinand II., his school-companion at Ingolstadt, and the friend of his youth, was no more; and, with the death of his friend and benefactor, the strong tie was dissolved which had linked the Elector to the House of Austria.

... Accordingly, the motives which the artifices of France now put in operation, in order to detach him from the Austrian alliance, and to induce him to lay down his arms, were drawn entirely from political considerations. . . . The Elector of Bavaria was unfortunately led to believe that the Spaniards alone were disinclined to peace, and that nothing but Spanish influence had induced the Emperor so long to resist a cessation of hostilities. Maximilian detested the Spaniards, and could never forgive their having opposed his application for the Palatine Electorate. . . . All doubts disappeared; and, convinced of the necessity of this step, he thought he should sufficiently discharge his obligations to the Emperor if he invited him also to share in the benefit of the truce. The deputies of the three crowns, and of Bavaria, met at Ulm, to adjust the conditions. But it was soon evident, from the instructions of the Austrian ambassador, that it was not the intention of the Emperor to second the conclusion of a truce, but if possible to prevent it. . . . The good intentions of the Elector of Bavaria, to include the Emperor in the benefit of the truce, having been thus rendered unavailing, he felt himself justified in providing for his own safety. . . . He agreed to the Swedes extending their quarters in Suabia and Franconia, and to his own being restricted to Bavaria and the Palatinate. The conquests which he had made in Suabia were ceded to the allies, who, on their part, restored to him what they had taken from Bavaria. Cologne and Hesse Cassel were also included in the truce. After the conclusion of this treaty, upon the 14th March, 1647, the French and Swedes left Bavaria. . . . Turenne, according to agreement, marched into Wurtemberg, where he forced the Landgrave of Darmstadt and the Elector of Mentz to imitate the example of Bavaria, and to embrace the neutrality. And now, at last, France seemed to have attained the great object of its policy, that of depriving the Emperor of the support of the League, and of his Protestant allies. . . . But . . . after a brief crisis, the fallen power of Austria rose again to a formidable strength. The jealousy which France entertained of Sweden, prevented it from permitting the total ruin of the Emperor, or allowing the Swedes to obtain such a preponderance in Germany, which might have been destructive to France herself. Accordingly, the French minister declined to take advantage of the distresses of Austria; and the army of Turenne, separating from that of Wrangel, retired to the frontiers of the Netherlands. Wrangel, indeed, after moving from Suabia into Franconia, taking Schweinfurt, . . . attempted to make his way into Bohemia, and laid siege to Egra, the key of that kingdom. To relieve this fortress, the Emperor put his last army in motion, and placed himself at its head. But . . . on his arrival Egra was already taken." Meantime the Emperor had engaged in intrigues with the Bavarian officers and had nearly seduced the whole army of the Elector. The latter discovered this conspiracy in time to thwart it; but he now suddenly, on his own behalf, struck hands with the Emperor again, and threw over his late agreements with the Swedes and French. "He had not derived from the truce the advantages he expected. Far from tending to accelerate a general peace, it had a pernicious influence upon the negotiations at Munster and Osaburg, and had made the allies

bolder in their demands." Maximilian, therefore, renounced the truce and began hostilities anew. "This resolution, and the assistance which he immediately despatched to the Emperor in Bohemia, threatened materially to injure the Swedes, and Wrangel was compelled in haste to evacuate that kingdom. He retired through Thuringia into Westphalia and Lunenburg, in the hope of forming a junction with the French army under Turenne, while the Imperial and Bavarian army followed him to the Weser, under Melander and Gronsfeld. His ruin was inevitable if the enemy should overtake him before his junction with Turenne; but the same consideration which had just saved the Emperor now proved the salvation of the Swedes. . . . The Elector of Bavaria could not allow the Emperor to obtain so decisive a preponderance as, by the sudden alteration of affairs, might delay the chances of a general peace. . . . Now that the power of the Emperor threatened once more to attain a dangerous superiority, Maximilian at once ceased to pursue the Swedes. . . . Melander, prevented by the Bavarians from further pursuing Wrangel, crossed by Jena and Erfurt into Hesse. . . . In this exhausted country, his army was oppressed by want, while Wrangel was recruiting his strength, and remounting his cavalry in Lunenburg. Too weak to maintain his wretched quarters against the Swedish general, when he opened the campaign in the winter of 1648, and marched against Hesse, he was obliged to retire with disgrace, and take refuge on the banks of the Danube. . . . Turenne received permission to join the Swedes; and the last campaign of this eventful war was now opened by the united armies. Driving Melander before them along the Danube, they threw supplies into Egra, which was besieged by the Imperialists, and defeated the Imperial and Bavarian armies on the Danube, which ventured to oppose them at Susmarshausen, where Melander was mortally wounded." They then forced a passage of the Lech, at the point where Gustavus Adolphus formerly overcame Tilly, and ravaged Bavaria once more; while nothing but a prolonged rain-storm, which flooded the Inn, saved Austria from a similar devastation. Koenigsmark, with his flying corps, entered Bohemia, penetrated to Prague and surprised and captured the lesser side of the city (the Kleinsite), thus acquiring the reputation of "closing the Thirty Years' War by the last brilliant achievement. This decisive stroke, which vanquished the Emperor's irresolution, cost the Swedes only the loss of a single man. But the old town, the larger half of Prague, which is divided into two parts by the Moldau, by its vigorous resistance wearied out the efforts of the Palatine, Charles Gustavus, the successor of Christina on the throne, who had arrived from Sweden with fresh troops. . . . The approach of winter at last drove the besiegers into their quarters, and in the meantime the intelligence arrived that a peace had been signed at Munster, on the 24th October,"—the "solemn and ever memorable and sacred treaty which is known by the name of the Peace of Westphalia."—F. Schiller, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, bk. 5.


ALSO IN: G. B. Malleson, *The Battle-fields of Germany*, ch. 7.

The Thirty Years War: Its horrors.—Its destructiveness.—The state of the country at its close.—"The materials of which the armies

were composed passed inevitably from bad to worse. This, which had been a civil war at the first, did not continue such for long; or rather it united presently all the dreadfulness of a civil war and a foreign. It was not long before the hosts which trampled the German soil had in large part ceased to be German; every region of Europe sending of its children, and, as it would seem, of those whom it must have been gladdest to be rid of, to swell the ranks of the destroyers. . . . From all quarters they came trooping, not singly, but in whole battalions. . . . All armies draw after them a train of camp-followers; they are a plague which in the very nature of things is inevitable. But never perhaps did this evil rise to so enormous a height as now. Toward the close of this War an Imperial army of 40,000 men was found to be attended by the ugly accompaniment of 140,000 of these. The conflict had in fact by this time lasted so long that the soldiery had become as a distinct nation, camping in the midst of another. . . . It is a thought to make one shudder, the passage of one of these armies with its foul retinue through some fair and smiling and well-ordered region—what it found and what it must have left it, and what its doings there will have been. . . . When all in their immediate neighbourhood was wasted, armed bands variously disguised, as merchants, as gypsies, as travellers, or sometimes as women, would penetrate far into the land. . . . Nor was the condition of the larger towns much better. . . . It did not need actual siege or capture to make them acquainted with the miseries of the time. With no draught-cattle to bring firewood in, there was no help for it but that abandoned houses, by degrees whole streets, and sometimes the greater part of a town, should be pulled down to prevent those of its inhabitants who remained from perishing by cold, the city thus living upon and gradually consuming itself. . . . Under conditions like these, it is not wonderful that the fields were left nearly or altogether untilled; for who would sow what he could never hope to reap? . . . What wonder that famine, thus invited, should before long have arrived? . . . Persons were found dead in the fields with grass in their mouths; while the tanners' and knackers' yards were beset for the putrid carcasses of beasts: the multitudes, fierce with hunger, hardly enduring to wait till the skin had been stript away. The bodies of malefactors, broken on the wheel, were secretly removed to serve for food; or men climbed up the gibbets, and tore down the bodies which were suspended there, and devoured them. This, indeed, was a supply which was not likely to fail. . . . Prisoners in Alsace were killed that they might be eaten. Children were enticed from home. . . . Putting all together, it is not too much to say that the crowning horrors of Samaria, of Jerusalem, of Saguntum, found their parallels, and often worse than their parallels, in Christian Germany only two centuries ago. I had thought at one time that there were isolated examples of these horrors, one here, one there, just enough to warrant the assertion that such things were done; but my conviction now is that they were very frequent indeed, and in almost every part of the land. . . . Districts which had for centuries been in the occupation of civilized men were repossessed by forests. . . . Of the population it was found that three-fourths, in some

parts a far larger proportion, had perished; or, not having perished, were not less effectually lost to their native land, having fled to Switzerland, to Holland, and to other countries, never to return from them again. Thus in one group of twenty villages which had not exceptionally suffered, 85 per cent., or more than four-fifths of the inhabitants, had disappeared. . . . Of the houses, three-fourths were destroyed. . . . Careful German writers assure us that there are districts which at this present day [1872] have just attained the population, the agricultural wealth, the productive powers which they had when the War commenced."—R. C. Trench, *Gustavus Adolphus in Germany, and other Lect's on the Thirty Years' War*, lect. 3 and 5.—"There is no other example of a destruction of civilization such as the Thirty Years War in Germany produced. There is no other case where a whole people in all parts of the land was uniformly exposed to such severe losses, so that in numbers it was reduced to one half; where, from riches, luxury, and abundance such as had undoubtedly prevailed at the beginning of the century men had come to poverty and to the want of even the necessities of life. . . . Beggary had long ceased to be a cause for shame; the war, which had brought down to it in a short time even those who had been formerly the richest, caused even the most dishonorable trade to be held in honor. Whoever by daily labor could earn his daily bread might think himself fortunate. In the place of the horses which war had carried away, human beings took to dragging carts in the street. . . . With the ruin of the trade and of the art industry of Germany, which in the 16th century would for so many objects have probably needed to fear no rivalry and which was only surpassed by that of Italy, went hand in hand the rise and increase of French industry. . . . Thus did the industrial triumph of France supplement its political supremacy; thus did Germany's misfortune become the cause of enriching her western neighbor."—H. von Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, *Deutsche Geschichte, 1648-1740* (trans. from the German), v. 1, pp. 45-49.—See, also, BOHEMIA: A. D. 1621-1648.


A. D. 1648.—The Peace of Westphalia.—Cession of Alsace to France.—Separation of Switzerland from the Empire.—Loosening of the constitutional bonds of the Empire. "The opening of the peace negotiations between the Emperor and his enemies was . . . fixed for the 25th of March, 1642, and the cities of Münster and Osnabrück as the places of the sitting; but neither in this year nor in the next did it take place. It was not until the year 1644 that in the former of these cities" were assembled the following: The Papal Nuncio and the envoy of the Republic of Venice, acting as mediators, two imperial ambassadors, two representatives of France, three of Spain, and the Catholic Electors; later came also the Catholic Princes. To Osnabrück, Sweden sent two ambassadors and France three, while the Electors, the German Princes and the imperial cities were represented. Questions of etiquette, which demanded prior settlement, occupied months, and serious matters when reached were dealt with slowly and jealously, with many interruptions. It was not until the 24th of October, 1648, that the articles of peace forming the two treaties of Münster and Osnabrück, and known together as the Peace of




GERMANY AT THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA (1648.)

- AUSTRIAN HABSBURGS
- SPANISH HABSBURGS
- ELECTOR OF BRANDENBURG
- FRENCH
- SWEDISH
- DANISH
- HOLSTEIN-GOTTORP
- IMPERIAL FREE CITIES
- ECCLIASTICAL STATES

THE NAMES OF THE ECCLIASTICAL STATES, AS THEY EXISTED BEFORE THE SECULARIZATION, ARE INDICATED BY SPECIAL TYPE, THUS: MAINZ.
THE SECULARIZED ECCLIASTICAL STATES ARE SHOWN BY THE BLACK UNDERLINES.
THE HEAVY RED LINE SHOWS THE BOUNDARY OF THE EMPIRE.





Westphalia, were signed by all the negotiators at Münster. The more important of the provisions of the two instruments were the following: "To France was secured the perpetual possession of the Bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, as also Moyenvic and Pignerol, with the right to keep a garrison in Philipsburg, and finally Breisach, Alsace, with its ten imperial cities, and the Sundgau. The Emperor bound himself to gain the assent of the Archduke Ferdinand, of Tyrol and Spain, to this last-named cession. France made good to the Archduke this loss by the payment of 3,000,000 francs. Although it was not expressly provided that the connection with the Empire of the German provinces ceded to France should be dissolved, yet the separation became, as a matter of fact, a complete one. The Emperor did not summon the Kings of France to the Diets of the Empire, and the latter made no demand for such summons. . . . In relation to Italy, the French treaty provided that the peace concluded in 1631 [see ITALY: A. D. 1627-1631] should remain in force, except the part relating to Pignerol. ['Pinerolo was definitely put under the French overlordship.'—G. W. Kitchen, *Hist. of France*, v. 3, p. 98]. Switzerland was made independent of the German Empire; but the Circle of Burgundy [the Spanish Netherlands and Franche-Comté] was still to form a part of the Empire, and after the close of the war between France and Spain, in which the Emperor and the Empire were to take no part, was to be included in the peace. No aid was to be rendered to the Duke of Lorraine against France, although the Emperor and the Empire were left free to mediate for him a peace. Sweden received Hither Pomerania, including the Island of Rügen, from Further Pomerania the Island of Wollin and several cities, with their surroundings, among which were Stettin, as also the expectancy of Further Pomerania in case of the extinction of the house of Brandenburg. Furthermore, it received the city of Wismar, in Mecklenburg, and the Bishoprics of Bremen [secularized and made a Grand Duchy] and Verden, with reservation of the rights and immunities of the city of Bremen. Sweden was to hold all the ceded territory as feudal tenures of the Empire, and be represented for them in the Imperial Diet. . . . Brandenburg received for its loss of Pomerania the Bishoprics of Halberstadt, Minden, and Camin, and the expectancy of that of Magdeburg as soon as this should become vacant by the death of its Administrator, the Saxon Prince, although the four bailiwicks separated from it were to remain with Saxony as provided in the Peace of Prague. . . . The house of Brunswick-Lüneberg was to renounce its right to the coadjutorship of Magdeburg, Bremen, Halberstadt, and Ratzeburg, and, in return for this renunciation, was to alternate with a Catholic prelate in the possession of the Bishopric of Osnabrück. . . . To Duke Maximilian of Bavaria was conveyed the Electorate, together with the Upper Palatinate, to be hereditary in his family of the line of William, for which he, on the other hand, was to surrender to the Emperor the account of the 13,000,000 florins which he had made for the execution of the sentence against the Palgrave Frederic. To the Palgrave, Charles Lewis, son of the proscribed Elector [Frederic, who had died in 1632], was given back the Lower Palatinate, while a new

Electorate, the eighth, was created for him. . . . There were numerous provisions relating to the restoration of the Dukes of Würtemberg, the Margraves of Baden, and the Counts of Nassau and those of Hanau to several parts of the territories which either belonged to them or were contested. A general amnesty was indeed provided, and every one was to be restored to the possession of the lands which he had held before the war. This general article was, however, limited by various special provisions, as that in relation to the Palgrave, and was not to be applied to Austria at all. . . . Specially important are the sections which relate to the settlement of religious grievances. The treaty of Passau and the Augsburg religious peace were confirmed; the 1st of January, 1624, was fixed as the time which was to govern mutual reclamations between the Catholics and Protestants; both parties were secured the right to all ecclesiastical foundations, whether in mediate or immediate connection with the Empire, which they severally held in possession on the first day of January, 1624; if any such had been taken from them after this date, restoration was to be made, unless otherwise specially provided. The Ecclesiastical Reservation was acknowledged by the Protestants, and Protestant holders of ecclesiastical property were freely admitted to the Imperial Diets. The right of reformation was conceded to the Estates, and permission to emigrate to the subjects; while it was at the same time provided that, if in 1624 Protestant subjects of Catholic Princes, or the reverse, enjoyed freedom of religion, this right should not in the future be diminished. It was specially granted for Silesia that all the concessions which had been made before the war to the Dukes of Liegnitz, Münsterburg, and Oels, and to the city of Breslau, relating to the free exercise of the Augsburg Confession, should remain in force. . . . Finally, the Reformed—that is, the adherents of Calvinism—were placed upon the same ground with those of the Augsburg Confession; and it was provided that if a Lutheran Estate of the Empire should become a Calvinist, or the reverse, his subjects should not be forced to change with their Prince."—A. Gindely, *Hist. of the Thirty Years' War*, v. 2, ch. 10.—"The emperor, in his own name, and in behalf of his family and the empire, ceded the full sovereignty of Upper and Lower Alsace, with the prefecture of Haguenau, or the ten towns [Haguenau, Schelestadt, Weissemburgh, Colmar, Landau, Oberenheim, Rosheim, Munster in the Val de St. Gregoire, Kaiserberg, and Turingheim], and their dependencies. But by one of those contradictions which are common in treaties, when both parties wish to preserve their respective claims, another article was introduced, binding the king of France to leave the ecclesiastics and immediate nobility of those provinces in the immediacy which they had hitherto possessed with regard to the Roman empire, and not to pretend to any sovereignty over them, but to remain content with such rights as belonged to the house of Austria. Yet this was again contradicted by a declaration, that this exception should not derogate from the supreme sovereignty before yielded to the king of France."—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 59 (v. 2).—"Respecting the rights of sovereignty due to the princes and the relations of the states of the empire with the emperor, the Peace of

Westphalia contained such regulations as must in the course of time produce a still greater relaxation of those ties, already partially loosened, which held together the empire in one entirety. . . . At the Peace of Westphalia the independence of the princes was made completely legal. They received the entire right of sovereignty over their territory, together with the power of making war, concluding peace, and forming alliances among themselves, as well as with foreign powers, provided such alliances were not to the injury of the empire. But what a feeble obstacle must this clause have presented? For henceforward, if a prince of the empire, having formed an alliance with a foreign power, became hostile to the emperor, he could immediately avail himself of the pretext that it was for the benefit of the empire, the maintenance of his rights, and the liberty of Germany. And in order that the said pretext might, with some appearance of right, be made available on every occasion, foreigners established themselves as the guardians of the empire; and accordingly France and Sweden took upon themselves the responsibility of legislating as guarantees, not only for the Germanic constitution, but for everything else that was concluded in the Peace of Westphalia at Münster and Osnaburg. Added to this, in reference to the imperial cities, whose rights had hitherto never been definitively fixed, it was now declared that they should always be included under the head of the other states, and that they should command a decisive voice in the diets; thenceforth, therefore, their votes and those of the other states—the electoral and other princes—should be of equal validity.”—F. Kohlrausch, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 26.—Peace between Spain and the United Provinces was embodied in a separate treaty, but negotiated at Münster, and concluded and signed a few months earlier in the same year. The war between Spain and France went on. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1646-1648.

A. D. 1648.—Effects of the Peace of Westphalia on the Empire.—It becomes a loose confederacy and purely German.—“It may . . . be said of this famous peace, as of the other so-called ‘fundamental law of the Empire,’ the Golden Bull, that it did no more than legalize a condition of things already in existence, but which by being legalized acquired new importance. . . . While the political situation, to use a current phrase, had changed within the last two hundred years, the eyes with which men regarded it had changed still more. Never by their fiercest enemies in earlier times, not once by the Popes or Lombard republicans in the heat of their strife with the Franconian and Swabian Cæsars, had the Emperors been reproached as mere German kings, or their claim to be the lawful heirs of Rome denied. The Protestant jurists of the 16th or rather of the 17th century were the first persons who ventured to scoff at the pretended lordship of the world, and declare their Empire to be nothing more than a German monarchy, in dealing with which no superstitious reverence need prevent its subjects from making the best terms they could for themselves, and controlling a sovereign whose religious predilections made him the friend of their enemies. . . . It was by these views . . . that the states, or rather France and Sweden acting on their behalf, were guided in the negotiations of Osnabrück and Münster. By ex-

torting a full recognition of the sovereignty of all the princes, Catholics and Protestants alike, in their respective territories, they bound the Emperor from any direct interference with the administration, either in particular districts or throughout the Empire. All affairs of public importance, including the rights of making war or peace, of levying contributions, raising troops, building fortresses, passing or interpreting laws, were henceforth to be left entirely in the hands of the Diet. . . . Both Lutherans and Calvinists were declared free from all jurisdiction of the Pope or any Catholic prelate. Thus the last link which bound Germany to Rome was snapped, the last of the principles by virtue of which the Empire had existed was abandoned. For the Empire now contained and recognized as its members persons who formed a visible body at open war with the Holy Roman Church; and its constitution admitted schismatics to a full share in all those civil rights which, according to the doctrines of the early Middle Age, could be enjoyed by no one who was out of the communion of the Catholic Church. The Peace of Westphalia was therefore an abrogation of the sovereignty of Rome, and of the theory of Church and State with which the name of Rome was associated. And in this light was it regarded by Pope Innocent X., who commanded his legate to protest against it, and subsequently declared it void by the bull ‘Zelo domus Dei.’ . . . The Peace of Westphalia is an era in imperial history not less clearly marked than the coronation of Otto the Great, or the death of Frederick II. As from the days of Maximilian it had borne a mixed or transitional character, well expressed by the name Romano-Germanic, so henceforth it is in everything but title purely and solely a German Empire. Properly, indeed, it was no longer an empire at all, but a Confederation, and that of the loosest sort. For it had no common treasury, no efficient common tribunals, no means of coercing a refractory member; its states were of different religions, were governed according to different forms, were administered judicially and financially without any regard to each other. . . . There were 300 petty principalities between the Alps and the Baltic, each with its own laws, its own courts, . . . its little armies, its separate coinage, its tolls and custom-houses on the frontier, its crowd of meddlesome and pedantic officials. . . . This vicious system, which paralyzed the trade, the literature, and the political thought of Germany, had been forming itself for some time, but did not become fully established until the Peace of Westphalia, by emancipating the princes from imperial control, had made them despots in their own territories.”—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 19.

A. D. 1648-1705.—After the Peace of Westphalia.—French influence in the Empire.—Creation of the Ninth Elector.—After the Peace of Westphalia, the remainder of the reign of Ferdinand III. “passed in tranquillity. . . . He caused his son to be elected king of the Romans, under the title of Ferdinand IV.; but the young prince, already king of Bohemia and Hungary, preceded him to the tomb, and left the question of the succession to be decided by a diet. Ferdinand III. died in 1657. . . . The interregnum, and, indeed, the century which followed the death of Ferdinand, showed the alarming preponderance of the influence gained by

France in the affairs of the empire, and the consequent criminality of the princes who had first invoked the assistance of that power. Her recent victories, her character as joint guarantor of the treaty of Westphalia, and the contiguity of her possessions to the states of the empire, encouraged her ministers to demand the imperial crown for the youthful Louis XIV. Still more extraordinary is the fact that four of the electors were gained, by that monarch's gold, to espouse his views. . . . Fortunately for Germany and for Europe, the electors of Treves, Brandenburg, and Saxony were too patriotic to sanction this infatuated proposal; they threatened to elect a native prince of their own authority, — a menace which caused the rest to co-operate with them; so that, after some fruitless negotiations, Leopold, son of the late emperor, king of Bohemia and of Hungary, was raised to the vacant dignity. His reign was one of great humiliation to his house and to the empire. Without talents for government, without generosity, feeble, bigoted, and pusillanimous, he was little qualified to augment the glory of the country. . . . Throughout his long reign [1657-1705], he had the mortification to witness, on the part of Louis XIV., a series of the most unprovoked, wanton, and unprincipled usurpations ever recorded in history. . . . Internally, the reign of Leopold affords some interesting particulars. . . . Not the least is the establishment of a ninth electoral dignity in favour of Ernest Augustus, Duke of Brunswick Lunenburg, who then became (1692) the first elector of Hanover. This was the act of Leopold, in return for important aid in money and troops from two princes of that house; but it could not be effected without the concurrence of the electoral body, who long resisted it. . . . The establishment of a permanent diet, attended, not by the electors in person, but by their representatives, is one of the most striking peculiarities of Leopold's reign."—S. A. Dunham, *Hist. of the Germanic Empire*, bk. 3, ch. 3 (v. 3).—See DIET, THE GERMANIC.

A. D. 1648-1715.—Relations of Austria, Germany and France after the Thirty Years War.—"The whole shamefulness of this disintegration of Germany, showed itself in the defenceless state of the empire. . . . Right under the greedy hands of France lay the weakest, the most unguarded members of the empire. All along that priest-avenue the Rhine, from Münster and Osnabrück up to Constance, stretched a confused mass of tiny states, incapable of in any way seriously arming themselves, compelled to betray their country through the feeling of their own utter weakness. Almost all the Rhenish courts held pensions from Versailles. . . . Fully one-third of Germany served in the wars of the empire as a dead burden. . . . The weakness of Germany was to blame for the new growth of power in Austria and France; . . . the foreigners laughed at the 'querelles allemandes' and the 'misère allemande'; the Frenchman Bonhours mockingly asked the question if it was possible that a German could have intellect. . . . As the born antagonist of the old order of things in Europe, the basis of which was Germany's weakness, Prussia stood in a world of enemies whose mutual jealousies formed her only safeguard. She was without any natural ally, for the German nation had not yet come to understand this budding power. . . . Just as the House

of Savoy was able to tread its way through the superiority of the Hapsburgs on the one hand and of the Bourbons on the other, so did Prussia, although immeasurably harder pressed, have to find a path for herself between Austria and France, between Sweden and Poland, between the maritime powers and the inert mass of the German empire. She had to use every means of remorseless egoism, always ready to change front, always with two strings to her bow. The electorate of Brandenburg felt to the very marrow of its being how deeply foreign ideas had eaten into Germany. All the disorganized forces . . . which opposed the strong lead of the new monarchy placed their faith in foreign help. Dutch garrisons were stationed on the Lower Rhine and favored the struggle of the Cleve estates against their German lords. The diets of Magdeburg and of the electoral Mark counted on Austria. . . . Frederick William breaks down the barriers of the Netherlands in the German Northwest; he drives their troops from Cleve and from East Friesland. . . . Then he calls out to the deaf nation his warning words, 'Remember that you are Germans,' and seeks to drive the Swedes from the soil of the empire. Twice did the ill-will of France and Austria succeed in robbing the Brandenburg prince of the reward of his victories, of the rule in Pomerania: the fame of the day at Fehrbellin [see BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1640-1688] they could not take from him. . . . When the republic of the Netherlands threatened to fall before the attack of Louis XIV., Brandenburg caught the raised arm of the conqueror [see NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1674-1678]. Frederick William carried on the only serious war that the empire ventured on for the recovery of Alsace [see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1672-1714]. . . . With the rise of Prussia began the long bloody work of freeing Germany from foreign rule. . . . In this one state there awoke again, still half unconscious as if drunken with long sleep, the old hearty pride in the fatherland. . . . The House of Hapsburgh recognized earlier than the Hohenzollerns did themselves how hostile this modern North German state was to the old constitution of the Holy Empire. In Silesia, in Pomerania, in the Jülich-Cleve war of succession — everywhere Austria stood and looked with distrust on its dangerous rival. . . . Equally dangerous to Hapsburgh and to the German empire were the French and the Turks; how natural was it for Hapsburgh to seek support from Germany, to involve the empire in its wars, to use it as a bulwark towards the west or for diversions against France in case the Turks threatened the walls of Vienna. . . . Only it cannot be denied that in this common action the Austrian policy, under a more centralized guidance and backed by a firmer tradition, looked out for its own advantage better than did the German empire—loose, heavy, and without consistent leadership. When the might of Louis XIV. began to oppress Germany the policy of the Hapsburgs was to remain for a long time lukewarm and inactive. This policy led Austria indeed even to make a league with France and, when she did at last decide to help the great elector of Brandenburg against the enemy of the empire, this happened so charily and equivocally as to give rise to the doubt whether the Austrian army was not placed there to keep watch over the Brandenburg forces or even to positively

hinder their advance. An Austrian writer himself assures us that Montecuculi was in secret commanded only to make a show of using his weapons against the French. For a long time Austria stood by inactive while the Reannexations [see FRANCE: A. D. 1679-1681] were going on. . . . The whole war as conducted by Austria on the Rhine and in the West [see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1672-1714] was languid and sleepy; the empire and individual warlike princes were left to protect themselves. What an entirely different display of power did Austria make when it was a question of fighting for its own dynastic interests! — H. von Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im 19ten Jahrhundert* (trans. from the German), v. 1, pp. 21-33. — "As in the wars so in the diplomatic negotiations the separation of the Austrian dynastic interests from the advantage and needs of the German empire often enough came to light. It is only necessary to revert to the attitude which the emperor's diplomacy took at Nimègue and Ryswick [see NIMEGUE; and FRANCE: A. D. 1697]. . . . When in the conferences at Gertruidenburg (1710) Louis XIV. was reduced to being willing not only to give up the 'Reannexations' and Strassburg but even to restore Alsace and the fortress of Valenciennes, it was also not the interests of the empire but solely those of the House of Hapsburgh which led to the rejection of these offers and to the continuance of a war by which, as it turned out eventually, not one of these demands was gained." — L. Häusser, *Deutsche Geschichte* (trans. from the German), v. 1, p. 23. — "Louis XIV. regarded himself not exactly as enemy of the German empire and of the imperial power of the House of Hapsburgh, but rather as a pretendant to the throne. As he explains it in the political directions meant for his son, the empire of the West, the heritage of Charles the Great, belongs not of right to the Germans but to the kings who are crowned at Rheims." — *Deutsche Geschichte* (1648-1740) (translated from the German), v. 1, p. 509.

A. D. 1648-1780. — The Austrian incubus. — "Before the Thirty Years' War the territories of the German Hapsburghs were not very considerable. The greatest part of Hungary was in the hands of the Turks; the Tyrol belonged to a collateral line, and, in the other provinces, the independence of the Nobility was much stronger than the sovereignty of the Archdukes. The Nobles were all zealous protestants, so that a monarchical power could only be created after a victory of the Catholic faith. For the first time since 1621, the crown was seen in these regions to assume a really dominant position. Efforts in this direction had been zealously carried on since 1648; the Tyrolese Estates now lost their most important privileges; and, above all, the Emperor succeeded, by the help of Polish and German troops, in driving out the Turks from Hungary, and at the same time crushing the national freedom of the Magyars with frightful bloodshed. By these victories the Monarchy gained, in the first place, a large increase of territory — which placed it nearly on a level with France. In the second place it acquired at home the power of raising as many taxes and soldiers as were necessary to increase the army to the extent of its wishes; and of distributing its officials and troops — without distinction of nation — as imperial servants, throughout its dominions. And

thus it secured submission at home and disposable strength for its operations abroad. Here it stopped short. As it had no national, and, consequently, no warm and natural relation to any of its provinces — which were merely used as passive tools to promote the lofty aims of the Hapsburgh family — the Government had no intention of using its power at home for the furtherance of the public good, or the building up of a generally useful Administration. The Nobility had no longer the strength to resist the demands of the Crown for men and money, but it still retained exemption from taxes, the jurisdiction and police among its own peasants, and a multitude of feudal rights, which, often enough, degraded the peasant to the condition of a serf, and everywhere bound down agriculture in the most galling bonds. Of manufactures there were little or none; trade was carried on on the system of guilds. The State officials exercised but little influence over the internal affairs of the Communes, or Provinces; and the privileged orders had full liberty to prosecute their own interests among their inferiors with inconsiderate selfishness. In this aristocracy, the Church, from its wealth and its close internal unity, assumed the first place; and its superior importance was still farther enhanced by the fact of its being the chief bond of unity between the otherwise so loosely compacted portions of the Empire. . . . The Church attached the Nobility to the Government; for we must not forget that a very considerable portion of the estates of the Nobles had passed into the hands of new possessors who had received them as a reward for being good catholics. The Church, too, taught all the youth of the Empire — in all its different languages — obedience to the House of Hapsburgh, and received from the Crown, in return, exclusive control of the national education. It formed, in spite of the resistance of nationalities, a sort of public opinion in favour of the unity of the Empire; and the Crown, in return, excluded all non-catholic opinions from the schools, from literature and religion. Austria, therefore, continued to be catholic, even after 1648; and by this we mean, not only that its Princes were personally devout — or that the Catholic clergy were supported in the performance of their spiritual functions — or that the institutions of the Church were liberally supported — but also that the State directed its policy according to ecclesiastical views, made use of the Church for political purposes, and crushed every movement hostile to it in all other spheres of the national life. In Austria, therefore, it was not merely a question of theological differences, but of the deepest and most comprehensive points of distinction between the mediæval and the modern world. Austria was still, in its whole nature, a Mediæval State or Confederacy of States. The consequences of this condition were most strikingly seen in its relation to Germany. In the first place, there was a complete separation, in regard to all mental and spiritual matters, between the great body of the Empire, and its powerful Eastern member. This was the period in which Germany was awaking to a new intellectual life in modern Europe, and laying the foundation of its modern science in every branch — in History and Statistics, Chemistry and Geology, Jurisprudence and Philosophy — and assuming by its Literature, an equal rank with other nations in national refinement and civilization.

By the works of genius which this period produced Austria remained entirely uninfluenced; and it has been said, that Werther had only been made known to the Viennese in the form of fireworks in the Prater. The literary policy allowed no seed of modern culture to enter the Empire; and the Jesuit schools had rendered the soil unfit for its reception. All the progress of German civilization, at this period, was based on the principle of the independence of the mind in art and science. The education of the Jesuits, on the contrary, though unsurpassed where the object is to prepare men for a special purpose, commences by disowning individual peculiarities, and the right of a man to choose his own career. There was, at this time, no other characteristic of an Austrian than an entire estrangement from the progress of the German mind. . . . The progress of the people in science and art, in politics and military strength, was only seen in the larger secular territories, which, after 1648, enjoyed their own sovereignty; and even these were checked in their movements at every step by the remnants of the Imperial Constitution. The Members of the Empire alone, in whom the decaying remains of Mediæval existence still lingered on — the Ecclesiastical Princes — the small Counts — the Imperial Knights and the Imperial Towns, — clung to the Emperor and the Imperial Diet. In these, partly from their small extent of territory, partly from the inefficiency of their institutions, neither active industry, nor public spirit, nor national pride, were to be found. In all which tended to elevate the nation, and raise its hopes for the future, they took, at this period, as little part as Austria herself. . . . The Imperial constitution, therefore, was inwardly decayed, and stood in no relation to the internal growth of the nation. . . . There was the same divergence between Austria and Germany with respect to their foreign interests, as we have observed in their internal relations. After the Turks had been driven from Hungary, and the Swedes from the half of Pomerania, Germany had only two neighbours whom it was a matter of vital importance to watch, — the Poles and the French. In the South, on the contrary, it had no interests in opposition to Italy, except the protection of its frontier by the possession or the neutrality of the Alpine passes. And yet it was just towards Italy that the eyes of the House of Hapsburg had been uninterruptedly directed for centuries past. The favourite traditions of the family, and their political and ecclesiastical interest in securing the support of the Pope, and thereby that of the Clergy, constantly impelled them to consolidate and extend their dominion in that country. All other considerations yielded to this; and this is intelligible enough from an Austrian point of view; but it was not on that account less injurious to the German Empire. How strikingly was this opposition of interests displayed at the end of the glorious war of the Spanish succession, when the Emperor rejected a peace which would have restored Strasburg and Alsace to the Empire, because only Naples, and not Sicily also, was offered to Austria! How sharply defined do the same relations present themselves to our view, in the last years of the Hapsburg dynasty, at the peace of Vienna in 1738! — on which occasion the Emperor — in order at least to gain Tuscany, as a compensation for the loss of Naples, — gave up Lorraine to the

French, without even consulting the Empire, which he had dragged into the war. Austria thus maintained a predominant influence in Italy; but the Empire, during the whole century after the Peace of Westphalia, did not obtain a single noteworthy advantage over France. How much more was this the case with respect to Poland, which during the whole period of the religious wars had been the most zealous ally of Spain and the Hapsburgs, and which subsequently seemed to threaten no danger to Austrian interests." — H. Von Sybel, *History of the French Revolution*, bk. 2, ch. 1 (v. 1).

A. D. 1658.—Election of the Emperor, Leopold I.

A. D. 1660-1664.—Renewed war with the Turks.—Victory of St. Gothard.—Transylvania liberated.—A twenty years truce. See HUNGARY: A. D. 1660-1664.

A. D. 1672-1679.—The war of the Coalition against Louis XIV. See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1672-1674, and 1674-1678; also NIMEGUEN, PEACE OF.

A. D. 1675-1678.—War with Sweden.—Battle of Fehrbellin. See BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1640-1688; and SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1644-1697.

A. D. 1679-1681.—The final absorption of Alsace and Les Trois-Évêchés by France, with boundaries widened.—Bold encroachments of the French Chambers of Reannexion.—The seizure of Strasburg. See FRANCE: A. D. 1679-1681.

A. D. 1686.—The League of Augsburg against Louis XIV.—"The Duke of Orléans, the French King's brother, had married the sister of the Elector Palatine, the last of the House of Simmern, who died in May 1685, when his next relative, the Count Palatine Philip William, Duke of Neuberg, took possession of the Electorate. The Duchess of Orléans had by her marriage contract renounced all her feudal rights to the Palatinate, but not her claims to the allodial property and the moveables of her family." These latter claims, taken in hand by Louis XIV. on behalf of his sister-in-law, were made so formidable that the new Elector appealed to the Empire for protection, "and thus redoubled the uneasiness felt in Germany, and indeed throughout the greater part of Europe, respecting the schemes of Louis. The Prince of Orange availed himself of these suspicions to forward his plans against Louis. He artfully inflamed the general alarm, and at length succeeded in inducing the Emperor Leopold, the Kings of Spain and Sweden, as princes of the Empire, the Electors of Saxony and Bavaria, the circles of Suabia, Franconia, Upper Saxony, and Bavaria, to enter into the celebrated League of Augsburg (July 9th 1686). The object of this league was to maintain the Treaties of Münster and Nimeguen and the Truce of Ratisbon. If any of the members of it was attacked he was to be assisted by the whole confederacy; 60,000 men were to be raised, who were to be frequently drilled, and to form a camp during some weeks of every year, and a common fund for their support was to be established at Frankfort. The League was to be in force only for three years, but might be prolonged at the expiration of that term should the public safety require it. The Elector Palatine, who was in fact the party most directly interested, acceded to the League early in September,

as well as the Duke of Holstein Gottorp."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 5, ch. 5 (v. 3).—"To Madame's great anger France set up a claim to the Palatinate on her behalf, Louvois persuading the King and the royal family that with a few vigorous measures the Palatinate would be abandoned by the Neubourgs and annexed to France as part of Madame's dowry. This led to the devastation of the states, to which Madame [Charlotte Elizabeth, the Duchess of Orleans] so often and so bitterly alludes during the next ten years. Obligated by Louis XIV.'s policy to represent herself as desirous to recover her rights over her father's and brother's succession, in many documents which she was never even shown, Madame protested in all her private letters against France's action in the matter, and made every one at court thoroughly aware of her grief and disapproval of what the king was doing on her behalf."—*Life and Letters of Charlotte Elizabeth, Princess Palatine*, ch. 2.

A. D. 1689-1696.—The War of the League of Augsburg, or Grand Alliance, against Louis XIV. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690 to 1695-1696.

A. D. 1690.—The second Devastation of the Palatinate. See FRANCE: A. D. 1689-1690.

A. D. 1700.—Interest in the question of the Spanish Succession. See SPAIN: A. D. 1698-1700.

A. D. 1700.—Prussia raised to the dignity of a kingdom. See PRUSSIA: A. D. 1700.

A. D. 1700-1740.—The first king of Prussia and his shabby court.—The second king, his Brobdingnagian army and his extraordinary character.—The up-bringing of Frederick the Great.—The "Great Elector" of Brandenburg "left to his son Frederic a principality as considerable as any which was not called a kingdom [see BRANDENBURG: A. D. 1640-1688]. Frederic aspired to the style of royalty. Ostentatious and profuse, negligent of his true interests and of his high duties, insatiably eager for frivolous distinctions, he added nothing to the real weight of the state which he governed; perhaps he transmitted his inheritance to his children impaired rather than augmented in value; but he succeeded in gaining the great object of his life, the title of King. In the year 1700 he assumed this new dignity. He had on that occasion to undergo all the mortifications which fall to the lot of ambitious upstarts. Compared with the other crowned heads of Europe, he made a figure resembling that which a Nabob or a Commissary, who had bought a title, would make in the company of Peers whose ancestors had been attainted for treason against the Plantagenets. The envy of the class which Frederic quitted, and the civil scorn of the class into which he intruded himself, were marked in very significant ways. . . . Frederic was succeeded by his son, Frederic William, a prince who must be allowed to have possessed some talents for administration, but whose character was disfigured by odious vices, and whose eccentricities were such as had never before been seen out of a madhouse. He was exact and diligent in the transacting of business; and he was the first who formed the design of obtaining for Prussia a place among the European powers, altogether out of proportion to her extent and population, by means of a strong military organization. Strict economy enabled him to keep up a peace establishment of 60,000 troops. These

troops were disciplined in such a manner, that, placed beside them, the household regiments of Versailles and St. James's would have appeared an awkward squad. The master of such a force could not but be regarded by all his neighbours as a formidable enemy and a valuable ally. But the mind of Frederic William was so ill regulated, that all his inclinations became passions, and all his passions partook of the character of moral and intellectual disease. His parsimony degenerated into sordid avarice. His taste for military pomp and order became a mania, like that of a Dutch burgomaster for tulips, or that of a member of the Roxburghe Club for Caxtons. While the envoys of the Court of Berlin were in a state of such squalid poverty as moved the laughter of foreign capitals; while the food placed before the princes and princesses of the blood-royal of Prussia was too scanty to appease hunger, and so bad that even hunger loathed it, no price was thought too extravagant for tall recruits. The ambition of the king was to form a brigade of giants, and every country was ransacked by his agents for men above the ordinary stature. . . . Though his dominant passion was the love of military display, he was yet one of the most pacific of princes.

We are afraid that his aversion to war was not the effect of humanity, but was merely one of his thousand whims. His feeling about his troops seems to have resembled a miser's feeling about his money. He loved to collect them, to count them, to see them increase; but he could not find it in his heart to break in upon the precious hoard. He looked forward to some future time when his Patagonian battalions were to drive hostile infantry before them like sheep; but this future time was always receding; and it is probable that, if his life had been prolonged 30 years, his superb army would never have seen any harder service than a sham fight in the fields near Berlin. But the great military means which he had collected were destined to be employed by a spirit far more daring and inventive than his own. Frederic, surnamed the Great, son of Frederic William, was born in January 1712. It may safely be pronounced that he had received from nature a strong and sharp understanding, and a rare firmness of temper and intensity of will. As to the other parts of his character, it is difficult to say whether they are to be ascribed to nature, or to the strange training which he underwent. The history of his boyhood is painfully interesting. Oliver Twist in the parish work-house, Smike at Dotheboys Hall, were petted children when compared with this wretched heir-apparent of a crown. The nature of Frederic William was hard and bad, and the habit of exercising arbitrary power had made him frightfully savage. His rage constantly vented itself to right and left in curses and blows. When his Majesty took a walk, every human being fled before him, as if a tiger had broken loose from a menagerie. . . . But it was in his own house that he was most unreasonable and ferocious. His palace was hell, and he the most execrable of fiends. . . . Early in the year 1740, Frederic William met death with a firmness and dignity worthy of a better and wiser man; and Frederic, who had just completed his 28th year, became king of Prussia."—Lord Macaulay, *Frederic the Great (Essays)*.—"Frederick William I. became . . . the founder of the first modern State in Germany. His was a nature in which the repulsive and the

imposing, the uncouth and the admirable, were closely united. In his manners a rough and unrefined peasant, in his family a tyrant, in his government a despot, choleric almost to madness, his reign would have been a curse to the country, had he not united with his unlimited power a rare executive ability and an incorruptible fidelity to duty; and from first to last he consecrated all his powers to the common weal. By him effective limitations were put upon the independent action of the provinces, and upon the overgrown privileges of the estates. He did not do away with the guilds of the different orders, but placed them under the strict control of a strongly centralized superintendence, and compelled their members to make every necessary sacrifice for the sake of assisting him in his efforts for the prosperity and power of Prussia. It is astonishing to see with what practical judgment he recognized a needed measure both in general and in detail; how he trained a body of officials, suited in all grades to the requirements of their position; how he disciplined them in activity, prudence, and rectitude, by strict inspection, by encouraging instruction, and by brutal punishments; how he enforced order and economy in the public finances; how he improved the administration of his own domains, so that it became a fruitful example to all proprietors; and how, full of the desire to make the peasants free owners of the soil, although he did not yet venture on such a radical measure, he nevertheless constantly protected the poor against the arbitrariness and oppression of the higher classes. . . . There was no department of life to which he did not give encouragement and assistance; it is also true that there was none which he did not render subservient to his own will, and the products of which he did not make conducive to the one great end,—the independence and aggrandizement of the State. So that he who was the ruler of, at most, three million people, created, without exhausting the country, a standing army of eighty thousand men: a remarkably skilful and ready army, which he disciplined with barbarous severity on the slightest occasion, at the same time that he looked out for the welfare of every soldier even in the smallest detail, according to his saying, that 'a king's warrior must live better than a gentleman's servant.' What he had in his mind, almost a hundred years before Scharnhorst, was the universal obligation of military service; but it fared with him in regard to this as in regard to the freedom of the peasants: strong as he was, he could not turn the world he lived in upside down; he contented himself with bequeathing his best ideas to a more propitious future. The foundations of the government rested upon the estates in spite of all monarchical reforms. Thus, beside the federative Empire of the Hapsburgs, arose the small, compact Prussian State, which, by reason of the concentration of its forces, was a match for its five-times-larger rival."—H. Von Sybel, *The Founding of the German Empire by William I.*, bk. 1, ch. 2 (v. 1).

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Frederick II.*, called the Great, bk. 3, ch. 19, bk. 5-10 (v. 1-2).

A. D. 1702.—The War of the Spanish Succession: Siege of Landau.—Battle of Friedlingen.—On the part of the Imperialists, the War of the Spanish Succession was opened on the Rhine frontier in June 1702, by a movement of the army commanded by the Margrave Louis

of Baden, which "came over the Rhine and laid siege to the important fortress of Landau,—the bulwark of Alsace as it was then regarded. The Margrave was subsequently joined by the Emperor's eldest son, the young King of the Romans, who desired to share in the glory, though not in the toils of the expected conquest. . . . The Maréchal de Catinat, one of the soldiers of whom France has most reason to be proud,—the virtuous Catinat as Rousseau terms him—held command at this period in Alsace. So inferior were his numbers that he could make no attempt to relieve Landau. But after its reduction an opportunity appeared in which by detaching a portion of his army he might retrieve the fortunes of France in another quarter. The Elector of Bavaria, after much irresolution, had openly espoused the cause of Louis. He seized upon the city of Ulm and issued a proclamation in favor of his new ally. To support his movements an enterprising and ambitious officer, the Marquis de Villars, was sent across the Rhine with part of the army of Alsace. The declaration of the Elector of Bavaria and the advance of Villars into Germany disquieted in no slight degree the Prince Louis of Baden. Leaving a sufficient garrison in Landau, he also passed the Rhine. The two armies met at Friedlingen on the 14th of October. Louis of Baden, a ponderous tactician bred in the wars against the Turks, might out-manceuvre some Grand Vizier, but was no match for the quick-witted Frenchman. He was signally defeated with the loss of 3,000 men; soon after which, the season being now far advanced, Villars led back his army to winter quarters in France. His victory of Friedlingen gained for him at Versailles the rank of Maréchal de France."—Earl Stanhope (Lord Mahon), *Hist. of Eng.: Reign of Queen Anne*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 68 (v. 2).—See, also, NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702-1704, and SPAIN: A. D. 1702.

A. D. 1703.—The War of the Spanish Succession: Campaigns on the Upper Rhine and in Bavaria.—"Early in June [A. D. 1703], Marshal Tallard assumed the command of the French forces in Alsace, . . . took Prissac on the 7th of September, and invested Landau on the 16th of October. The allies, under the Prince of Hesse, attempted to raise the siege, but were defeated with considerable loss; and, soon after, Landau surrendered, thus terminating with disaster the campaign on the Upper Rhine. Still more considerable were the losses sustained in Bavaria. Marshal Villars commanded there, and, at the head of the French and Bavarians, defeated General Stirum, who headed the Imperialists, on the 20th of September. In December, Marshal Marsin, who had succeeded Villars in the command, made himself master of the important city of Augsburg, and in January, 1704, the Bavarians got possession of Passau. Meanwhile, a formidable insurrection had broken out in Hungary, which so distracted the cabinet of Vienna that the capital seemed to be threatened by the combined forces of the French and Bavarians after the fall of Passau. . . . Instead of confining the war to one of posts and sieges in Flanders and Italy, it was resolved [by the French] to throw the bulk of their forces at once into Bavaria, and operate against Austria from the heart of Germany, by pouring down the valley of the Danube. The advanced post held

there by the Elector of Bavaria in front, forming a salient angle, penetrating, as it were, into the Imperial dominions, the menacing aspect of the Hungarian insurrection in the rear, promised the most successful issue to this decisive operation. For this purpose, Marshal Tallard, with the French army on the Upper Rhine, received orders to cross the Black Forest and advance into Swabia, and unite with the Elector of Bavaria, which he accordingly did at Donawerth, in the beginning of July. Marshal Villeroi, with forty battalions and thirty-nine squadrons, was to break off from the army in Flanders and support the advance by a movement on the Moselle, so as to be in a condition to join the main army on the Danube, of which it would form, as it were, the left wing; while Vendôme, with the army of Italy, was to penetrate into the Tyrol, and advance by Innsbruck on Salzburg. The united armies, which it was calculated, after deducting all the losses of the campaign, would muster 80,000 combatants, was then to move direct by Lintz and the valley of the Danube on Vienna, while a large detachment penetrated into Hungary to lend a hand to the already formidable insurrection in that kingdom. The plan was grandly conceived. . . . Marlborough, by means of the secret information which he obtained from the French head-quarters, had got full intelligence of it, and its dangers to the allies, if it succeeded, struck him as much as the chances of great advantage to them if ably thwarted. His line was instantly taken."—A. Alison, *Military Life of Marlborough*, ch. 2, sect. 30-33.—The measures taken by Marlborough to defeat the plans of the French in this campaign are briefly stated in the account of his first campaigns in the Netherlands. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1702-1704.

ALSO IN: H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.* (tr. by M. L. Booth), v. 2, ch. 5.—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 69 (v. 2).

A. D. 1704.—The War of the Spanish Succession: Marlborough and Prince Eugene on the Danube.—The Battle of Blenheim.—"Marlborough, with his motley army of English, Dutch, Danes and Germans, concealing his main purpose, was marching south along the Rhine, with a design to strike his critical blow, by attacking the French armies that were forming for the campaign of the Danube, and thus protect the Emperor and Vienna, and punish the Elector of Bavaria, whose territories would be then exposed. On the route, Marlborough was joined by Prince Eugene and the Margrave of Baden; but as a new French force was approaching, Prince Eugene was sent to keep it in check. Marlborough and the Prince of Baden, with united forces of about 60,000 men, then advanced, in rapid marches, and took, by gallant assault, the fortifications of the Schellenberg in Bavaria, and the old town of Donauwerth, a critical and commanding position on the Danube. The allies were now masters of the main passages of the Danube—and had a strong place as a basis of action. The allied leaders thereupon sent troops into the heart of Bavaria, and devastated the country even to the vicinity of Munich—burning and destroying as they marched, and taking several minor fortresses. Marlborough's forces and those of Prince Eugene were distant from each other some forty miles, when came the news of the march of a French army of 25,000 men under Tallard, to

form a junction with the others, to succor the Elector, and take revenge for the defeat of the Schellenberg. Two French Marshals, Tallard and Marsin, were now in command: their design was to attack Marlborough and Eugene's armies in detail. By rapid marches, Marlborough crossed the Danube and joined Prince Eugene near Donauwerth, and thereupon occurred one of the most important and decisive contests of modern times, fought between the old town of Hochstadt and the village of Blenheim, about fifteen miles south of Donauwerth. The skilful tactics of the allied generals precipitated the battle. The allied French and Bavarians numbered 60,000 [56,000; Malleson] men—the English, Dutch and Germans and other allies, about 53,000 [52,000; Malleson]. The allies were allowed to cross an intervening brook without opposition, and form their lines. A great charge, in full force, of the allies was then made; they broke the enemy's extended line: and an ensuing charge of cavalry scattered his forces right and left, and drove many into the Danube. More than 14,000 French and Bavarians, who had not struck a blow, except to defend their position, entrenched and shut up in the village of Blenheim, waiting for orders to move, were then surrounded by the victorious allies, and compelled to surrender as prisoners of war. The scattered remnants of the French and Bavarian army either disbanded, or were driven over the Rhine. The garrison at Ulm capitulated, and the Elector fled into France."—J. W. Gerard, *The Peace of Utrecht*, ch. 16.—"The armies of Marchin and of Max Emanuel [of Bavaria] had been defeated; that of Tallard had been annihilated. Whilst the loss of the victors in killed and wounded reached 12,000 men, that of the French and Bavarians exceeded 14,000. In addition, the latter lost 13,000 men taken prisoners, 47 pieces of cannon, 25 standards, and 90 colours. Such was the battle of Blenheim. It was one of the decisive battles of history, and it changed the character of the war. Up to that moment, the action of France against Germany had been aggressive; thenceforward it became purely defensive. Blenheim, in fact, dashed to the ground the hopes of Louis XIV. and Max Emanuel of Bavaria. It saved the house of Habsburg in Germany, and helped it greatly in Hungary. It showed likewise that it was possible to inflict a crushing defeat on the armies of Louis XIV."—Col. G. B. Malleson, *Prince Eugene of Savoy*, ch. 6.—"Marlborough [after the battle], having detached part of his force to besiege Ulm, drew near with the bulk of his army to the Rhine, which he passed near Philipsburg on the 6th of September, and soon after commenced the siege of Landau, on the French side; Prince Louis, with 20,000 men, forming the besieging force, and Eugene and Marlborough, with 30,000, the covering army. Villeroi, with the French army, abandoned an entrenched camp which he had constructed to cover the town. Marlborough followed, and made every effort to bring the French marshal to battle, but in vain. . . . Ulm surrendered on the 16th of September, . . . which gave the allies a solid foundation on the Danube, and effectually crushed the power of the Elector of Bavaria, who, isolated now in the midst of his enemies, had no alternative but to abandon his dominions and seek refuge in Brussels, where he arrived in the end of September. . . . The

Electress of Bavaria, who had been left regent of that state in the absence of the Elector in Flanders, had now no resource left but submission; and a treaty was accordingly concluded in the beginning of November, by which she agreed to disband all her troops. Trèves and Traerbach were taken in the end of December; the Hungarian insurrection was suppressed; Landau capitulated in the beginning of the same month; a diversion which the enemy attempted toward Trèves was defeated by Marlborough's activity and vigilance, and that city put in a sufficient posture of defense; and, the campaign being now finished, that accomplished commander returned to the Hague and London."—A. Alison, *Military Life of Marlborough*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: G. B. Malleson, *Battle-fields of Germany*, ch. 10.—W. Coxe, *Memoirs of Marlborough*, ch. 22–26 (v. 1).—J. H. Burton, *Hist. of the Reign of Queen Anne*, ch. 6 (v. 1).—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 2, ch. 5.

A. D. 1705.—The Election of the Emperor Joseph I.

A. D. 1705.—The War of the Spanish Succession: The dissolution of Bavaria.—"The campaign of 1705 was destitute of any important events on the side of Germany. . . . In Bavaria, the peasants, irritated by the oppressions of the Austrian government, rose in a body in the autumn, and, could they have been supported by France, would have placed the Emperor in great danger; but without that aid the insurrection only proved fatal to themselves. The insurgents were beaten in detail, and the Emperor now resolved on the complete dissolution of Bavaria as a state. The four elder sons of Maximilian were carried to Klagenfurt in Carinthia, to be there educated under the strictest inspection as Counts of Wittelsbach, while the younger sons were consigned to the care of a court lady at Munich, and the daughters sent to a convent. The Electress, who had been on a visit to Venice, was not permitted to return to her dominions, and the Elector Maximilian, as well as the Elector of Cologne, was, by a decree of the Electoral College, placed under the ban of the Empire. The Upper Palatinate was restored to the Elector Palatine. . . . The remaining Bavarian territories were confiscated, and divided among various princes."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 5, ch. 6 (v. 3).—W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 72 (v. 3).—The campaign of 1705 in the Netherlands was unimportant; but in Spain it had brilliant results. See SPAIN: A. D. 1705; and NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1705.

A. D. 1706–1711.—The War of the Spanish Succession: Successes of the French.—During 1706, little was attempted on either side by the forces which watched each other along the Rhine. In 1707 Villars, the French commander, obtained liberty to act. "The Emperor, greatly preoccupied with Hungary, had furnished but indifferent resources to the new general of the army of the Rhine, Brandenburg-Baireuth; the German army was ill paid and in bad condition in its immense lines on the right bank, which extended along the Rhine from Philippsburg as far as Stollhofen, then, in a square, from Stollhofen to the Black Mountains by Bühl. May 22, the lines were attacked simultaneously at four points. . . . The success was complete; the enemy fled into the mountains, abandoning artillery, baggage, and munitions, and did not stop till beyond

the Neckar. The lines were razed; Swabia and a part of Franconia were put under contribution. Villars marched on Stuttgart, crossed the Neckar, and subjected the whole country to ransom as far as the Danube. The enemies in vain rallied and reinforced themselves with tardy contingents of the Empire; they could not prevent Villars from laying under contribution the Lower Neckar, then the country between the Danube and Lake Constance, and from maintaining himself beyond the Rhine till he went into winter-quarters. French parties scoured the country as conquerors as far as the fatal field of Hochstadt." At the beginning of the campaign of 1708, it was the plan of the allies to make their chief attack on France "by the way of the Rhine and the Moselle, with two armies of 60,000 men each, under the command of the Elector of Hanover and Eugene, whilst Marlborough occupied the great French army in Flanders." But this plan was changed. "Eugene left the Elector of Hanover in the north of Swabia, behind the lines of Etlingen, which the allies had raised during the winter to replace the lines of Bühl at Stollhofen, and, with 24,000 soldiers collected on the Moselle, he marched by the way of Coblenz towards Belgium (June 30). The French forces of the Rhine and the Moselle followed this movement." The campaign then ensuing in the Netherlands was that which was signalized by Marlborough and Eugene's victory at Oudenarde and the siege of Lille. In 1709, "the attention of Europe, as in 1708, was chiefly directed to Flanders; but it was not only on that side that France was menaced. France was to be encroached upon at once on the north and the east. Whilst the great allied army penetrated into Artois, the army of the Rhine and the army of the Alps were to penetrate, the latter into Bresse by the way of Savoy, the former into Franche-Comté by the way of Alsace, and to combine their operations. . . . The Germans had not taken the offensive in Alsace till in the month of August. Marshal Harcourt, with over 20,000 men, had covered himself with the lines of the Lauter: the Elector of Hanover, who had crossed the Rhine at Philippsburg with superior forces, did not attack Harcourt, and strove to amuse him whilst 8,000 or 9,000 Germans, left in Swabia with General Merci, moved rapidly on Neuberg . . . and established there a tête-du-pont in order to enter Upper Alsace." By swiftly sending a sufficient force to attack and defeat Merci at Neuberg, Aug. 26, Harcourt completely frustrated these plans. "The Elector of Hanover recrossed the river and retired behind the lines of Etlingen." During the two following years the French and German forces on the side of the Rhine did little more than observe one another.—H. Martin, *Hist. of France: Age of Louis XIV.*, v. 2, ch. 5–6.—Meantime, Ramillies, Oudenarde and Malplaquet had been fought in the Netherlands; Prince Eugene had won his victory at Turin, and the contest had been practically decided in Spain, at Almanza. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1706–1707, 1708–1709, 1710–1712; ITALY: A. D. 1701–1713; SPAIN: A. D. 1706, 1707, and 1707–1710; and ENGLAND: A. D. 1710–1712.

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 75–79 (v. 3).—F. P. Guizot, *Popular Hist. of France*, ch. 45 (v. 5).

A. D. 1711.—Election of the Emperor Charles VI.

A. D. 1711.—The War of the Spanish Succession: Change in the circumstances of the war. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1711.

A. D. 1713-1719.—The Emperor's continued differences with the King of Spain.—The Triple Alliance.—The Quadruple Alliance. See SPAIN: A. D. 1713-1725.

A. D. 1714.—Ending of the War of the Spanish Succession: The Peace of Utrecht and the Treaty of Rastadt. See UTRECHT: A. D. 1712-1714.

A. D. 1732-1733.—Interference in the election of the King of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1732-1733.

A. D. 1733-1735.—The War of the Polish Succession.—Cession of Lorraine to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1733-1735.

A. D. 1740.—The question of the Austrian Succession.—The Pragmatic Sanction. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1718-1738, and 1740.

A. D. 1740-1756.—Early years of the reign of Frederick the Great in Prussia.—The War of the Austrian Succession.—When Frederick II., known as Frederick the Great, succeeded his father, in 1740, "nobody had the least suspicion that a tyrant of extraordinary military and political talents, of industry more extraordinary still, without fear, without faith, and without mercy, had ascended the throne."—Lord Macaulay, *Frederic the Great (Essays)*.—The reign of Frederick II. "was expected to be an effeminate one; but when at the age of twenty-nine he became king, he forgot his pleasures, thought of nothing but glory, and no longer employed himself but in attention to his finances, his army, his policy, and his laws. His provinces were scattered, his resources weak, his power precarious; his army of seventy thousand soldiers was more remarkable for handsomeness of the men, and the elegance of their appearance, than for their discipline. He augmented it, instructed it, exercised it, and fortune began to open the field of glory to him at the moment he was fully prepared to enjoy her favours. Charles XII. was dead, and his station filled by a king without authority. Russia, deprived of Peter the Great, who had only rough-hewn her civilization, languished under the feeble government of the Empress Anne, and of a cruel and ignorant minister. Augustus III. King of Poland and Elector of Saxony, a Prince devoid of character, could not inspire him with any dread. Louis XV., a weak and peaceable king, was governed by Cardinal Fleuri, who loved peace, but always by his weakness suffered himself to be drawn into war. He presented to Frederic rather a support than an obstacle. The court of France had espoused the cause of Charles VII. against Francis I. Maria Theresa, wife of Francis, and Queen of Hungary, saw herself threatened by England, Holland, and France; and whilst she had but little reason to hope the preservation of her hereditary dominions, that arrogant princess wished to place her husband on the Imperial Throne. This quarrel kindled the flames of war in Europe; the genius of Frederic saw by a single glance that the moment was arrived for elevating Prussia to the second order of powers; he made an offer to Maria Theresa to defend her, if she would cede Silesia to him, and threatened her with war in case of refusal. The Empress, whose firmness nothing could shake, impolitely refused that proposition; war was declared, and Frederic entered

Silesia at the head of eighty thousand men. This first war lasted eighteen months [see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1740 to 1741]. Frederic, by gaining five battles, shewed that Europe would recognize one great man more in her bloody annals. He had begun the war from ambition, and contrary to strict justice; he concluded it with ability, but by the abandonment of France his ally, without giving her information of it, and he thus put in practice, when he was seated on the throne, the principles of Machiavel, whom he had refuted before he ascended it. Men judge according to the event. The hero was absolved by victory from the wrongs with which justice reproached him; and this brilliant example serves to confirm men in that error, too generally and too lightly adopted, that ability in politics is incompatible with the strict rule of morality. Four years after, in [1744], Frederic again took up arms [see AUSTRIA: A. D. 1743-1744 to 1744-1745]. He invaded Bohemia, Upper Silesia, and Moravia. Vienna thought him at her gates; but the defection of the Bavarians, the retreat of the French, and the return of Prince Charles into Bohemia, rapidly changed the face of affairs. The position of Frederic became as dangerous as it had been menacing; he was on the point of being lost, and he saw himself compelled to retire with as much precipitation, as he had advanced with boldness. The gaining the battle of Hohen-Friedberg saved him. That retreat and that victory fixed the seal to his reputation. It was after this action that he wrote to Louis XV. 'I have just discharged in Silesia the bill of exchange which your majesty drew on me at Fontenoy.' A letter so much the more modest, as Frederic had conquered, and Louis had only been witness to a victory. He displayed the same genius and the same activity in the campaign of 1745, and once more abandoned France in making his separate peace at Dresden. By this treaty Francis was peaceably assured of the empire, and the cession of Silesia was confirmed to Frederic. France during this war committed some wrongs, which might palliate the abandonment of Prussia. The French did not keep Prince Charles within bounds, they made no diversion into Germany, and fought no where but in Flanders. . . . In 1756, Europe was again in a flame. France and England declared war against each other, and both sought alliances; Frederic ranged himself on the side of England, and by that became the object of the unreflecting vengeance of the French, and of the alliance of that power with Austria; Austria also formed an alliance with the Court of Petersburg by means of a Saxon secretary; Frederic discovered the project of the Courts of Petersburg, Dresden, and Vienna, to invade the Prussian dominions. He was beforehand with them, and began the war by some conquests."—L. P. Ségur, the elder, *Hist. of the Principal Events of the Reign of Frederic William II., King of Prussia*, v. 1, pp. 2-6.

A. D. 1742.—The Elector of Bavaria crowned Emperor (Charles VII.). See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1741 (OCTOBER).

A. D. 1745.—The consort of Maria Theresa elected Emperor (Francis I.).—Rise of the imperial house of Hapsburg-Lorraine. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1745 (SEPT.—OCT.); also, 1744-1745.

A. D. 1748.—End and results of the War of the Austrian Succession. See AIX-LA-CHAPELLE. THE CONGRESS.

A. D. 1755-1756.—The Seven Years War: Its causes and provocations.—"The great national quarrel between England and the powers which restrained her free movements on the sea and her extension of colonies, had never ceased. England would have the freedom of the sea; and on land she pushed population and ploughs where France paraded soldiers. In such a struggle war must come, but, by laws invariable as the laws of nature, the population will win in the end. After much bickering, blows began in 1754, and at the beginning of 1755 England despatched the ill-fated Braddock with a small force, which was destroyed in July. . . . As yet, however, the quarrel was only colonial. England embittered it by seizing French ships without any declaration of war. But why did Frederick [of Prussia] strike in, if indeed he desired peace? In truth there was no choice for him. As early as 1752-53 his secret agents had discovered that Austria, Russia and Saxony were hatching a plot for the destruction of Prussia, and such a partition as afterwards befell unhappy Poland. In 1753 a Saxon official, Mentzel by name, began to supply the Prussian agents with copies of secret documents from the archives at Dresden, which proved that, during the whole of the peace, negotiations had been proceeding for a simultaneous attack on Frederick, though the astute Brühl [Saxon minister], mindful of former defeats, objected to playing the part of jackal to the neighbouring lions. In short, by the end of 1755 the king knew that preparations were already on foot in Austria and Russia, and that he would probably be attacked next year certainly, or, at latest, the year after. A great war was coming between England and France, in which the continental power would attack Hanover, and tread closely on the skirts of Prussia. The situation was dangerous, and became terribly menacing when England bargained with Russia to subsidise a Muscovite army of 55,000 men for defence of Hanover. Russia consented with alacrity. Money was all that the czarina needed for her preparations against Frederick, and in the autumn of 1755 she assembled, not 55,000, but 70,000 men on the Prussian frontier, nominally for the use of England. But throughout the winter all the talk at St. Petersburg was of Frederick's destruction in the coming spring. It was time for him to stir. His first move was one of policy. He offered England a 'neutrality convention' by which the two powers jointly should guarantee the German Reich against all foreign intervention during the coming war. On the 16th of January, 1756, the convention was signed in London, and the Russian agreement thrown over, as it could well be, since it had not been ratified. Europe was now ranking herself for the struggle. In preceding years, the Austrian diplomatist, Kaunitz, had so managed the French court, especially through the medium of Madame de Pompadour, that Louis XV. was now on the side of Maria Theresa, who had bowed her neck so far as to write to the French king's mistress as 'Ma Cousine,' while Frederick forgot policy, and spoke of the Pompadour in slighting terms. 'Je ne la connais pas,' said he once, and was never forgiven. . . . The agreement with Russia to partition Prussia had already been made, and Frederick's sharp tongue had betrayed him into calling the czarina that 'Infame catin du nord.' Saxony waited for the ap-

pearance of her stronger neighbours in order to join them. England alone was Frederick's ally."

—Col. C. B. Brackenbury, *Frederick the Great*, ch. 9.—"The secret sources of the Third Silesian War, since called 'Seven-Years War,' go back to 1745; nay, we may say, to the First Invasion of Silesia in 1740. For it was in Maria Theresa's incurable sorrow at loss of Silesia, and her inextinguishable hope to reconquer it, that this and all Friedrich's other Wars had their origin. . . . Traitor Menzel the Saxon Kanzellist . . . has been busy for Prussia ever since 'the end of 1752.' Got admittance to the Presses; sent his first Excerpt 'about the time of Easter-Fair 1753,'—time of Voltaire's taking wing. And has been at work ever since. Copying Despatches from the most secret Saxon Repositories; ready always on Excellency Maltzahn's indicating the Piece wanted [Maltzahn being the Prussian Minister at Dresden]. . . . Menzel . . . lasted in free activity till 1757; and was then put under lock and key. Was not hanged; sat prisoner for twenty-seven years after; over-grown with hair, legs and arms chained together, heavy iron-bar uniting both ankles; diet bread-and-water;—for the rest, healthy; and died, not very miserable it is said, in 1784."—T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Friedrich II. of Prussia*, bk. 17, ch. 1 (v. 7).

ALSO IN: Duc de Broglie, *The King's Secret*, ch. 1-2 (v. 1).—Frederick II., *Hist. of the Seven Years War (Posthumous Works*, v. 2), ch. 3.—H. Tuttle, *Hist. of Prussia, 1745-1756* (v. 3), ch. 6-9.—F. Von Raumer, *Contributions to Modern Hist.: Frederick II. and his Times*, ch. 24-28.—See, also, ENGLAND: A. D. 1754-1755; and AUSTRIA: A. D. 1755-1763.

A. D. 1756.—The Seven Years War: Frederick strikes the first blow.—Saxony subdued.—"Finding that the storm was wholly inevitable, and must burst on him next year, he [Frederick], with bold sagacity, determined to forestall it. First, then, in August, 1756, his ambassador at Vienna had orders to demand of the Empress Queen a statement of her intentions, to announce war as the alternative, and to declare that he would accept no answer 'in the style of an oracle.' The answer, as he expected, was evasive. Without further delay an army of 60,000 Prussians, headed by Frederick in person, poured into Saxony. The Queen of Poland was taken in Dresden: the King of Poland [Augustus III. Elector of Saxony, and, by election, King of Poland] and his troops were blockaded in Pirna. Thus did Frederick commence that mighty struggle which is known to Germans by the name of the Seven Years' War. The first object of the Prussian monarch at Dresden was to obtain possession of the original documents of the coalition against him, whose existence he knew by means of the traitor Menzel. The Queen of Poland, no less aware than Frederick of the importance of these papers, had carried them to her own bed-chamber. She sat down on the trunk which contained the most material ones, and declared to the Prussian officer sent to seize them that nothing but force should move her from the spot. [The official account of this occurrence which Carlyle produces represents the Queen as 'standing before the door' of the 'archive apartment' in which the compromising documents were locked up, she having previously sealed the door.] This officer was of Scottish blood, General Keith, the Earl

Marischal's brother. 'All Europe,' said the Queen, 'would exclaim against this outrage; and then, sir, you will be the victim; depend upon it, your King is a man to sacrifice you to his own honour!' Keith, who knew Frederick's character, was startled, and sent for further orders; but on receiving a reiteration of the first he did his duty. The papers were then made public, appended to a manifesto in vindication of Frederick's conduct; and they convinced the world that, although the apparent aggressor in his invasion of Saxony, he had only acted on the principles of self-defence. Meanwhile, the Prussian army closely blockaded the Saxon in Pirna, but the Austrian, under Marshal Brown, an officer of British extraction, was advancing to its relief through the mountain passes of Bohemia. Frederick left a sufficient force to maintain the blockade, marched against Brown with the remainder, and gave him battle at Lowositz [or Lobositz] on the 1st of October. It proved a hard-fought day; the King no longer found, as he says in one of his letters, the old Austrians he remembered; and his loss in killed and wounded was greater than theirs [3,308 against 2,984]; but victory declared on his side. Then retracing his steps towards Pirna he compelled, by the pressure of famine, the whole Saxon army, 17,000 strong, to an unconditional surrender. The officers were sent home on parole, but the soldiers were induced, partly by force and partly by persuasion, to enlist in the Prussian ranks, and swear fidelity to Frederick. Their former sovereign, King Augustus, remained securely perched on his castle-rock of Königstein, but, becoming weary of confinement, solicited, and was most readily granted, passports to Warsaw. During the whole winter Frederick fixed his head-quarters at Dresden, treating Saxony in all respects as a conquered province, or as one of his own. Troops and taxes were levied throughout that rich and populous land with unsparing rigour, and were directed against the very cause which the sovereignty of that land had embraced."—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713–1783, ch. 33 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Friedrich II.*, bk. 17, ch. 4–8 (v. 7).—Lord Dover, *Life of Frederick II.*, v. 2, ch. 1.

A. D. 1756–1757.—The Seven Years War: Frederick under the Ban of the Empire.—The coalition against Frederick.—"All through the winter Austria strained every nerve to consolidate her alliances, and she did not scruple to use her position at the head of the Empire, in order to drag that body into the quarrel that had arisen between two of its members. On his own responsibility, without consulting the electors, princes, and cities, the Emperor passed sentence on Frederick, and condemned him, unheard, as a disturber of the peace. Many of the great cities altogether refused to publish the Emperor's decree, and even among the states generally subservient to Austria there were some that were alarmed at so flagrant a disregard of law and precedent. It may have seemed a sign of what was to be expected should Prussia be annihilated, and no state remain in Germany that dared to lift up its voice against Austria. Nevertheless, in spite of this feeling, and in spite of the opposition of nearly all the Protestant states, Austria succeeded in inducing the Empire to espouse her cause. In all three colleges of electors, princes,

and cities she obtained a majority, and at a diet, held on Jan. 17, 1757, it was resolved that an army of the Empire should be set on foot for the purpose of making war on Prussia. Some months later Frederick was put to the ban of the Empire. But the use of this antiquated weapon served rather to throw ridicule on those who employed it than to injure him against whom it was launched. . . . It has been calculated that the population of the States arrayed against Frederick the Great amounted to 90,000,000, and that they put 430,000 men into the field in the year 1757. The population of Prussia was 4,500,000, her army 200,000 strong; but, after deducting the garrisons of the fortresses, there remained little over 150,000 men available for service in the field. The odds against Frederick were great, but they were not absolutely overwhelming. His territories were scattered and difficult of defence, the extremities hardly defensible at all; but he occupied a central position from which he might, by rapidity of movement, be able to take his assailants in detail, unless their plans were distinguished by a harmony unusual in the efforts of a coalition."—F. W. Longman, *Frederick the Great and the Seven Years' War*, ch. 8, sect. 3.

A. D. 1756–1758.—War of Prussia with Sweden in Pomerania. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (SWEDEN): A. D. 1720–1792.

A. D. 1757 (April–June).—The Seven Years War: Frederick's invasion of Bohemia.—Victory at Prague and defeat at Kolin.—"At the commencement of 1757, the grand confederacy against the king of Prussia was consolidated by the efforts and intrigues of the court of Vienna. The French had drawn together 80,000 men on the Rhine, under the command of marshal d'Étrées; the army of execution was assembling in the empire; the Swedes were preparing to penetrate into Pomerania, and 60,000 Russians were stationed on the frontiers of Livonia, waiting the season of action to burst into the kingdom of Prussia. With this favourable aspect of affairs, the empress prepared for the campaign by augmenting her forces in Hungary and Bohemia to 150,000 men; the main army, stationed in the vicinity of Prague, was commanded by Prince Charles, who was assisted by the skill of marshal Brown, and the other corps intrusted to count Daun. Frederic possessed too much foresight and vigilance to remain inactive while his enemies were collecting their forces; he therefore resolved to carry the war into the heart of the Austrian territories, and by a decisive stroke to shake the basis of the confederacy. He covered this plan with consummate address; he affected great trepidation and uncertainty, and, to deceive the Austrians into a belief that he only intended to maintain himself in Saxony, put Dresden in a state of defence, broke down the bridges, and marked out various camps in the vicinity. In the midst of this apparent alarm three Prussian columns burst into Bohemia, in April, and rapidly advanced towards Prague. . . . The Austrians, pressed on all sides, retreated with precipitation under the walls of Prague, on the southern side of the Moldau, while the Prussians advancing towards the capital formed two bodies; one under Schwerin remaining at Jung Bunzlau, and the other, headed by the king, occupying the heights between the Moldau and the Weisseberg. Expecting to be joined by marshal Daun, who was hastening from Moravia, the Austrians

remained on the defensive; but prince Charles took so strong a position as seemed to defy all apprehensions of an attack. . . . These obstacles, however, were insufficient to arrest the daring spirit of Frederic, who resolved to attack the Austrians before the arrival of Daun. Leaving a corps under prince Maurice above Prague, he crossed the Moldau near Rostock and Podabe on the 5th of May, with 16,000 men, and on the following morning at break of day was joined by the corps under marshal Schwerin. . . . Victory declared on the side of the Prussians, but was purchased by the loss of their best troops, not less than 18,000, even by the avowal of the king, being killed, with many of his bravest officers, and Schwerin, the father of the Prussian discipline, and the guide of Frederic in the career of victory. Of the Austrians 8,000 were killed and wounded, 9,000 made prisoners, and 28,000 shut up within the walls of Prague. . . . A column of 16,000 Austrians made good their retreat along the Moldau to join the army of marshal Daun. Prague was instantly blockaded by the victorious army, and not less than 100,000 souls were confined within the walls, almost without the means of subsistence. They were soon reduced to the greatest extremities. . . . In this disastrous moment the house of Austria was preserved from impending destruction by the skill and caution of a general, who now, for the first time, appeared at the head of an army. This general was Leopold count Daun, a native of Bohemia. . . . Daun had marched through Moravia towards Prague, to effect a junction with prince Charles. On arriving at Boehmisch-grod, within a few miles of Prague, he was apprised of the recent defeat, and halted a few days to collect the fugitives, till his corps swelled so considerably that Frederic detached against him the prince of Bevern with 20,000 men." Daun declined battle and retreated, until he had collected an army of 60,000 men and restored their courage. He then advanced, forcing back the prince of Bevern, and when Frederic, joining the latter with reinforcements, attacked him at Kolin, on the 18th of June, he inflicted on the Prussian king a disastrous defeat—the first which Frederic had known. The Prussian troops, "for the first time defeated, gave way to despondency, and in their retreat exclaimed, 'This is our Pultawa.' Daun purchased the victory with the loss of 9,000 men; but on the side of the Prussians not less than 14,000 were killed, wounded, and taken prisoners, and 43 pieces of artillery, with 22 standards, fell into the hands of the Austrians. Maria Theresa . . . conveyed in person the news of this important victory to the countess Daun, and instituted the military order of merit, or the Order of Maria Theresa, with which she decorated the commander and officers who had most signalled themselves, and dated its commencement from the era of that glorious victory. To give repose to the troops, and to replace the magazines which had been destroyed by the Prussians, Daun remained several days on the field of battle; and as he advanced to Prague found that the Prussians had raised the siege on the 20th of June, and were retreating with precipitation towards Saxony and Lusatia." —W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 112 (c. 3).

ALSO IN: Col. C. B. Brackenbury, *Frederick the Great*, ch. 11-12.—F. Kugler, *Pict. Hist. of*

Germany during the Reign of Frederick the Great, ch. 25.

A. D. 1757 (July—December).—The Seven Years War: Darkening and brightening of Frederick's career.—Closter-Seven.—Rossbach.—Leuthen.—The enemies of the King of Prussia "were now closing upon him from every side. The provinces beyond the Vistula became the prey of Russian hordes, to which only one division of Russians under Marshal Lehwald was opposed. In the result, however, their own devastations, and the consequent want of supplies, proved a check to their further progress during this campaign. In Westphalia above 80,000 effective French soldiers were advancing, commanded by the Mareschal d'Estrées, a grandson of the famous minister Louvois. The Duke of Cumberland, who had undertaken to defend his father's electorate against them, was at the head of a motley army of scarce 50,000 men. . . . His military talents were not such as to supply his want of numbers or of combination; he allowed the French to pass the deep and rapid Weser unopposed; he gave them no disturbance when laying waste great part of the Electorate; he only fell back from position to position until at length the enemy came up with him at the village of Hastenback near Hameln. There, on the 26th of July, an action was fought, and the Duke was worsted with the loss of several hundred men. The only resource of His Royal Highness was a retreat across the wide Lüneberg moors, to cover the town of Stade towards the mouth of the Elbe, where the archives and other valuable effects from Hanover had been already deposited for safety." Intrigue at Versailles having recalled D'Estrées and sent the Duke de Richelieu into his place, the latter pressed the Duke of Cumberland so closely, hemming him in and cutting off his communications, that he was soon glad to make terms. On the 8th of September the English Duke signed, at Closter-Seven, a convention under which the auxiliary troops in his army were sent home, the Hanoverians dispersed, and only a garrison left at Stade. "After the battle of Kolin and the Convention of Closter-Seven, the position of Frederick, —hemmed in on almost every side by victorious enemies, —was not only most dangerous but well-nigh desperate. To his own eyes it seemed so. He resolved in his thoughts, and discussed with his friends, the voluntary death of Otho as a worthy example to follow. Fully resolved never to fall alive into the hands of his enemies, nor yet to survive any decisive overthrow, he carried about his person a sure poison in a small glass phial. Yet . . . he could still, with indomitable skill and energy, make every preparation for encountering the Prince de Soubise. He marched against the French commander at the head of only 22,000 men; but these were veterans, trained in the strictest discipline, and full of confidence in their chief. Soubise, on the other hand, owed his appointment in part to his illustrious lineage, as head of the House of Rohan, and still more to Court-favour, as the minion of Madame de Pompadour, but in no degree to his own experience or abilities. He had under his orders nearly 40,000 of his countrymen, and nearly 20,000 troops of the Empire; for the Germanic diet also had been induced to join the league against Frederick. On the 5th of November the two armies came to a battle at Rosbach [or Rossbach], close to the

plain of Lützen, where in the preceding century Gustavus Adolphus conquered and fell. By the skilful manœuvres of Frederick the French were brought to believe that the Prussians intended nothing but retreat, and they advanced in high spirits as if only to pursue the fugitives. Of a sudden they found themselves attacked with all the compactness of discipline, and all the courage of despair. The troops of the Empire, a motley crew, fled at the first fire. . . . So rapid was the victory that the right wing of the Prussians, under Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, was never engaged at all. Great numbers of the French were cut down in their flight by the Prussian cavalry, not a few perished in the waters of the Saale, and full 7,000 were made prisoners, with a large amount of baggage, artillery and standards. . . . The battle of Rosbach was not more remarkable for its military results than for its moral influence. It was hailed throughout Germany as a triumph of the Teutonic over the Gallic race. . . . So precarious was now Frederick's position that the battle of Rosbach, as he said himself, gained him nothing but leisure to fight another battle elsewhere. During his absence on the Saale, the Austrian armies had poured over the mountains into Silesia; they had defeated the Prussians under the Duke of Bevern; they had taken the main fortress, Schweidnitz, and the capital, Breslau; nearly the whole province was already theirs. A flying detachment of 4,000 cavalry, under General Haddick, had even pushed into Brandenburg, and levied a contribution from the city of Berlin [entering one of the suburbs of the Prussian capital and holding it for twelve hours]. The advancing season seemed to require winter quarters, but Frederick never dreamed of rest until Silesia was recovered. He hastened by forced marches from the Saale to the Oder, gathering reinforcements while he went along. As he drew near Breslau, the Imperial commander, Prince Charles of Lorraine, flushed with recent victory and confident in superior numbers, disregarded the prudent advice of Marshal Daun, and descended from an almost inaccessible position to give the King of Prussia battle on the open plain. . . . On the 5th of December, one month from the battle of Rosbach, the two armies met at Leuthen, a small village near Breslau, Frederick with 40,000, Prince Charles of Lorraine with between 60,000 and 70,000 men. For several hours did the conflict rage doubtfully and fiercely. It was decided mainly by the skill and the spirit of the Prussian monarch. 'The battle of Leuthen,' says Napoleon, 'was a master-piece. Did it even stand alone it would of itself entitle Frederick to immortal fame.' In killed, wounded and taken, the Austrians lost no less than 27,000 men; above 50 standards, above 100 cannon, above 4,000 wagons, became the spoil of the victors; Breslau was taken, Schweidnitz blockaded, Silesia recovered; the remnant of the Imperial forces fled back across the mountains; and Frederick, after one of the longest and most glorious campaigns that History records, at length allowed himself and his soldiers some repose."—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 34 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Friedrich II.*, bk. 18, ch. 5-10.—Lord Dover, *Life of Frederick II.*, v. 2, ch. 3-4.—Sir E. Cust, *Annals of the Wars of the 18th Century*, v. 2, pp. 217-240.

A. D. 1758.—The Seven Years War: Campaign in Hanover.—Siege of Olmütz.—Russian defeat at Zorndorf.—Prussian defeat at Hochkirch.—"Before the end of 1757, England began to take a more active part on the Continent. Lord Chatham brought about the rejection of the Convention of Closter-Zeven by Parliament, and the recall of Cumberland by the king. The efficient Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick was proposed by Frederick and made commander of the English and Hanoverian forces. He opened the campaign of 1758 in the winter. The French, under Clermont, being without discipline or control, he drove them in headlong flight out of their winter-quarters in Hanover and Westphalia, to the Rhine and across it; and on June 23 defeated them at the battle of Crefeld. A French army under Soubise afterward crossed the Rhine higher up, and Ferdinand retreated, but succeeded in protecting the west as far as the Weser against General Contades. Frederick first retook Schweidnitz, April 16. He then, in order to prevent the junction of the Russians and Austrians, ventured to attack Austria, and invaded Moravia. His brother, Prince Henry, had but a small force in Saxony, and Frederick thought that he could best cover that country by an attack on Austria. But the siege of Olmütz detained him from May until July, and his prospects grew more doubtful. The Austrians captured a convoy of 300 wagons of military stores, which Ziethen was to have escorted to him. [Instead of 300, the convoy comprised 3,000 to 4,000 wagons, of which only 200 reached the Prussian camp, and its destruction by General Loudon completely frustrated Frederick's plan of campaign.] Frederick raised the siege, and, by an admirable retreat, brought his army through Bohemia by way of Königgrätz to Landshut. Here he received bad news. The Russians, under Fermor, were again in Prussia, occupying the eastern province, but treating it mildly as a conquered country, where the empress already received the homage of the people. They then advanced, with frightful ravages, through Pomerania and Neumark to the Oder, and were now near Küstrin, which they laid in ashes. Frederick made haste to meet them. He was so indignant at the desolation of the country and the suffering of his people that he forbade quarter to be given. The report of this fact also embittered the Russians. At Zorndorf, Frederick met the enemy, 50,000 strong, August 25, 1758. They were drawn up in a great square or phalanx, in the ancient, half-barbarous manner. A frightfully bloody fight followed, since the Russians would not yield, and were cut down in heaps. Seidlitz, the victor of Rossbach, by a timely charge of his cavalry, captured the Russian artillery, and crushed their right wing. On the second day the Russians were driven back, but not without inflicting heavy loss on the Prussians, who, though they suffered much less than their enemies, left more than one third of their force on the field. The Russians were compelled to withdraw from Prussia. Frederick then hastened to Saxony, where his brother Henry was sorely pressed by Daun and the imperial army. He could not even wait to relieve Silesia, where Neisse, his principal fortress, was threatened. Daun, hearing of his approach, took up a position in his way, between Bautzen and Görlitz. But Frederick, whose contempt for this prudent and slow general was

excessive, occupied a camp in a weak and exposed position, at Hochkirch, under Daun's very eyes, against the protest of his own generals. He remained there three days unmolested; but on October 14, the day fixed for advancing, the Austrians attacked him with twice his numbers. A desperate fight took place in the burning village; the Prussians were driven out, and lost many guns. Frederick himself was in imminent danger, and his friends Keith and Duke Francis of Brunswick fell at his side. Yet the army did not lose its spirit or its discipline. Within eleven days Frederick, who had been joined by his brother Henry, was in Silesia, and relieved Neisse and Kosel. Thus the campaign of 1758 ended favorably to Frederick. The pope sent Daun a consecrated hat and sword, as a testimonial for his victory at Hochkirch."—C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany*, bk. 5, ch. 23, sect. 7-9.

ALSO IN: G. B. Malleon, *Military Life of Loudon*, ch. 7-8.—F. Kugler, *Pict. Hist. of Germany during the Reign of Frederick the Great*, ch. 29-31.—Frederick II., *Hist. of the Seven Years War* (Posthumous Works, v. 2), ch. 8.

A. D. 1759 (April—August).—The Seven Years War: Prince Ferdinand's Hanoverian campaign.—Defeat at Bergen and victory at Minden.—In the Hanoverian field of war, where Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick held command, the campaign of 1759 was important, and prosperous in the end for the allies of Prussia. "Besides the Hanoverians and Hessians in British pay, he [Prince Ferdinand] had under his direction 10,000 or 12,000 British soldiers, amongst whom, since the death of the Duke of Marlborough, Lord George Sackville was the senior officer. The French, on their part, were making great exertions, under the new administration of the Duke de Choiseul; large reinforcements were sent into Germany, and early in the year they surprised by stratagem the free city of Frankfort and made it the place of arms for their southern army. No object could be of greater moment to Ferdinand than to dislodge them from this important post." Marching quickly, with 30,000 of his army, he attacked the French, under the Duke de Broglie, at Bergen, on the Nidda, in front of Frankfort, April 13, and was repulsed, after heavy fighting, with a loss of 2,000 men. "This reverse would, it was supposed, reduce Prince Ferdinand to the defensive during the remainder of the campaign. Both De Broglie and Contades eagerly pushed forward, their opponents giving way before them. Combining their forces, they reduced Cassel, Munster, and Minden, and they felt assured that the whole Electorate must soon again be theirs. Already had the archives and the most valuable property been sent off from Hanover to Stade. Already did a new Hastenbeck—a new Closter-Seven—rise in view. But it was under such difficulties that the genius of Ferdinand shone forth. With a far inferior army (for thus much is acknowledged, although I do not find the French numbers clearly or precisely stated), he still maintained his ground on the left of the Weser, and supplied every defect by his superiority of tactics. He left a detachment of 5,000 men exposed, and seemingly unguarded, as a bait to lure De Contades from his strong position at Minden. The French Mareschal was deceived by the feint, and directed the Duke De Broglie to march forward and profit by the blunder, as he deemed it to be.

On the 1st of August, accordingly, De Broglie advanced into the plain, his force divided in eight columns." Instead of the small corps expected, he found the whole army of the allies in front of him. De Contades hurried to his assistance, and the French, forced to accept battle in an unfavorable position, were overcome. At the decisive moment of their retreat, "the Prince sent his orders to Lord George Sackville, who commanded the whole English and some German cavalry on the right wing of the Allies, and who had hitherto been kept back as a reserve. The orders were to charge and overwhelm the French in their retreat, before they could reach any clear ground to rally. Had these orders been duly fulfilled, it is acknowledged by French writers that their army must have been utterly destroyed; but Lord George either could not or would not understand what was enjoined on him.

... Under such circumstances the victory of Minden would not have been signal or complete but for a previous and most high-spirited precaution of Prince Ferdinand. He had sent round to the rear of the French a body of 10,000 men, under his nephew—and also the King of Prussia's—the Hereditary Prince of Brunswick. ... Thus Ferdinand became master of the passes, and the French were constrained to continue their retreat in disorder. Upon the whole, their loss was 8,000 men killed, wounded, or taken, 30 pieces of artillery, and 17 standards. ... Great was the rejoicing in England at the victory of Minden"; but loud the outcry against Lord George Sackville, who was recalled and dismissed from all his employments.—Lord Mahon (Earl Stanhope), *Hist. of Eng.*, 1713-1783, ch. 36 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: Sir E. Cust, *Annals of the Wars of the 18th Century*, v. 2, pp. 327-333.

A. D. 1759 (July—November).—The Seven Years War: Disasters of Frederick.—Kunersdorf.—Dresden.—Maxen.—"Three years of the war were gone and the ardour of Frederick's enemies showed no signs of abating. The war was unpopular in the Russian army, but the Czarina thought no sacrifice too great for the gratification of her hatred. France was sick of it too, and tottering on the verge of national bankruptcy, but Louis was kept true to his engagements by domestic influences and by the unbending determination of Maria Theresa never to lay down arms until Prussia was thoroughly humbled. ... Already Frederick was at his wits' end for men and money. Of the splendid infantry which had stormed the heights at Prague, and stemmed the rout of Kollin, very little now remained. ... Moreover, Austria, relying on her vastly larger population, had ceased to exchange prisoners, and after the end of 1759 Russia followed her example. ... Frederick's pecuniary difficulties were even greater still. But for the English subsidy he could hardly have subsisted at all. ... The summer was half gone before there was any serious fighting. Frederick had got together 125,000 men of some sort, besides garrison troops, but he no longer felt strong enough to take the initiative, and the Austrians were equally indisposed to attack without the co-operation of their allies. Towards the middle of July the Russians, under Count Soltikoff, issued from Posen, advanced to the Oder, and, after defeating a weak Prussian corps near Kay, took possession of Frankfort. It now became necessary for the king to march in person against

them, the more especially as Laudon [or Loudon] with 18,000 Austrians was on his way to join Soltikoff. Before he could reach Frankfort, Laudon, eluding with much dexterity the vigilance of his enemies, effected his junction, and Frederick, with 48,000 men, found himself confronted by an army 78,000 strong. The Russians were encamped on the heights of Kunersdorf, east of Frankfort." Frederick attacked them, Aug. 12, with brilliant success at first, routing their left wing and taking 70 guns, with several thousand prisoners. "The Prussian generals then besought the king to rest content with the advantage he had gained. The day was intensely hot; his soldiers had been on foot for twelve hours, and were suffering severely from thirst and exhaustion; moreover, if the Russians were let alone, they would probably go off quietly in the night, as they had done after Zorn-dorf. Unhappily Frederick refused to take counsel. He wanted to destroy the Russian army, not merely to defeat it; he had seized the Frankfort bridge and cut off its retreat." He persisted in his attack and was beaten off. "The Prussians were in full retreat when Laudon swept down upon them with eighteen fresh squadrons. The retreat became a rout more disorderly than in any battle of the war except Rossbach. The king, stupefied with his disaster, could hardly be induced to quit the field, and was heard to mutter, 'Is there then no cursed bullet that can reach me?' The defeat was overwhelming. Had it been properly followed up, it must have put an end to the war, and Kunersdorf would have ranked among the decisive battles of the world. Berlin lay open to the enemy; the royal family fled to Magdeburg. For the first (and last) time in his life Frederick gave way utterly to despair. 'I have no resources left,' he wrote to the minister Finckenstein the evening after the battle, 'and to tell the truth I hold all for lost. I shall not survive the ruin of my country. Farewell for ever.' The same night he resigned the command of the army to General Finck. Eighteen thousand, five hundred of his soldiers were killed, wounded, or prisoners, and the rest were so scattered that no more than 3,000 remained under his command. All the artillery was lost, and most of his best generals were killed or wounded. . . . By degrees, however, the prospect brightened. The fugitives kept coming in, and the enemy neglected to give the finishing stroke. Frederick shook off his despair, and resumed the command of his army. Artillery was ordered up from Berlin, and the troops serving against the Swedes were recalled from Pomerania. Within a week of Kunersdorf he was at the head of 33,000 men, and in a position to send relief to Dresden, which was besieged by an Austrian and Imperialist army. The relief, as it happened, arrived just too late." Dresden was surrendered by its commandant, Schmettau, on the 4th of Sept., to the great wrath of Frederick. By a wonderful march of fifty-eight miles in fifty hours, Prince Henry, the brother of Frederick, prevented the Austrians from gaining the whole electorate of Saxony. The Russians and the Austrians quarrelled, the former complaining that they were left to do all the fighting, and presently they withdrew into Poland. "With the departure of the Russians, the campaign would probably have ended, had not Frederick's desire to close it with a victory led him into a fresh disaster, hardly

less serious and far more disgraceful than that of Kunersdorf. . . . With the view of hastening the retreat of the Austrians, and of driving them, if possible, into the difficult Pirna country, he ordered General Finck to take post with his corps at Maxen, to bar their direct line of communications with Bohemia." As the result, Finck, with his whole corps, of 12,000, were overwhelmed and taken prisoners. "The capitulation of Maxen was no less destructive of Frederick's plans than galling to his pride. The Austrians now retained Dresden, a place of great strategical importance, though the king, in the hope of dislodging them, exposed the wrecks of his army to the ruinous hardships of a winter campaign, in weather of unusual severity, and borrowed 12,000 men of Ferdinand of Brunswick to cover his flank while so engaged. The new year had commenced before he allowed his harassed troops to go into winter-quarters."—F. W. Longman, *Frederick the Great and the Seven Years War*, ch. 10, sect. 2.

ALSO IN: T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Friedrich II.*, bk. 19, ch. 4-7.—Frederick II., *Hist. of the Seven Years War* (*Posthumous Works*, v. 3), ch. 10.

A. D. 1760.—The Seven Years War: Saxony reconquered by Frederick.—Dresden bombarded.—Battles of Liegnitz, Torgau and Warburg.—"The campaign of 1759 had extended far into the winter, and Frederick conceived the bold idea of renewing it while the vigilance of his enemies was relaxed in winter quarters, and of making another effort to drive the Austrians from Saxony. His head-quarters were at Freyberg. Having received reinforcements from Prince Ferdinand, and been joined by 12,000 men under the hereditary prince, he left the latter to keep guard behind the Mulde, and in January 1760, at a time when the snow lay deep upon the ground, he made a fierce spring upon the Austrians, who were posted at Dippoldiswalde; but General Maguire, who commanded there, baffled him by the vigilance and skill with which he guarded every pass, and compelled him to retrace his steps to Freyberg. When the winter had passed and the regular campaign had opened, Laudohn [Loudon], one of the most active of the Austrian generals—the same who had borne a great part in the victories of Hochkirchen and Kunersdorf—entered Silesia, surprised with a greatly superior force the Prussian General Fouqué, compelled him, with some thousands of soldiers, to surrender [at Landshut, June 22], and a few days later reduced the important fortress of Glatz [July 26]. Frederick, at the first news of the danger of Fouqué, marched rapidly towards Silesia, Daun slowly following, while an Austrian corps, under General Lacy, impeded his march by incessant skirmishes. On learning the surrender of Fouqué, Frederick at once turned and hastened towards Dresden. It was July, and the heat was so intense that on a single day more than a hundred of his soldiers dropped dead upon the march. He hoped to gain some days upon Daun, who was still pursuing, and to become master of Dresden before succours arrived. As he expected, he soon outstripped the Austrian general, and the materials for the siege were collected with astonishing rapidity, but General Maguire, who commanded at Dresden, defended it with complete success till the approach of the Austrian army obliged Frederick to retire. Baffled in his design, he

took a characteristic vengeance by bombarding that beautiful city with red-hot balls, slaughtering multitudes of its peaceable inhabitants, and reducing whole quarters to ashes; and he then darted again upon Silesia, still followed by the Austrian general. Laudohn had just met with his first reverse, having failed in the siege of Breslau [an attempted surprise and a brief bombardment]; on August 15, when Daun was still far off, Frederick fell upon him and beat him in the battle of Liegnitz. [The statement that 'Daun was still far off' appears to be erroneous. Loudon and Daun had formed a junction four days before, and had planned a concerted attack on Frederick's camp; Loudon was struck and defeated while making the movement agreed upon, and Daun was only a few miles away at the time.] Soon after, however, this success was counterbalanced by Lacy and Tottlehen, who, at the head of some Austrians and Russians, had marched upon Berlin, which, after a brave resistance, was once more captured and ruthlessly plundered; but on the approach of Frederick the enemy speedily retreated. Frederick then turned again towards Saxony, which was again occupied by Daun, and on November 3 he attacked his old enemy in his strong entrenchments at Torgau. Daun, in addition to the advantage of position, had the advantage of great numerical superiority, for his army was reckoned at 65,000, while that of Frederick was not more than 44,000. But the generalship of Frederick gained the victory. General Zieten succeeded in attacking the Austrians in the rear, gaining the height, and throwing them into confusion. Daun was wounded and disabled, and General O'Donnell, who was next in command, was unable to restore the Austrian line. The day was conspicuous for its carnage, even among the bloody battles of the Seven Years' War: 20,000 Austrians were killed, wounded, or prisoners, while 14,000 Prussians were left on the field. The battle closed the campaign for the year, leaving all Saxony in the possession of the Prussians, with the exception of Dresden, which was still held by Maguire. The English and German army, under Prince Ferdinand, succeeded in the meantime in keeping at bay a very superior French army, under Marshal Broglio; and several slight skirmishes took place, with various results. The battle of Warburg, which was the most important, was won chiefly by the British cavalry, but Prince Ferdinand failed in his attempts to take Wesel and Gottingen; and at the close of the year the French took up their quarters at Cassel."—W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of Eng.*, 18th Century, ch. 8 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: W. Coxe, *Hist. of the House of Austria*, ch. 115 (v. 3).—G. B. Malleson, *Military Life of Loudon*, ch. 10.—T. Carlyle, *Hist. of Friedrich II.*, bk. 20, ch. 1-6.

A. D. 1761-1762.—The Seven Years War: The closing campaigns.—"All Frederick's exertions produced him only 96,000 men for defence of Silesia and Saxony this year [1761]. Prince Henry had to face Daun in Saxony; the king himself stood in Silesia against Loudon and the Russians under Butterlin. Loudon opened the campaign by advancing against Goltz, near Schweidnitz, in April. Goltz had only 12,000 to his adversary's 30,000, but posted himself so well that Loudon could not attack him. Reinforcements came gradually to Loudon, raising his

army to 72,000, but orders from Vienna obliged him to remain inactive till he could be joined near Neisse by the Russians with 60,000. Goltz, manœuvring against the Russians, was taken prisoner. The king himself delayed the junction of his enemies for some time, but could not now offer battle. The junction took place the 18th of August. He then struck at Loudon's communications, but the thrust was well parried, and on the 20th of August, Frederick, for the first time, was reduced to an attitude of pure defence. He formed an intrenched camp at Bunzelwitz, and lay there, blocking the way to Schweidnitz. Loudon's intreaties could not persuade the Russians to join him in full force to attack the position, and on the 9th of September Butterlin's army fell back across the Oder, leaving 20,000 of his men to act under Loudon. Frederick remained a fortnight longer in the camp of Bunzelwitz, but was then forced to go, as his army was eating up the magazines of Schweidnitz. Again he moved against Loudon's magazines, but the Austrian general boldly marched for Schweidnitz, and captured the place by assault on the night of the 30th September—1st October. No fight took place between Loudon and the king. They both went into winter quarters in December—Prussians at Strehlen, Austrians at Kunzendorf, and Russians about Glatz. . . . In the western theatre Ferdinand defeated Broglio and Soubise at Vellinghausen [or Wellinghausen, or Kirch-Denkern, as the battle, fought July 15, is differently called], the English contingent again behaving gloriously. . . . Prince Henry and Daun manœuvred skillfully throughout the campaign, but never came to serious blows. Frederick is described as being very gloomy in mind this winter. The end of the year left him with but 60,000 men in Saxony, Silesia, and the north. Eugene of Wurtemberg had 5,000 to hold back the Swedes, Prince Henry 25,000 in Saxony, the king himself 30,000. But the agony of France was increasing; Maria Theresa had to discharge 20,000 men from want of money, and Frederick's bitter enemy, 'cette infame Catin du Nord' [the czarina Elizabeth], was falling fast in health. A worse blow to the king than the loss of a battle had been the fall of Pitt, in October, and with him all hope of English subsidies. Still, the enemies of Prussia were almost exhausted. One more year of brave and stubborn resistance, and Prussia must be left in peace. By extraordinary exertions, and a power of administrative organisation which was one of his greatest qualities, Frederick not only kept up his 60,000, but doubled their number. In the spring he had 70,000 for his Silesian army, 40,000 for Prince Henry in Saxony, and 10,000 for the Swedes or other purposes. Best news of all, the czarina died on the 5th of January, 1762, and Peter, who succeeded her—only for a short time, poor boy—was an ardent admirer of the great king. Frederick at once released and sent home his Russian prisoners, an act which brought back his Prussians from Russia. On the 23rd February Peter declared his intention to be at peace and amity with Frederick, concluded peace on the 5th of May, and a treaty of alliance a month later. The Swedes, following suit, declared peace on the 22nd of May, and Frederick could now give his sole attention to the Austrians." For a few weeks, only, the Prussian king had a Russian contingent of 20,000 in alliance with him, but

could make no use of it. It was recalled in July, by the revolution at St. Petersburg, which deposed the young czar, Peter, in favour of his ambitious consort, Catherine. Frederick succeeded in concealing the fact long enough to frighten Daun by a show of preparations for attacking him, with the Russian troops included in his army, and the Austrian general retired to Glatz and Bohemia. Frederick then took Schweidnitz, and marched on Dresden. "Daun followed heavily. Like a prize-fighter knocked out of time, he had no more fight in him. Prince Henry had two affairs with the Reich's army and its Austrian contingent. Forced to retire from Freyburg on the 15th, he afterwards attacked them on the 29th of October and defeated them by a turning movement. They had 40,000, he 30,000. The Austrian contingent suffered most. In the western theatre Ferdinand held his own and had his usual successes. His part in the war was to defend only, and he never failed to show high qualities as a general. Thus, nowhere had Frederick's enemies succeeded in crushing his defences. For seven years the little kingdom of Prussia had held her ground against the three great military powers, France, Austria, and Russia. All were now equally exhausted. The constancy, courage, and ability of Frederick were rewarded at last; on the 15th of February, 1763, the treaty of Hubertsburg was signed, by which Austria once more agreed to the cession of Silesia. Prussia was now a Great Power like the rest, her greatness resting on no shams, as she had proved." —Col. C. B. Brackenbury, *Frederick the Great*, ch. 18.

ALSO IN: Sir E. Cust, *Annals of the Wars of the 18th Century*, v. 3, pp. 57-87.—Frederick II., *Hist. of the Seven Years War* (Posthumous Works, v. 3), ch. 14-16.

A. D. 1763.—The end, results and costs of the Seven Years War.—The Peace of Hubertsburg and Peace of Paris. See SEVEN YEARS WAR.

A. D. 1763-1790.—A period of peace and progress.—Intellectual cultivation.—Accession of the Emperor Joseph II.—His character and his reforms.—Accession of Leopold II.—"The peace of nearly thirty years which followed the Seven-Years' War in Germany was a time of rich mental activity and growth. Court life itself, if its vanities were not abolished, still acquired a more enlightened and humane tone. The fierce passions of the princes no longer exclusively controlled it: there was something of regard for education, for art and science, and for the public welfare. This is particularly true of courts which were intimately connected with Prussia; as that of Brunswick, where Duke Charles, Frederick II.'s brother-in-law, though personally an extravagant prince, founded an institution of learning which brought together many of the best intellects of Germany (1740 to 1760), or that of Anhalt-Dessau, where the famous 'Philanthropinum' was established. Several princes imitated Frederick's military administration, and that sometimes on a scale so small as to be ludicrous. Prince William of Lippe-Schaumburg founded in his little territory a fortress and a school of war. But this school educated Scharnhorst, and the prince himself won fame in distant lands. He invited Herder to his little court at Bückeburg. Weimar, too, imitated Frederick's example, where the Duchess Amalie,

daughter of Charles of Brunswick, and her intellectual son, Charles Augustus, made their little cities Weimar and Jena places of gathering for the greatest men of genius of the time. Among the petty Thuringian princes of this period, there were others of noble character. In 1764 the Saxon throne was ascended by Frederick Augustus, grandson of Augustus III., but, being a minor, he could not be elected king of Poland. This put an end to the union of the two titles, which had been the cause of immeasurable evil to Saxony and to Germany. When the young elector attained his majority, the government of Saxony was greatly improved, and a period of prosperity followed. Duke Charles Eugene of Wirtemberg (1737-1793), during his early years, rivaled Louis XV. in extravagance and immorality, but in after-days was greatly changed. He founded the Charles School, at which Schiller was educated. Baden enjoyed a high degree of prosperity under Charles Frederick (1746-1811). Even the spiritual lords, on the whole, threw their influence in favor of enlightenment and progress. . . . The prelates of Cologne, Trèves, Mayence, and Salzburg, strange to say, agreed at Ems in 1786 to renounce the supremacy of Rome, and to found an independent German Catholic Church; but the plan was broken down by the resistance of the inferior clergy and of the Emperor Joseph II. Some of the German states were slow to take part in the general progress. Bavaria was constantly retarded by the influence of the Jesuits. . . . The Palatinate, too, was under luxurious and idle rulers, mostly in the pay of France. In some territories the boundless extravagance of the princes was a terrible burden upon their subjects. . . . Men who professed enlightenment and humanity were often shamefully tyrannical. The courts of Cassel and Wirtemberg sold their people by regiments to England, to fight against the independence of the North American Colonies [see UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1776 (JANUARY-JUNE)]. . . . Austria shared in the general intellectual awakening of Germany. Maria Theresa was a firm, strong character, with a clear mind and sincere desire for the people's welfare. She found Austria in decay, and was able to introduce many reforms. She alleviated the condition of the peasants, who were still mostly serfs. The nobles had before lived mainly for show, but she provided institutions for their education. . . . It was a condition of the Peace of Hubertsburg that Frederick II. should give his electoral vote for the eldest son of Francis I. None of the other electors objected to the choice, and on March 27, 1764, they performed the ceremony of choosing Joseph 'King of the Romans,' but without power to interfere with the government during his father's life. Francis I. died August 18, 1765, and his son Joseph II. (1765-1790) was then crowned emperor in the traditional fashion. He was also associated with his mother in the government of Austria; but she retained the royal power mainly in her own hands, assigning to her son the executive control of military affairs. Joseph II. was an impetuous and intellectual character, all aglow with the new ideas of enlightenment and progress, and was perhaps more deeply impressed by the example of Frederick II. than any other prince of the age. . . . At the same time, Joseph II. was eager to aggrandize Austria, and at least to obtain an equivalent for Silesia. For a long

time Austria had been longing to acquire Bavaria, and there now seemed to be some reason to hope for success. The ancient line of electors of the house of Wittelsbach died out in 1777 with Maximilian Joseph (December 30). The next heir was the Elector Palatine, Charles Theodore, also Duke of Jülich and Berg, who was not eager to obtain Bavaria, since, by the Peace of Westphalia, he must then forfeit the electorate of the Palatinate. . . . Under these circumstances Joseph II. made an unfounded claim to Lower Bavaria, under a pretended grant of the Emperor Sigismund in 1426. A secret treaty was made by him with Charles Theodore, by which he was to pay that prince a large sum of money for Lower Bavaria; and soon after Maximilian Joseph's death, Joseph II. occupied the land with troops. Frederick II., who was ever jealous of the growth of Austria, resolved to prevent this acquisition [see BAVARIA: A. D. 1777-1779]. . . . Thus the war of the Bavarian Succession broke out (1778-79). . . . By the death of Maria Theresa, November 29, 1780, her son Joseph II. became sole monarch of Austria. . . . Joseph II. was a man of large mind and noble aims. Like Frederick, he was unwearying in labor, accessible to every one, and eager to assume his share of work or responsibility. The books and the people's memory are full of anecdotes of him, though he was far from popular during his life. But he lacked the strong practical sense and calculating foresight of the veteran Prussian king. In his zeal for reforms he hastened to heap one upon another in confusion. Torture was abolished, and for a time even the death penalty. Rigid equality before the law was introduced, and slavery done away [see SLAVERY, MEDIEVAL: GERMANY]. His reforms in the Church were still more sweeping. He closed more than half of the monasteries, and devoted their estates to public instruction; he introduced German hymns of praise and the German Bible. By his Edict of Toleration, June 22, 1781, he secured to all Protestants throughout the Austrian states their civil rights and freedom of worship, 'in houses of prayer without bells or towers.' . . . He zealously followed up Maria Theresa's policy of consolidating Austria into one state; and it was this course which made him enemies. He offended the powerful nobility of Hungary by abolishing serfdom (November 1, 1781), and the whole people by the measures he took to promote the use of the German language. In the Netherlands, he alienated from him the powerful clergy by his innovations; and they stirred up against him the people, already aggrieved by the loss of some of their ancient liberties. A revolution broke out among them in 1788, and was threatening to extend to Hungary and Bohemia, when the emperor suddenly died, still in the full vigor of manhood, at the age of forty-nine, February 20, 1790. . . . After his death, the progress of reform was checked in Austria; but he had awakened new and strong forces there, and a complete return to the ancient system was impossible. . . . Leopold II. (1790-1792), who succeeded his brother Joseph II., both in Austria and as emperor, was a self-indulgent but prudent ruler."—C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany*, bk. 5, ch. 24, sect. 8-18.

A. D. 1772-1773.—The first Partition of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1763-1773.

A. D. 1787.—Prussian intervention in Holland.—Restoration of the expelled stadtholder.

See NETHERLANDS (HOLLAND): A. D. 1746-1787.

A. D. 1791.—The forming of the Coalition against French democracy. See FRANCE: A. D. 1790-1791; and 1791 (JULY-SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1791-1792.—The question of war with France, and the question of the Partition of Poland.—Motives and action of Prussia and Austria.—"After the acceptance of the Constitution by Louis XVI. [September—see FRANCE: A. D. 1791 (JULY-SEPTEMBER)], the Emperor indulged for a time a confident hope, that the French question was solved, and that he was relieved from all fear of trouble from that quarter. He had cares enough upon him to make him heartily congratulate himself on this result. . . . In foreign affairs, the Polish question—the next in importance to the French—was still unsettled, and daily presented fresh difficulties. . . . The fact that Russia began to show the greatest favour to the Emigrés, and to preach at Berlin and Vienna a crusade against the wicked Jacobins, only served to confirm the Emperor in his peaceful sentiments. He rightly concluded that Catharine wished to entangle the German Powers in a struggle with France, that she might have her own way in Poland; and he was not at all inclined to be the dupe of so shallow an artifice. . . . At the same time he set about bringing his alliance with Prussia to a definite conclusion, in order to secure to himself a firm support for every emergency. On the 17th of November—a week after the enactment of the first edict against the Emigrés—Prince Reuss made a communication on this subject to the Prussian Ministry, and on this occasion declared himself empowered to commence at any moment the formal draft of an alliance. . . . 'We are now convinced,' wrote the Ministers to their ambassador at Vienna, 'that Austria will undertake nothing against France.' This persuasion was soon afterwards fully confirmed by Kaunitz, who descended in the severest terms on the intrigues of the Emigrés on the Rhine, which it was not in the interest of any Power to support. It was ridiculous, he said, in the French Princes, and in Russia and Spain, to declare the acceptance of the constitution by the King compulsory, and therefore void; and still more so to dispute the right of Louis XVI. to alter the constitution at all. He said that they would vainly endeavour to goad Austria into a war, which could only have the very worst consequences for Louis and the present predominance of the moderate party in France. . . . Here, again, we see that without the machinations of the Girondists, the revolutionary war would never have been commenced. It is true, indeed, that at this time a very perceptible change took place in the opinions of the second German potentate—the King of Prussia. Immediately after the Congress of Pillnitz, great numbers of French Emigrés, who had been driven from Vienna by the coldness of Leopold, had betaken themselves to Berlin. At the Prussian Court they met with a hospitable reception, and aroused in the King, by their graphic descriptions, a warm interest for the victims of the Revolution. . . . He loaded the Emigrés with marks of favour of every kind, and thereby excited in them the most exaggerated hopes. Yet the King was far from intending to risk any important interest of the State for the sake of his protégés; he had no idea of pursuing an aggressive policy towards France;

and the only point in which he differed from Leopold was in the feeling with which he regarded the development of the warlike tendencies of the French. His Ministers, moreover, were, without exception, possessed by the same idea as Prince Kaunitz; that a French war would be a misfortune to all Europe." As the year 1791 drew towards its close, "unfavourable news arrived from Paris. The attempts of the Feuillants had failed; Lafayette had separated himself from them and from the Court; and the zeal and confidence of victory among the Democrats were greater than ever. The Emigrés in Berlin were jubilant; they had always declared that no impression was to be made upon the Jacobins except by the edge of the sword, and that all hopes founded on the stability of a moderate middle party were futile. The King of Prussia agreed with them, and determined to begin the unavoidable struggle as quickly as possible. He told his Ministers that war was certain, and that Bischoffswerder ought to go once more to the Emperor. . . . Bischoffswerder, having received instructions from the King himself, left Berlin, and arrived in Vienna, after a speedy journey, on the 28th of February. But he was not destined again to discuss the fate of Europe with his Imperial patron; for on the 29th the small-pox showed itself, of which Leopold died after three days sickness. The greatest consternation and confusion reigned in Vienna. . . . No one knew to whom the young King Francis—he was as yet only king of Hungary and Bohemia—would give his confidence, or what course he would take; nay, his weakly and nervous constitution rendered it doubtful whether he could bear—even for a short period—the burdens of his office. For the present he confirmed the Ministers in their places, and expressed to them his wish to adhere to the political system of his father. . . . He . . . ordered one of his most experienced Generals, Prince Hohenlohe-Kirchberg, to be summoned to Vienna, that he might take council with Bischoffswerder respecting the warlike measures to be adopted by both Powers, in case of a French attack. At the same time, however, the Polish question was, if possible, to be brought to a decision, and Leopold's plan in all its details was to be categorically recommended for adoption, both in Berlin and Petersburg. . . . The Austrian Minister, Spielmann, had prepared the memorial on Poland, which Prince Reuss presented at Berlin, on the 10th of March. It represented that Austria and Prussia had the same interest in stopping a source of eternal embarrassment and discussion, by strengthening the cause of peace and order in Poland. That herein lay an especially powerful motive to make the crown of that country hereditary; that for both Powers the Elector of Saxony would be the most acceptable wearer of that crown. . . . The important point, the memorial went on to say, was this, that Poland should no longer be dependent on the predominant influence of any one neighbouring Power. . . . When the King had read this memorial, in which the Saxon-Polish union was brought forward, not as an idea of the feeble Elector, but as a proposal of powerful Austria, he cried out, 'We must never give our consent to this.' He agreed with his Ministers in the conclusion that nothing would be more dangerous to Prussia, than the formation of such a Power as would re-

sult from the proposed lasting union of Poland and Saxony—a Power, which, in alliance with Austria, could immediately overrun Silesia, and in alliance with Russia, might be fatal to East Prussia. . . . In the midst of this angry and anxious excitement, which for a moment alienated his heart from Austria, the King received a fresh and no less important despatch from Petersburg. Count Golz announced the first direct communication of Russia respecting Poland. 'Should Poland' [wrote the Russian Vice Chancellor] 'be firmly and lastingly united to Saxony, a Power of the first rank will arise, and one which will be able to exercise the most sensible pressure upon each of its neighbours. We are greatly concerned in this, in consequence of the extension of our Polish frontier; and Prussia is no less so, from the inevitable increase which would ensue of Saxon influence in the German Empire. We therefore suggest, that Prussia, Austria, and Russia, should come to an intimate understanding with one another on this most important subject.' . . . This communication sounded differently in the ears of the King from that which he had received from Austria. The fears which agitated his own mind and those of the Russian chancellor were identical. While Austria called upon him to commit a political suicide, Russia offered her aid in averting the most harassing danger, and even opened a prospect of a considerable territorial increase. The King had no doubt to which of the two Powers he ought to incline. He would have come to terms with Russia on the spot, had not an insurmountable obstacle existed in the new path which was opened to the aggrandizement of Prussia,—viz., the Polish treaty of 1790; in which Prussia had expressly bound herself to protect the independence and integrity of Poland. . . . He decided that there was no middle course between the Russian and Austrian plans. On the one side was his Polish treaty of 1790, the immediate consequence of which would be a new breach, and perhaps a war, with Russia, and the final result such a strengthening of Poland, as would throw back the Prussian State into that subordinate position, both in Germany and Europe, which it had occupied in the seventeenth century. On the other side there was, indeed, a manifest breach of faith, but also the salvation of Prussia from a perilous dilemma, and perhaps the extension of her boundaries by a goodly Polish Province. If he wavered at all in this conflict of feeling, the Parisian complications soon put an end to his doubts. In quick succession came the announcements that Delessart's peaceful Ministry had fallen; that King Louis had suffered the deepest humiliation; and that the helm of the State had passed into the hands of the Girondist war party. A declaration of war on the part of France against Francis II. might be daily expected, and the Russian-Polish contest would then only form the less important moiety of the European catastrophe. Austria would now be occupied for a long time in the West; there could be no more question of the formation of a Polish-Saxon State; and Austria could no longer be reckoned upon to protect the constitution of 1791, or even to repel a Russian invasion of Poland. Prussia was bound to aid the Austrians against France, and for many months the King had cherished no more ardent wish than to fulfil this obligation with all his power. Simultaneously

to oppose the Empress Catharine, was out of the question. . . . The King wrote on the 12th of March to his Ministers as follows: . . . 'Russia is not far removed from thoughts of a new partition; and this would indeed be the most effectual means of limiting the power of a Polish King, whether hereditary or elective. I doubt, however, whether in this case a suitable compensation could be found for Asutria; and whether, after such a curtailment of the power of Poland, the Elector of Saxony would accept the crown. Yet if Austria could be compensated, the Russian plan would be the most advantageous for Prussia,—always provided that Prussia received the whole left bank of the Vistula, by the acquisition of which that distant frontier—so hard to be defended—would be well rounded off. This is my judgment respecting Polish affairs.' This was Poland's sentence of death. It was not, as we have seen, the result of a long-existing greed, but a suddenly seized expedient, which seemed to be accompanied with the least evil, in the midst of an unexampled European crisis. . . . On the 20th of April the French National Assembly proclaimed war against the King of Hungary and Bohemia. A fortnight later the Prince of Hohenlohe-Kirchberg appeared in Berlin to settle some common plan for the campaign; and at the same time Kaunitz directed Prince Reuss to enter into negotiations on the political question of expenditure and compensation. Count Schulenburg . . . immediately sent a reply to the Prince, to the effect that Prussia—as it had uniformly declared since the previous summer—could only engage in the war on condition of receiving an adequate compensation. . . . Both statesmen well knew with what secret mistrust each of these Powers contemplated the aggrandizement of the other; their deliberations were therefore conducted with slow and anxious caution, and months passed by before their respective demands were reduced to any definite shape."—H. von Sybel, *History of the French Revolution*, bk. 4, ch. 1 (v. 2).

A. D. 1792.—Accession of the Emperor Francis II.

A. D. 1792-1793.—War with Revolutionary France.—The Coalition. See FRANCE: A. D. 1791-1792; 1792 (APRIL—JULY), and (SEPTEMBER—DECEMBER); 1792-1793 (DECEMBER—FEBRUARY); 1793 (FEBRUARY—APRIL), (MARCH—SEPTEMBER), and (JULY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1792-1796.—The second and third Partitions of Poland. See POLAND: A. D. 1791-1792; and 1793-1796.

A. D. 1794.—Withdrawal of Prussia from the Coalition.—French conquest of the Austrian Netherlands and successes on the Rhine. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794 (MARCH—JULY).

A. D. 1795.—Treaty of Basle between Prussia and France.—Crumbling of the Coalition. See FRANCE: A. D. 1794-1795 (OCTOBER—MAY).

A. D. 1796-1797.—Expulsion of Austria from Italy.—Bonaparte's first campaigns.—Advance of Moreau and Jourdan beyond the Rhine.—Their retreat.—Peace preliminaries of Leoben. See FRANCE: A. D. 1796 (APRIL—OCTOBER); and 1796-1797 (OCTOBER—APRIL).

A. D. 1797 (October).—The Treaty of Campo Formio between Austria and France.—Austrian cession of the Netherlands and Lombardy and acquisition of Venice. See FRANCE: A. D. 1797 (MAY—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1798.—The second Coalition against Revolutionary France.—Prussia and the Empire withheld from it. See FRANCE: A. D. 1798-1799 (AUGUST—APRIL).

A. D. 1799.—The Congress at Rastadt.—Murder of French envoys. See FRANCE: A. D. 1799 (APRIL—SEPTEMBER).

A. D. 1800 (May—December).—The disastrous campaigns of Marengo and Hohenlinden. See FRANCE: A. D. 1800-1801 (MAY—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1801-1803.—The Peace of Luneville.—Territorial cessions and changes.—The settlement of indemnities in the Empire.—Confiscation and secularization of the ecclesiastical principalities.—Absorption of Free Cities.—Re-constitution of the Electoral College.—"By the treaty of Luneville, which the Emperor Francis was obliged to subscribe, 'not only as Emperor of Austria, but in the name of the German empire,' Belgium and all the left bank of the Rhine were again formally ceded to France; Lombardy was erected into an independent state, and the Adige declared the boundary betwixt it and the dominions of Austria; Venice, with all its territorial possessions as far as the Adige, was guaranteed to Austria; the Duke of Modena received the Brisgau in exchange for his duchy, which was annexed to the Cisalpine republic; the Grand Duke of Tuscany, the Emperor's brother, gave up his dominions to the infant Duke of Parma, a branch of the Spanish family [who was thereupon raised to royal rank by the fiat of Bonaparte, who transformed the grand-duchy of Tuscany into the kingdom of Etruria], on the promise of an indemnity in Germany; France abandoned Kehl, Cassel, and Ehrenbreitstein, on condition that these forts should remain in the situation in which they were when given up; the princes dispossessed by the cession of the left bank of the Rhine were promised an indemnity in the bosom of the Empire; the independence of the Batavian, Helvetic, Cisalpine and Ligurian republics was guaranteed, and their inhabitants declared 'to have the power of choosing whatever form of government they preferred.' These conditions did not differ materially from those contained in the treaty of Campo Formio, or from those offered by Napoleon previous to the renewal of the war. . . . The article which compelled the Emperor to subscribe this treaty as head of the empire, as well as Emperor of Austria, gave rise in the sequel . . . to the most painful internal divisions in Germany. By a fundamental law of the empire, the Emperor could not bind the electors and states of which he was the head, without either their concurrence or express powers to that effect previously conferred. . . . The emperor hesitated long before he subscribed such a condition, which left the seeds of interminable discord in the Germanic body; but the conqueror was inexorable, and no means of evasion could be found. He vindicated himself to the electors in a dignified letter, dated 8th February 1801, the day before that when the treaty was signed. . . . The electors and princes of the empire felt the force of this touching appeal; they commiserated the situation of the first monarch in Christendom, compelled to throw himself on his subjects for forgiveness of a step which he could not avoid; and one of the first steps of the Diet of the empire, assembled after the treaty of Luneville was signed, was to give

it their solemn ratification, grounded on the extraordinary situation in which the Emperor was then placed. But the question of indemnities to the dispossessed princes was long and warmly agitated. It continued for above two years to distract the Germanic body; the intervention both of France and Russia was required to prevent the sword being drawn in these internal disputes; and by the magnitude of the changes which were ultimately made, and the habit of looking to foreign protection which was acquired, the foundation was laid of that league to support separate interests which afterwards, under the name of the Confederation of the Rhine, so well served the purposes of French ambition, and broke up the venerable fabric of the German empire."—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789-1815, ch. 32 (v. 7).—"Germany lost by this treaty about 24,000 square miles of its best territory and 3,500,000 of its people; while the princes were indemnified by the plunder of their peers. But the hardest task, the satisfactory distribution of this plunder, remained. While the Diet at Regensburg, after much complaint and management, assigned the arrangement of these affairs to a committee, the princely bargainers were in Paris, employing the most disgraceful means to obtain the favor of Talleyrand and other influential diplomatists. On the 25th of February, 1803, the final decision of the delegation or committee of the empire was adopted by the Diet, and promulgated with the approval of the emperor, Francis II., and of Prussia and Bavaria. It confiscated all the spiritual principalities in Germany, except that the Elector of Mayence, Charles Theodore of Dalberg, received Regensburg, Aschaffenburg, and Wetzlar, as an indemnity, and retained a seat and a voice in the imperial Diet. Of the 48 free cities of the empire, six only remained—Hamburg, Bremen, Lubeck, Frankfort, Nuremberg, and Augsburg. Austria obtained the bishoprics of Trent and Brixen; Prussia, as a compensation for the loss of 1,018 square miles with 122,000 inhabitants west of the Rhine, received 4,875 square miles, with 580,000 inhabitants, including the endowments of the religious houses of Hildesheim and Paderborn, and most of Münster; also Erfurt and Eichsfeld, and the free cities of Nordhausen, Mülhausen, and Goslar; Hanover obtained Osnabrück; to Bavaria, in exchange for the Palatinate, were assigned Würzburg, Bamberg, Freisingen, Augsburg, and Passau, besides a number of cities of the empire, in all about 6,150 square miles, to compensate for 4,240, vastly increasing its political importance. Wirtemberg, too, was richly compensated for the loss of the Mömpelgard by the confiscation of monastery endowments and free cities in Suabia. But Baden made the best bargain of all, receiving about 1,270 square miles of land, formerly belonging to bishops or to the Palatinate, in exchange for 170. After this acquisition, Baden extended, though in patches, from the Neckar to the Swiss border. By building up these three South German states, Napoleon sought to erect a barrier for himself against Austria and Prussia. With the same design, Hesse-Darmstadt and Nassau were much enlarged. There were multitudes of smaller changes, under the name of 'compensations and indemnities.' Four new lay electorates were established in the place of the three secularized prelaties, and were given to Baden, Wirtemberg, Hesse-Cassel, and Salzburg. But they never had occasion to take

part in the election of an emperor."—C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 25, sect. 26-27.

ALSO IN: A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire*, bk. 7 and 15 (v. 1).—J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 1, ch. 4 (v. 1).

A. D. 1803.—Bonaparte's seizure of Hanover in his war with England. See FRANCE: A. D. 1802-1803.

A. D. 1805 (January—April).—The third Coalition against France.—Prussian Neutrality. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (JANUARY—APRIL).

A. D. 1805 (September—December).—Napoleon's overwhelming campaign.—The catastrophes at Ulm and Austerlitz. See FRANCE: A. D. 1805 (MARCH—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1805-1806.—The Peace of Presburg.—Territorial losses of Austria.—Aggrandizement of Bavaria and Wirtemberg, which become kingdoms, and Baden a grand duchy.—The Confederation of the Rhine.—End of the Holy Roman Empire.—"On the 6th of December, hostilities ceased, and the Russians retired by way of Galicia, but in accordance with the terms of the armistice, the French troops continued to occupy all the lands they had invaded, Austria, Tyrol, Venetia, Carniola, Carinthia, and Styria; within Bohemia they were to have the circle of Tabor, together with Brno and Znoymo in Moravia and Pozsony (Pressburg) in Hungary. The Morava (March) and the Hungarian frontier formed the line of demarcation between the two armies. A definitive peace was signed at Pressburg on the 26th of December, 1805. Austria recognized the conquests of France in Holland and Switzerland and the annexation of Genoa, and ceded to the kingdom of Italy Friuli, Istria, Dalmatia with its islands, and the Bocche di Cattaro. A little later, by the explanatory Act of Fontainebleau, she lost the last of her possessions to the west of the Isonzo, when she exchanged these portions of the counties of Gorico and Gradisca which are situated on the right bank of that river for the county of Montefalcone in Istria. The new kingdoms of Bavaria and Wirtemberg [brought into existence by this treaty, through the recognition of them by the Emperor Francis] were aggrandized at the expense of Austria. Bavaria obtained Vorarlberg, the county of Hohenembs, the town of Lindau, and the whole of Tyrol, with Brixen and Trent. Austrian Suabia was given to Wirtemberg, while Breisgau and the Ortenau were bestowed on the new grand-duke of Baden. One compensation alone, the duchy of Salzburg, fell to Austria for all her sacrifices, and this has remained in her possession ever since. The old bishopric of Würzburg was created an electorate and granted to Ferdinand III. of Tuscany and Salzburg. Altogether the monarchy lost about 25,400 square miles and nearly 3,000,000 of inhabitants. She lost Tyrol with its brave and loyal inhabitants and the Vörlände which had assured Austrian influence in Germany; every possession on the Rhine, in the Black Forest, and on the Lower Danube; she no longer touched either Switzerland or Italy, and she ceased to be a maritime power. Besides all this, she had to pay forty millions for the expenses of the war, while she was exhausted by contributions and requisitions. Vienna had suffered much, and the French army had carried off the 2,000 cannons and the 100,000 guns which had been contained in her arsenals.

On the 16th of January, 1806, the emperor Francis returned to his capital. He was enthusiastically received, and the Viennese returned to the luxurious and easy way of life which has always characterized them. . . . Austria seemed no longer to have any part to play in German politics. Bavaria, Würtemberg and Baden had been formed into a separate league—the Confederation of the Rhine—under French protection. On the 1st of August, 1806, these states announced to the Reichstag at Ratisbon that they looked upon the empire as at an end, and on the 6th, Francis II. formally resigned the empire altogether, and released all the imperial officials from their engagements to him. Thus the sceptre of Charlemagne fell from the hands of the dynasty which had held it without interruption from 1438.”—L. Leger, *Hist. of Austro-Hungary*, ch. 25.—“Every bond of union was dissolved with the diet of the empire and with the imperial chamber. The barons and counts of the empire and the petty princes were mediatised; the princes of Hohenlohe, Oettingen, Schwarzenberg, Thurn, and Taxis, the Truchsess von Waldburg, Fürstenberg, Fugger, Leiningen, Löwenstein, Solms, Hesse-Homburg, Wied-Runkel, and Orange-Fulda, became subject to the neighbouring Rhenish confederated princes. Of the remaining six imperial free cities, Augsburg and Nuremberg fell to Bavaria; Frankfurt, under the title of grand-duchy, to the ancient elector of Mayence, who was again transferred thither from Ratisbon. The ancient Hanse-towns, Hamburg, Lübeck, and Bremen, alone retained their freedom.”—W. Menzel, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 253 (v. 3).—“A swift succession of triumphs had left only one thing still preventing the full recognition of the Corsican warrior as sovereign of Western Europe, and that one was the existence of the old Romano-Germanic Empire. Napoleon had not long assumed his new title when he began to mark a distinction between ‘la France’ and ‘l’Empire Française.’ France had, since A. D. 1792, advanced to the Rhine, and, by the annexation of Piedmont, had overstepped the Alps; the French Empire included, besides the kingdom of Italy, a mass of dependent states, Naples, Holland, Switzerland, and many German principalities, the allies of France in the same sense in which the ‘socii populi Romani’ were allies of Rome. When the last of Pitt’s coalitions had been destroyed at Austerlitz, and Austria had made her submission by the peace of Presburg, the conqueror felt that his hour was come. He had now overcome two Emperors, those of Austria and Russia, claiming to represent the old and new Rome respectively, and had in eighteen months created more kings than the occupants of the Germanic throne in as many centuries. It was time, he thought, to sweep away obsolete pretensions, and claim the sole inheritance of that Western Empire, of which the titles and ceremonies of his court presented a grotesque imitation. The task was an easy one after what had been already accomplished. Previous wars and treaties had so redistributed the territories and changed the constitution of the Germanic Empire that it could hardly be said to exist in anything but name. . . . The Emperor Francis, partly foreboding the events that were at hand, partly in order to meet Napoleon’s assumption of the imperial name by depriving that name of its peculiar meaning, began in A. D. 1805 to style himself ‘Hereditary Emperor of

Austria,’ while retaining at the same time his former title. The next act of the drama was one in which we may more readily pardon the ambition of a foreign conqueror than the traitorous selfishness of the German princes, who broke every tie of ancient friendship and duty to grovel at his throne. By the Act of the Confederation of the Rhine, signed at Paris, July 12th, 1806, Bavaria, Würtemberg, Baden, and several other states, sixteen in all, withdrew from the body and repudiated the laws of the Empire, while on August 1st the French envoy at Regensburg announced to the Diet that his master, who had consented to become Protector of the Confederate princes, no longer recognized the existence of the Empire. Francis II. resolved at once to anticipate this new Odoacer, and by a declaration, dated August 6th, 1806, resigned the imperial dignity. His deed states that finding it impossible, in the altered state of things, to fulfil the obligations imposed by his capitulation, he considers as dissolved the bonds which attached him to the Germanic body, releases from their allegiance the states who formed it, and retires to the government of his hereditary dominions under the title of ‘Emperor of Austria.’ Throughout, the term ‘German Empire’ (*Deutsches Reich*) is employed. But it was the crown of Augustus, of Constantine, of Charles, of Maximilian, that Francis of Hapsburg laid down, and a new era in the world’s history was marked by the fall of its most venerable institution. One thousand and six years after Leo the Pope had crowned the Frankish king, eighteen hundred and fifty-eight years after Cæsar had conquered at Pharsalia, the Holy Roman Empire came to its end.”—J. Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, ch. 20.

A. D. 1806 (January–August).—The Confederation of the Rhine.—Cession of Hanover to Prussia.—Double dealing and weakness of the latter.—Her submission to Napoleon’s insults and wrongs.—Final goading of the nation to war.—“The object at which all French politicians had aimed since the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, the exclusion of both Austria and Prussia from influence in Western Germany, was now completely attained. The triumph of French statesmanship, the consummation of two centuries of German discord, was seen in the Act of Federation subscribed by the Western German Sovereigns in the summer of 1806. By this Act the Kings of Bavaria and Würtemberg, the Elector of Baden, and 13 minor princes, united themselves, in the League known as the Rhenish Confederacy, under the protection of the French Emperor, and undertook to furnish contingents, amounting to 63,000 men, in all wars in which the French Empire should engage. Their connection with the ancient Germanic Body was completely severed; the very town in which the Diet of the Empire had held its meetings was annexed by one of the members of the Confederacy. The Confederacy itself, with a population of 8,000,000, became for all purposes of war and foreign policy a part of France. Its armies were organised by French officers; its frontiers were fortified by French engineers; its treaties were made for it at Paris. In the domestic changes which took place within these States the work of consolidation begun in 1801 was carried forward with increased vigour. Scores of tiny principalities which had escaped dissolution

in the earlier movement were now absorbed by their stronger neighbours. . . . With the establishment of the Rhenish Confederacy and the conquest of Naples, Napoleon's empire reached, but did not overpass, the limits within which the sovereignty of France might probably have been long maintained. . . . If we may judge from the feeling with which Napoleon was regarded in Germany down to the middle of the year 1806, and in Italy down to a much later date, the Empire then founded might have been permanently upheld, if Napoleon had abstained from attacking other States." During the winter of 1806, Count Haugwitz, the Prussian minister, had visited Paris "for the purpose of obtaining some modification in the treaty which he had signed [at the palace of Schönbrunn, near Vienna] on behalf of Prussia after the battle of Austerlitz. The principal feature in that treaty had been the grant of Hanover to Prussia by the French Emperor in return for its alliance. This was the point which above all others excited King Frederick William's fears and scruples. He desired to acquire Hanover, but he also desired to derive his title rather from its English owner [King George III., who was also Elector of Hanover] than from its French invader. It was the object of Haugwitz' visit to Paris to obtain an alteration in the terms of the treaty which should make the Prussian occupation of Hanover appear to be merely provisional, and reserve to the King of England at least a nominal voice in its ultimate transfer. In full confidence that Napoleon would agree to such a change, the King of Prussia, on taking possession of Hanover in January, 1806, concealed the fact of its cession to himself by Napoleon, and published an untruthful proclamation. . . . The bitter truth that the treaty between France and Prussia contained no single word reserving the rights of the Elector, and that the very idea of qualifying the absolute cession of Hanover was an afterthought, lay hidden in the conscience of the Prussian Government. Never had a Government more completely placed itself at the mercy of a pitiless enemy. Count Haugwitz, on reaching Paris, was received by Napoleon with a storm of indignation and contempt. Napoleon declared that the ill-faith of Prussia had made an end even of that miserable pact which had been extorted after Austerlitz, and insisted that Prussia should openly defy Great Britain by closing the ports of Northern Germany to British vessels, and by declaring itself endowed by Napoleon with Hanover in virtue of Napoleon's own right of conquest. Haugwitz signed a second and more humiliating treaty [February 15] embodying these conditions; and the Prussian Government, now brought into the depths of contempt, but unready for immediate war, executed the orders of its master. . . . A decree was published excluding the ships of England from the ports of Prussia and from those of Hanover itself (March 28, 1806). It was promptly followed by the seizure of 400 Prussian vessels in British harbours, and by the total extinction of Prussian maritime commerce by British privateers. Scarcely was Prussia committed to this ruinous conflict with Great Britain when Napoleon opened negotiations for peace with Mr. Fox's Government. The first condition required by Great Britain was the restitution of Hanover to King George III. It was unhesitatingly granted by Napoleon. Thus

was Prussia to be mocked of its prey, after it had been robbed of all its honour. . . . There was scarcely a courtier in Berlin who did not feel that the yoke of the French had become past endurance; even Haugwitz himself now considered war as a question of time. The patriotic party in the capital and the younger officers of the army bitterly denounced the dishonoured Government, and urged the King to strike for the credit of his country. . . . Brunswick was summoned to the King's council to form plans of a campaign; and appeals for help were sent to Vienna, to St. Petersburg, and even to the hostile Court of London. The condition of Prussia at this critical moment was one which filled with the deepest alarm those few patriotic statesmen who were not blinded by national vanity or by a slavery to routine. . . . Early in the year 1806 a paper was drawn up by Stein, exposing, in language seldom used by a statesman, the character of the men by whom Frederick William was surrounded, and declaring that nothing but a speedy change of system could save the Prussian State from utter downfall and ruin. Two measures of immediate necessity were specified by Stein, the establishment of a responsible council of Ministers, and the removal of Haugwitz and all his friends from power. . . . The army of Prussia . . . was nothing but the army of Frederick the Great grown twenty years older. . . . All Southern Germany was still in Napoleon's hands. The appearance of a Russian force in Dalmatia, after that country had been ceded by Austria to the French Emperor, had given Napoleon an excuse for maintaining his troops in their positions beyond the Rhine. As the probability of a war with Prussia became greater and greater, Napoleon tightened his grasp upon the Confederate States. Publications originating among the patriotic circles of Austria were beginning to appeal to the German people to unite against a foreign oppressor. An anonymous pamphlet, entitled 'Germany in its Deep Humiliation,' was sold by various booksellers in Bavaria, among others by Palm, a citizen of Nuremberg. There is no evidence that Palm was even acquainted with the contents of the pamphlet; but . . . Napoleon . . . required a victim to terrify those who, among the German people, might be inclined to listen to the call of patriotism. Palm was not too obscure for the new Charlemagne. The innocent and unoffending man, innocent even of the honourable crime of attempting to save his country, was dragged before a tribunal of French soldiers, and executed within twenty-four hours of his trial, in pursuance of the imperative orders of Napoleon (August 26). . . . Several years later, . . . the story of Palm's death was one of those that kindled the bitterest sense of wrong; at the time, it exercised no influence upon the course of political events. Prussia had already resolved upon war."—C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 1, ch. 6-7.

ALSO IN: Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 51-52.—J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 2, ch. 4-5 (v. 1).—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 15.

A. D. 1806 (October).—Napoleon's sudden invasion of Prussia.—The decisive battle of Jena.—Prostration of the Prussian Kingdom.—"The Emperor of Russia . . . visited Berlin, when the feelings of Prussia, and indeed of all the neighbouring states, were in this fever of

excitement. He again urged Frederick William to take up arms in the common cause, and offered to back him with all the forces of his own great empire. The English government, taking advantage of the same crisis, sent Lord Morpeth to Berlin, with offers of pecuniary supplies—about the acceptance of which, however, the anxiety of Prussia on the subject of Hanover created some difficulty. Lastly, Buonaparte, well informed of what was passing in Berlin, and desirous, since war must be, to hurry Frederick into the field ere the armies of the Czar could be joined with his, now poured out in the 'Moniteur' such abuse on the persons and characters of the Queen, Prince Louis, and every illustrious patriot throughout Prussia, that the general wrath could no longer be held in check. Warlike preparations of every kind filled the kingdom during August and September. On the 1st of October the Prussian minister at Paris presented a note to Talleyrand, demanding, among other things, that the formation of a confederacy in the north of Germany should no longer be thwarted by French interference, and that the French troops within the territories of the Rhenish League should recross the Rhine into France, by the 8th of the same month of October. But Napoleon was already in person on the German side of the Rhine; and his answer to the Prussian note was a general order to his own troops, in which he called on them to observe in what manner a German sovereign still dared to insult the soldiers of Austerlitz. The conduct of Prussia, in thus rushing into hostilities without waiting for the advance of the Russians, was as rash as her holding back from Austria during the campaign of Austerlitz had been cowardly. As if determined to profit by no lesson, the Prussian council also directed their army to advance towards the French, instead of lying on their own frontier—a repetition of the great leading blunder of the Austrians in the preceding year. The Prussian army accordingly invaded the Saxon provinces, and the Elector . . . was compelled to accept the alliance which the cabinet of Berlin urged on him, and to join his troops with those of the power by which he had been thus insulted and wronged. No sooner did Napoleon know that the Prussians had advanced into the heart of Saxony, than he formed the plan of his campaign; and they, persisting in their advance, and taking up their position finally on the Saale, afforded him, as if studiously, the means of repeating, at their expense, the very manœuvres which had ruined the Austrians in the preceding campaign." The flank of the Prussian position was turned,—the bridge across the Saale, at Saalfeld, having been secured, after a hot engagement with the corps of Prince Louis of Prussia who fell in the fight,—“the French army passed entirely round them; Napoleon seized Naumburg and blew up the magazines there,—announcing, for the first time, by this explosion, to the King of Prussia and his generalissimo the Duke of Brunswick, that he was in their rear. From this moment the Prussians were isolated, and cut off from all their resources, as completely as the army of Mack was at Ulm, when the French had passed the Danube and overrun Suabia. The Duke of Brunswick hastily endeavoured to concentrate his forces for the purpose of cutting his way back again to the frontier which he had so rashly abandoned. Napoleon,

meantime, had posted his divisions so as to watch the chief passages of the Saale, and expected, in confidence, the assault of his outwitted opponent. It was now that he found leisure to answer the manifesto of Frederick William. . . . His letter, dated at Gera, is written in the most elaborate style of insult. . . . The Prussian King understood well, on learning the fall of Naumburg, the imminent danger of his position; and his army was forthwith set in motion, in two great masses; the former, where he was in person present, advancing towards Naumburg; the latter attempting, in like manner, to force their passage through the French line in the neighbourhood of Jena. The King's march was arrested at Auerstadt by Davoust, who, after a severely contested action, at length repelled the assailant. Napoleon himself, meanwhile, was engaged with the other great body of the Prussians. Arriving on the evening of the 13th October at Jena, he perceived that the enemy were ready to attempt the advance next morning, while his own heavy train was still six-and-thirty hours' march in his rear. Not discouraged with this adverse circumstance, the Emperor laboured all night in directing and encouraging his soldiery to cut a road through the rocks, and draw up by that means such light guns as he had at command to a position on a lofty plateau in front of Jena, where no man could have expected beforehand that any artillery whatever should be planted. . . . Lannes commanded the centre, Augereau the right, Soult the left, and Murat the reserve and cavalry. Soult had to sustain the first assault of the Prussians, which was violent—and sudden; for the mist lay so thick on the field that the armies were within half-gunshot of each other ere the sun and wind rose and discovered them, and on that instant Mollendorf charged. The battle was contested well for some time on this point; but at length Ney appeared in the rear of the Emperor with a fresh division; and then the French centre advanced to a general charge, before which the Prussians were forced to retire. They moved for some space in good order; but Murat now poured his masses of cavalry on them, storm after storm, with such rapidity and vehemence that their rout became inevitable. It ended in the complete breaking up of the army—horse and foot all flying together, in the confusion of panic, upon the road to Weimar. At that point the fugitives met and mingled with their brethren flying, as confusedly as themselves, from Auerstadt. In the course of this disastrous day 20,000 Prussians were killed or taken, 300 guns, 20 generals, and 60 standards. The Commander-in-Chief, the Duke of Brunswick, being wounded in the face with a grape-shot, was carried early off the field, never to recover. . . . The various routed divisions roamed about the country, seeking separately the means of escape: they were in consequence destined to fall an easy prey. . . . The Prince of Hohenlohe at length drew together not less than 50,000 of these wandering soldiers,” and retreated towards the Oder; but was forced, in the end, to lay down his arms at Prentzlow. “His rear, consisting of about 10,000, under the command of the celebrated General Blücher, was so far behind as to render it possible for them to attempt escape. Their heroic leader traversed the country with them for some time unbroken, and sustained a variety of assaults, from far superior

numbers, with the most obstinate resolution. By degrees, however, the French, under Soult, hemmed him in on one side, Murat on the other, and Bernadotte appeared close behind him. He was thus forced to throw himself into Lubeck, where a severe action was fought in the streets of the town, on the 6th of November. The Prussian, in this battle, lost 4,000 prisoners, besides the slain and wounded: he retreated to Schwerta, and there, it being impossible for him to go farther without violating the neutrality of Denmark, on the morning of the 7th, Blücher at length laid down his arms. . . . The strong fortresses of the Prussian monarchy made as ineffectual resistance as the armies in the field. . . . Buonaparte, in person, entered Berlin on the 25th of October; and before the end of November, except Königsberg—where the King himself had found refuge, and gathered round him a few thousand troops. . . .—and a few less important fortresses, the whole of the German possessions of the house of Brandenburg were in the hands of the conqueror. Louis Buonaparte, King of Holland, meanwhile had advanced into Westphalia and occupied that territory also, with great part of Hanover, East Friesland, Embden, and the dominions of Hesse-Cassel.”—J. G. Lockhart, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 20.

ALSO IN: C. Adams, *Great Campaigns in Europe from 1796 to 1870*, ch. 4.—Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 9 (v. 2).—*Memoirs of Napoleon dictated at St. Helena*, v. 6, pp. 60–72.—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe, 1789–1815*, ch. 43 (v. 10).—Duke of Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 1, pt. 2, ch. 21–23.

A. D. 1806 (October—December).—Napoleon's ungenerous use of his victory.—His insults to the Queen of Prussia.—The kingdom governed as conquered territory.—The French advance into Poland, to meet the Russians.—Saxony made a kingdom.—“Napoleon made a severe and ungenerous use of his victory. The old Duke of Brunswick, respectable from his age, his achievements under the Great Frederick, and the honourable wounds he had recently received on the field of battle, and who had written a letter to Napoleon, after the battle of Jena, recommending his subjects to his generosity, was in an especial manner the object of invective. His states were overrun, and the official bulletins disgraced by a puerile tirade against a general who had done nothing but discharge his duty to his sovereign. For this he was punished by the total confiscation of his dominions. So virulent was the language employed, and such the apprehensions in consequence inspired, that the wounded general was compelled, with great personal suffering, to take refuge in Altona, where he soon after died. The Queen, whose spirit in prosperous and constancy in adverse fortune had justly endeared her to her subjects, and rendered her the admiration of all Europe, was pursued in successive bulletins with unmanly sarcasms; and a heroic princess, whose only fault, if fault it was, had been an excess of patriotic ardour, was compared to Helen, whose faithless vices had involved her country in the calamities consequent on the siege of Troy. The whole dominions of the Elector of Hesse Cassel were next seized; and that prince, who had not even combated at Jena, but merely permitted, when he could not prevent, the entry of the Prussians into his dominions, was dethroned and

deprived of all his possessions. . . . The Prince of Orange, brother-in-law to the King of Prussia, . . . shared the same fate: while to the nobles of Berlin he used publicly the cruel expression, more withering to his own reputation than theirs, —‘I will render that noblesse so poor that they shall be obliged to beg their bread.’ . . . Meanwhile the French armies, without any further resistance, took possession of the whole country between the Rhine and the Oder; and in the rear of the victorious bands appeared, in severity unprecedented even in the revolutionary armies, the dismal scourge of contributions. Resolved to maintain the war exclusively on the provinces which were to be its theatre, Napoleon had taken only 24,000 francs in specie across the Rhine in the military chest of the army. It soon appeared from whom the deficiency was to be supplied. On the day after the battle of Jena appeared a proclamation, directing the levy of an extraordinary war contribution of 159,000,000 francs (£6,300,000) on the countries at war with France, of which 100,000,000 was to be borne by the Prussian states to the west of the Vistula, 25,000,000 by the Elector of Saxony [who had already detached himself from his alliance with Prussia], and the remainder by the lesser states in the Prussian confederacy. This enormous burden . . . was levied with unrelenting severity. . . . Nor was this all. The whole civil authorities who remained in the abandoned provinces were compelled to take an oath of fidelity to the French Emperor,—an unprecedented step, which clearly indicated the intention of annexing the Prussian dominions to the great nation. . . . Early in November there appeared an elaborate ordinance, which provided for the complete civil organisation and military occupation of the whole country from the Rhine to the Vistula. By this decree the conquered states were divided into four departments; those of Berlin, of Magdeburg, of Stettin, and of Custrin; the military and civil government of the whole conquered territory was intrusted to a governor-general at Berlin, having under him eight commanders of provinces into which it was divided. . . . The same system of government was extended to the duchy of Brunswick, the states of Hesse and Hanover, the duchy of Mecklenburg, and the Hanse towns, including Hamburg, which was speedily oppressed by grievous contributions. . . . The Emperor openly announced his determination to retain possession of all these states till England consented to his demands on the subject of the liberty of the seas. . . . Meanwhile the negotiations for the conclusion of a separate peace between France and Prussia were resumed. . . . The severity of the terms demanded, as well as . . . express assurances that no concessions, how great soever, could lead to a separate accommodation, as Napoleon was resolved to retain all his conquests until a general peace, led, as might have been expected, to the rupture of the negotiations. Desperate as the fortunes of Prussia were, . . . the King . . . declared his resolution to stand or fall with the Emperor of Russia [who was vigorously preparing to fulfil his promise of help to the stricken nation]. This refusal was anticipated by Napoleon. It reached him at Posen, whither he had advanced on his road to the Vistula; and nothing remained but to enter vigorously on the prosecution of the war in Poland. To this period of

the war belongs the famous Berlin decree [see FRANCE: A. D. 1806-1810] of the 21st November against the commerce of Great Britain. . . . Napoleon . . . at Posen, in Prussian Poland, gave audience to the deputies of that unhappy kingdom, who came to implore his support to the remains of its once mighty dominion. His words were calculated to excite hopes which his subsequent conduct never realised. . . . While the main body of the French army was advancing by rapid strides from the Oder to the Vistula, Napoleon, ever anxious to secure his communications, and clear his rear of hostile bodies, caused two different armies to advance to support the flanks of the invading force. . . . The whole of the north of Germany was overrun by French troops, while 100,000 were assembling to meet the formidable legions of Russia in the heart of Poland. Vast as the forces of Napoleon were, such prodigious efforts, over so great an extent of surface, rendered fresh supplies indispensable. The senate at Paris was ready to furnish them; and on the requisition of the Emperor 80,000 were voted from the youth who were to arrive at the military age in 1807. . . . A treaty, offensive and defensive, between Saxony and France, was the natural result of these successes. This convention, arranged by Talleyrand, was signed at Posen, on the 12th December. It stipulated that the Elector of Saxony should be elevated to the dignity of king; he was admitted into the Confederation of the Rhine, and his contingent fixed at 20,000 men. By a separate article, it was provided that the passage of foreign troops across the kingdom of Saxony should take place without the consent of the sovereign: a provision which sufficiently pointed it out as a military outpost of the great nation—while, by a subsidiary treaty, signed at Posen three days afterwards, the whole minor princes of the House of Saxony were also admitted into the Confederacy.” —Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe, 1789-1815*, ch. 43, sect. 87-99 (v. 10).

ALSO IN: P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 16.—Mrs. S. Austin, *Germany from 1760 to 1814*, p. 294, and after.—E. H. Hudson, *Life and Times of Louisa, Queen of Prussia*, v. 2, ch. 8-9.

A. D. 1806-1807.—Opening of Napoleon's campaign against the Russians.—The deluding of the Poles.—Indecisive battle of Eylau.—The campaign against the Russians “opened early in the winter. The 1st of November, the Russians and French marched towards the Vistula, the former from the Memel, the latter from the Oder. Fifty thousand Russians pressed forward under General Benningsen; a second and equal army followed at a distance with a reserve force. Some of the Russian forces on the Turkish frontier were recalled, but were still remote. The first two Russian armies, with the remaining Prussians, numbered about 120,000. England made many promises and kept few of them, thinking more of conquering Spanish and Dutch colonies than of helping her allies. Her aid was limited to a small reinforcement of the Swedes guarding Swedish Pomerania, the only portion of Northern Germany not yet in French power. Gustavus II., the young King of Sweden, weak and impulsive, rushed headlong, without a motive, into the . . . alliance [against Napoleon], destined to be so fatal to Sweden. . . . Eighty thousand men under Murat crossed

the Oder and entered Prussian Poland, and an equal number stood ready to sustain them. November 9, Davout's division entered Posen, the principal town of the Polish provinces still preserving the national sentiment, and whose people detested Prussian rule and resented the treachery with which Prussia dismembered Poland after swearing alliance with her. All along the road, the peasants hastened to meet the French; and at Posen, Davout was hailed with an enthusiasm which moved even him, cold and severe as he was, and he urged Napoleon to justify the hopes of Poland, who looked to him as her savior. The Russian vanguard reached Warsaw before the French, but made no effort to remain there, and recrossed the Vistula. November 28, Davout and Murat entered the town, and public delight knew no bounds. It would be a mere illusion to fancy that sentiments of right and justice had any share in Napoleon's resolve, and that he was stirred by a desire to repair great wrongs. His only question was whether the resurrection of Poland would increase his greatness or not; and if he told the Sultan that he meant to restore Poland, it was because he thought Turkey would assist him the more willingly against Russia. He also offered part of Silesia to Austria, if she would aid him in the restoration of Poland by the cession of her Polish provinces; but it was not a sufficient offer, and therefore not serious. The truth was that he wanted promises from the Poles before he made any to them. . . . Thousands of Poles enlisted under the French flag and joined the Polish legions left from the Italian war. Napoleon established a provisional government of well-known Poles in Warsaw, and required nothing but volunteers of the country. He had seized without a blow that line of the Vistula which the Prussian king would not barter for a truce, and might have gone into winter-quarters there; but the Russians were close at hand on the opposite shore, in two great divisions 100,000 strong, in a wooded and marshy country forming a sort of triangle, whose point touches the union of the Narew and Ukra rivers with the Vistula, a few leagues below Warsaw. The Russians communicated with the sea by a Prussian corps stationed between them and Dantzic. Napoleon would not permit them to hold this post, and resolved to strike a blow, before going into winter-quarters, which should cut them off from the sea and drive them back towards the Memel and Lithuania. He crossed the Vistula, December 23, and attacked the Russians between the Narew and the Ukra. A series of bloody battles followed [the most important being at Pultusk and Golymin, Dec. 26] in the dense forests and deep bogs of the thawing land. Napoleon said that he had discovered a fifth element in Poland,—mud. Men and horses stuck in the swamp and the cannons could not be extricated. Luckily the Russians were in the incompetent hands of General Kamenski, and both parties fought in the dark, the labyrinth of swamps and woods preventing either army from guessing the other's movements. The Russians were finally driven, with great loss, beyond the Narew towards the forests of Belostok, and a Prussian corps striving to assist them was driven back to the sea. . . . The grand army did not long enjoy the rest it so much needed; for the Russians, whose losses were more than made up by the arrival of their reserves,

suddenly resumed the offensive. General Benningsen, who gave a fearful proof of his sinister energy by the murder of Paul I., had been put in command in Kamenski's place. Marching round the forests and traversing the line of lakes which divide the basin of the Narew from those water-courses flowing directly to the sea, he reached the maritime part of old Prussia, intending to cross the Vistula and drive the French from their position in Poland. He had hoped to surprise the French left wing, lying between the Passarge and Lower Vistula, but arrived too late. Ney and Bernadotte rapidly concentrated their forces and fought with a bravery which arrested the Russians (January 25 and 27). Napoleon came to the rescue, and having once driven the enemy into the woods and marshes of the interior, now strove to turn those who meant to turn him, by an inverse action forcing them to the sea-coast. . . . Benningsen then halted beyond Eylau, and massed his forces to receive battle next day [February 8]. He had about 70,000 men, twice the artillery of Napoleon (400 guns against 200), and hoped to be joined betimes by a Prussian corps. Napoleon could only dispose of 60,000 out of his 300,000 men,—Ney being some leagues away and Bernadotte out of reach. . . . The battle-field was a fearful sight next day. Twelve thousand Russians and 10,000 French lay dying and dead on the vast fields of snow reddened with blood. The Russians, besides, carried off 15,000 wounded. 'What an ineffectual massacre!' cried Ney, as he traversed the scene of carnage. This was too true; for although Napoleon drove the Russians to the sea, it was not in the way he desired. Benningsen succeeded in reaching Königsberg, where he could rest and reinforce his army, and Napoleon was not strong enough to drive him from this last shelter."—H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France from 1789*, v. 2, ch. 11.

ALSO IN: Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 10 (v. 2).—C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I.*, v. 1, ch. 8.—J. C. Ropes, *The First Napoleon*, lect. 3.—Baron de Marbot, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 29-30.

A. D. 1806-1810.—Commercial blockade by the English Orders in Council and Napoleon's Decrees. See FRANCE: A. D. 1806-1810.

A. D. 1807 (February—June).—Closer alliance of Prussia and Russia.—Treaty of Bartenstein.—Napoleon's victory at Friedland.—End of the campaign.—The effect produced in Europe by the doubtful battle of Eylau "was unlucky for France; in Paris the Funds fell. Benningsen boldly ordered the *Te Deum* to be sung. In order to confirm his victory, re-organise his army, reassure France, re-establish the opinion of Europe, encourage the Polish insurrection, and to curb the ill-will of Germany and Austria, Napoleon remained a week at Eylau. He negotiated: on one side he caused Talleyrand to write to Zastrow, the Prussian foreign minister, to propose peace and his alliance; he sent Bertrand to Memel to offer to re-establish the King of Prussia, on the condition of no foreign intervention. He also tried to negotiate with Benningsen; to which the latter made answer, 'that his master had charged him to fight, and not negotiate.' After some hesitation, Prussia ended by joining her fortunes to those of Russia. By the convention of Bartenstein (25th April, 1807) the two sovereigns came to terms on the following points:—1. The re-establishment of Prussia

within the limits of 1805. 2. The dissolution of the Confederation of the Rhine. 3. The restitution to Austria of the Tyrol and Venice. 4. The accession of England to the coalition, and the aggrandisement of Hanover. 5. The co-operation of Sweden. 6. The restoration of the house of Orange, and indemnities to the kings of Naples and Sardinia. This document is important; it nearly reproduces the conditions offered to Napoleon at the Congress of Prague, in 1813. Russia and Prussia proposed then to make a more pressing appeal to Austria, Sweden, and England; but the Emperor Francis was naturally undecided, and the Archduke Charles, alleging the state of the finances and the army, strongly advised him against any new intervention. Sweden was too weak; and notwithstanding his fury against Napoleon, Gustavus III. had just been forced to treat with Mortier. The English minister showed a remarkable inability to conceive the situation; he refused to guarantee the new Russian loan of a hundred and fifty millions, and would lend himself to no maritime diversion. Napoleon showed the greatest diplomatic activity. The Sultan Selim III. declared war against Russia; General Sebastiani, the envoy at Constantinople, put the Bosphorus in a state of defence, and repulsed the English fleet [see TURKS: A. D. 1806-1807]; General Gardane left for Ispahan, with a mission to cause a Persian outbreak in the Caucasus. Dantzic had capitulated [May 24, after a long siege], and Lefebvre's 40,000 men were therefore ready for service. Masséna took 36,000 of them into Italy. In the spring, Benningsen, who had been reinforced by 10,000 regular troops, 6,000 Cossacks, and the Imperial Guard, being now at the head of 100,000 men, took the offensive; Gortchakof commanding the right and Bagration the left. He tried, as in the preceding year, to seize Ney's division; but the latter fought, as he retired, two bloody fights, at Gutstadt and Ankendorff. Benningsen, again in danger of being surrounded, retired on Heilsberg. He defended himself bravely (June 10); but the French, extending their line on his right, marched on Eylau, so as to cut him off from Königsberg. The Russian generalissimo retreated; but being pressed, he had to draw up at Friedland, on the Alle. The position he had taken up was most dangerous. All his army was enclosed in an angle of the Alle, with the steep bed of the river at their backs, which in case of misfortune left them only one means of retreat, over the three bridges of Friedland. . . . 'Where are the Russians concealed?' asked Napoleon when he came up. When he had noted their situation, he exclaimed, 'It is not every day that one surprises the enemy in such a fault.' He put Lannes and Victor in reserve, ordered Mortier to oppose Gortchakof on the left and to remain still, as the movement which 'would be made by the right would pivot on the left.' As to Ney, he was to cope on the right with Bagration, who was shut in by the angle of the river; he was to meet them 'with his head down,' without taking any care of his own safety. Ney led the charge with irresistible fury; the Russians were riddled by his artillery at 150 paces: he successively crushed the chasseurs of the Russian Guard, the Ismailovski, and the Horse Guards, burnt Friedland by shells, and cannonaded the bridges which were the only means of retreat. . . . The Russian left wing was almost thrown into the river; Bagration,

with the Semenovskî and other troops, was hardly able to cover the defeat. On the Russian right, Gortchakof, who had advanced to attack the immovable Mortier, had only time to ford the Alle. Count Lambert retired with 29 guns by the left bank; the rest fled by the right bank, closely pursued by the cavalry. Meanwhile Murat, Davoust, and Soult, who had taken no part in the battle, arrived before Königsberg. Lestocq, with 25,000 men, tried to defend it, but on learning the disaster of Friedland he hastily evacuated it. Only one fortress now remained to Frederick William — the little town of Memel. The Russians had lost at Friedland from 15,000 to 20,000 men, besides 80 guns (June 14, 1807). . . . Alexander had no longer an army. Only one man, Barclay de Tolly, proposed to continue the war; but in order to do this it would be necessary to re-enter Russia, to penetrate into the very heart of the empire, to burn everything on the way, and only present a desert to the enemy. Alexander hoped to get off more cheaply. He wrote a severe letter to Bennigsen, and gave him powers to treat."—A. Rambaud, *Hist. of Russia*, v. 2, ch. 12.

Also in: Duke de Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 2, pt. 1, ch. 4-6.

A. D. 1807 (June—July).—The Treaty of Tilsit.—Its known and its unknown agreements.—"Alexander I. now determined to negotiate in person with the rival emperor, and on the 25th of June the two sovereigns met at Tilsit, on a raft which was moored in the middle of the Niemen. The details of the conference are a secret, as Napoleon's subsequent account of it is untrustworthy, and no witnesses were present. All that is certain is that Alexander I., whose character was a curious mixture of nobility and weakness, was completely won over by his conqueror. . . . Napoleon, . . . instead of attempting to impose extreme terms upon a country which it was impossible to conquer, . . . offered to share with Russia the supremacy in Europe which had been won by French arms. The only conditions were the abandonment of the cause of the old monarchies, which seemed hopeless, and an alliance with France against England. Alexander had several grievances against the English government, especially the lukewarm support that had been given in recent operations, and made no objection to resume the policy of his predecessors in this respect. Two interviews sufficed to arrange the basis of an agreement. Both sovereigns abandoned their allies without scruple. Alexander gave up Prussia and Sweden, while Napoleon deserted the cause of the Poles, who had trusted to his zeal for their independence, and of the Turks, whom his envoy had recently induced to make war upon Russia. The Treaty of Tilsit was speedily drawn up; on the 7th of July peace was signed between France and Russia, on the 9th between France and Prussia. Frederick William III. had to resign the whole of his kingdom west of the Elbe, together with all the acquisitions which Prussia had made in the second and third partitions of Poland. The provinces that were left, amounting to barely half of what he had inherited, were burthened with the payment of an enormous sum as compensation to France. The district west of the Elbe was united with Hesse-Cassel, Brunswick, and ultimately with Hanover, to form the kingdom of Westphalia, which was given to Napoleon's youngest

brother, Jerome. Of Polish Prussia, one province, Bialystock, was added to Russia, and the rest was made into the grand duchy of Warsaw, and transferred to Saxony. Danzig, with the surrounding territory, was declared a free state under Prussian and Saxon protection, but it was really subject to France, and remained a centre of French power on the Baltic. All trade between Prussia and England was cut off. Alexander I., on his side, recognised all Napoleon's new creations in Europe — the Confederation of the Rhine, the kingdoms of Italy, Naples, Holland, and Westphalia, and undertook to mediate between France and England. But the really important agreement between France and Russia was to be found, not in the formal treaties, but in the secret conventions which were arranged by the two emperors. The exact text of these has never been made public, and it is probable that some of the terms rested upon verbal rather than on written understandings, but the general drift of them is unquestionable. The bribe offered to Alexander was the aggrandisement of Russia in the East. To make him an accomplice in the acts of Napoleon, he was to be allowed to annex Finland from Sweden, and Moldavia and Wallachia from Turkey. With regard to England, Russia undertook to adopt Napoleon's blockade-system, and to obtain the adhesion of those states which still remained open to English trade—Sweden, Denmark, and Portugal."—R. Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, ch. 24, sect. 25. —"‘I thought,’ said Napoleon at St. Helena, ‘it would benefit the world to drive these brutes, the Turks, out of Europe. But when I reflected what power it would give to Russia, from the number of Greeks in the Turkish dominions who may be considered Russians, I refused to consent to it, especially as Alexander wanted Constantinople, which would have destroyed the equilibrium of power in Europe. France would gain Egypt, Syria, and the islands; but those were nothing to what Russia would have obtained.’ This coincides with Savary's [Duke de Rovigo's] statement, that Alexander told him Napoleon said he was under no engagements to the new Sultan, and that changes in the world inevitably changed the relations of states to one another; and again, Alexander said that, in their conversations at Tilsit, Napoleon often told him he did not require the evacuation of Moldavia and Wallachia; he would place things in a train to dispense with it, and it was not possible to suffer longer the presence of the Turks in Europe. ‘He even left me,’ said Alexander, ‘to entertain the project of driving them back into Asia. It is only since that he has returned to the idea of leaving Constantinople to them, and some surrounding provinces.’ One day, when Napoleon was talking to Alexander, he asked his secretary, M. Meneval, for the map of Turkey, opened it, then renewed the conversation; and placing his finger on Constantinople said several times to the secretary, though not loud enough to be heard by Alexander, ‘Constantinople, Constantinople, never. It is the capital of the world.’ . . . It is very evident in their conversations that Napoleon agreed to his [Alexander's] possessing himself of the Turkish Empire up to the Balkan, if not beyond; though Bignon denies that any plan for the actual partition of Turkey was embodied in the treaty of Tilsit. Hardenberg, not always well informed, asserts that it was. Savary says

he could not believe that Napoleon would have abandoned the Turks without a compensation in some other quarter; and he felt certain Alexander had agreed in return to Napoleon's project for the conquest of Spain, 'which the Emperor had very much at heart.'—C. Joyneville, *Life and Times of Alexander I.*, v. 1, ch. 8.

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe, 1789-1815*, ch. 46 (v. 10).—Count Miot de Melito, *Memoirs*, ch. 24.—P. Lanfrey, *Hist. of Napoleon*, ch. 3-4.—Prince de Talleyrand, *Memoirs*, pt. 3 (v. 1).—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire*, bk. 27 (v. 2).

A. D. 1807 (July).—The collapse of Prussia and its Causes.—"For the five years that followed, Prussia is to be conceived, in addition to all her other humiliations, as in the hands of a remorseless creditor whose claims are decided by himself without appeal, and who wants more than all he can get. She is to be thought of as supporting for more than a year after the conclusion of the Treaty a French army of more than 150,000 men, then as supporting a French garrison in three principal fortresses, and finally, just before the period ends, as having to support the huge Russian expedition in its passage through the country. . . . It was not in fact from the Treaty of Tilsit, but from the systematic breach of it, that the sufferings of Prussia between 1807 and 1813 arose. It is indeed hardly too much to say that the advantage of the Treaty was received only by France, and that the only object Napoleon can have had in signing it was to inflict more harm on Prussia than he could inflict by simply continuing the war. Such was the downfall of Prussia. The tremendousness of the catastrophe strikes us less because we know that it was soon retrieved, and that Prussia rose again and became greater than ever. But could this recovery be anticipated? A great nation, we say, cannot be dissolved by a few disasters; patriotism and energy will retrieve everything. But precisely these seemed wanting. The State seemed to have fallen in pieces because it had no principle of cohesion, and was only held together by an artificial bureaucracy. It had been created by the energy of its government and the efficiency of its soldiers, and now it appeared to come to an end because its government had ceased to be energetic and its soldiers to be efficient. The catastrophe could not but seem as irremediable as it was sudden and complete." There may be discerned "three distinct causes for it. First, the undecided and pusillanimous policy pursued by the Prussian government since 1803 had an evident influence upon the result by making the great Powers, particularly England and Austria, slow to render it assistance, and also by making the commanders, especially Brunswick, irresolute in action because they could not, even at the last moment, believe the war to be serious. This indecision we have observed to have been connected with a mal-organisation of the Foreign Department. Secondly, the corruption of the military system, which led to the surrender of the fortresses. Thirdly, a misfortune for which Prussia was not responsible, its desertion by Russia at a critical moment, and the formation of a close alliance between Russia and France."—J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 2, ch. 5 (v. 1).

A. D. 1807-1808.—The great Revolutionary Reforms of Hardenberg, Stein and Scharn-

horst.—Edict of Emancipation.—Military reorganization.—Beginning of local self-government.—Seeds of a new national life.—"The work of those who resisted Napoleon—even if no one of them should ever be placed in the highest class of the benefactors of mankind—has in some cases proved enduring, and nowhere so much as in Germany. They began two great works—the reorganisation of Prussia and the revival of the German nationality, and time has deliberately ratified their views. Without retrogression, without mistake, except the mistake which in such matters is the most venial that can be committed, that, namely, of over-caution, of excessive hesitation, the edifice which was then founded has been raised higher and higher till it is near completion. . . . Because Frederick-William III. remains quietly seated on the throne through the whole period, we remain totally unaware that a Prussian revolution took place then—a revolution so comprehensive that the old reign and glories of Frederick may fairly be said to belong to another world—to an 'ancien régime' that has utterly passed away. It was a revolution which, though it did not touch the actual framework of government in such a way as to substitute one of Aristotle's forms of government for another, yet went so far beyond government, and made such a transformation both in industry and culture, that it deserves the name of revolution far more, for instance, than our English Revolution of the 17th century. . . . In Prussia few of the most distinguished statesmen, few even of those who took the lead in her liberation from Napoleon, were Prussians. Blücher himself began life in the service of Sweden, Scharnhorst was a Hanoverian, so was Hardenberg, and Stein came from Nassau. Niebuhr was enticed to Berlin from the Bank of Copenhagen. Hardenberg served George III. and afterwards the Duke of Brunswick before he entered the service of Frederick-William II.; and when Stein was dismissed by Frederick-William III. in the midst of the war of 1806, though he was a man of property and rank, he took measures to ascertain whether they were in want of a Finance Minister at St. Petersburg. . . . We misapprehend the nature of what took place when we say, as we usually do, that some important and useful reforms were introduced by Stein, Hardenberg, and Scharnhorst. In the first place, such a word as reform is not properly applied to changes so vast, and in the second place, the changes then made or at least commenced, went far beyond legislation. We want some word stronger than reform which shall convey that one of the greatest events of modern history now took place in Prussia. Revolution would convey this, but unfortunately we appropriate that word to changes in the form of government, or even mere changes of dynasty, provided they are violent, though such changes are commonly quite insignificant compared to what now took place in Prussia. . . . The form of government indeed was not changed. Not merely did the king continue to reign, but no Parliament was created even with powers ever so restricted. Another generation had to pass away before this innovation, which to us seems the beginning of political life, took place. But a nation must be made before it can be made free, and, as we have said, in Prussia there was an administration (in great disorder) and an army, but no nation. When

Stein was placed at the head of affairs in the autumn of 1807, he seems, at first, hardly to have been aware that anything was called for beyond the reform of the administration, and the removal of some abuses in the army. Accordingly he did reform the administration from the top to the bottom, remodelling the whole machinery both of central and local government which had come down from the father of Frederick the Great. But the other work also was forced upon him, and he began to create the nation by emancipating the peasantry, while Scharnhorst and Gneisenau were brooding over the ideas which, five years later, took shape in the Landwehr of East Prussia. Besides emancipating the peasant he emancipated industry,—everywhere abolishing that strange caste system which divided the population rigidly into nobles, citizens, and peasants, and even stamped every acre of land in the country with its own unalterable rank as noble, or citizen, or peasant land. Emancipation, so to speak, had to be given before enfranchisement. The peasant must have something to live for; freewill must be awakened in the citizen; and he must be taught to fight for something before he could receive political liberty. Of such liberty Stein only provided one modest germ. By his *Städteordnung* he introduced popular election into the towns. Thus Prussia and France set out towards political liberty by different roads. Prussia began modestly with local liberties, but did not for a long time attempt a Parliament. France with her charte, and in imitation of France many of the small German States, had grand popular Parliaments, but no local liberties. And so for a long time Prussia was regarded as a backward State. . . . It was only by accident that Stein stopped short at municipal liberties and created no Parliament. He would have gone further, and in the last years of the wartime Hardenberg did summon deliberative assemblies, which, however, fell into disuse again after the peace. . . . In spite however of all reaction, the change irrevocably made by the legislation of that time was similar to that made in France by the Revolution, and caused the age before Jena to be regarded as an 'ancien régime.' But in addition to this, a change had been made in men's minds and thoughts by the shocks of the time, which prepared the way for legislative changes which have taken place since. How unprecedented in Prussia, for instance, was the dictatorial authority wielded by Hardenberg early in 1807, by Stein in the latter part of that year and in 1808, and by Hardenberg again from 1810 onwards! Before that time in the history of Prussia we find no subject eclipsing or even approaching the King in importance. Prussia had been made what she was almost entirely by her electors and kings. In war and organisation alike all had been done by the Great Elector or Frederick-William I., or Frederick the Great. But now this is suddenly changed. Everything now turns on the minister. Weak ministers are expelled by pressure put upon the king, strong ones are forced upon him. He is compelled to create a new ministerial power much greater than that of an English Prime Minister, and more like that of a Grand Vizier, and by these dictators the most comprehensive innovations are made. The loyalty of the people was not impaired by this; on the contrary, Stein and Hardenberg saved the Monarchy; but it evidently transferred the

Monarchy, though safely, to a lower pedestal."—J. R. Seeley, *Prussian History* (*Macmillan's Mag.*, v. 36, pp. 342-351).

ALSO IN: The same, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 3-5 (v. 1-2).—R. B. D. Morier, *Agrarian Legislation of Prussia* (*Systems of Land Tenure: Cobden Club Essays*, ch. 5).

A. D. 1808.—The Awakening of the national spirit.—Effects of the Spanish rising, and of Fichte's Addresses.—The beginnings of the great rising in Spain against Napoleon (see SPAIN: A. D. 1808, and after) "were watched by Stein from Berlin while he was engaged in negotiating with Daru; we can imagine with what feelings! His cause had been, since his ministry began, substantially the same as that of Spain; but he had perhaps understood it himself but dimly, at any rate hoped but faintly to see it prosper. But now he ripens at once into a great nationality statesman; the reforms of Prussia begin at once to take a more military stamp, and to point more decisively to a great uprising of the German race against the foreign oppressor. The change of feeling which took place in Prussia after the beginning of the Spanish troubles is very clearly marked in Stein's autobiography. After describing the negotiations at Paris and Berlin, . . . he begins a new paragraph thus: 'The popular war which had broken out in Spain and was attended with good success, had heightened the irritation of the inhabitants of the Prussian State caused by the humiliation they had suffered. All thirsted for revenge; plans of insurrection, which aimed at exterminating the French scattered about the country, were arranged; among others, one was to be carried out at Berlin, and I had the greatest trouble to keep the leaders, who confided their intentions to me, from a premature outbreak. We all watched the progress of the Spanish war and the commencement of the Austrian, for the preparations of that Power had not remained a secret; expectation was strained to the highest point; pains were necessary to moderate the excited eagerness for resistance in order to profit by it in more favourable circumstances. . . . Fichte's Addresses to the Germans, delivered during the French occupation of Berlin and printed under the censorship of M. Bignon, the Intendant, had a great effect upon the feelings of the cultivated class.' . . . That in the midst of such weighty matters he should remember to mention Fichte's Addresses is a remarkable testimony to the effect produced by them on the public mind, and at the same time it leads us to conjecture that they must have strongly influenced his own. They had been delivered in the winter at Berlin and of course could not be heard by Stein, who was then with the King, but they were not published till April. As affecting public opinion therefore, and also as known to Stein, the book was almost exactly of the same date as the Spanish Rebellion, and it is not unnatural that he should mention the two influences together. . . . When the lectures were delivered at Berlin a rising in Spain was not dreamed of, and even when they were published it had not taken place, nor could clearly be foreseen. And yet they teach the same lesson. That doctrine of nationality which was taught affirmatively by Spain had been suggested to Fichte's mind by the *reductio ad absurdum* which events had given to the negation of it in Germany. Nothing could be

more convincing than the concurrence of the two methods of proof at the same moment, and the prophetic elevation of these discourses (which may have furnished a model to Carlyle) was well fitted to drive the lesson home, particularly to a mind like Stein's, which was quite capable of being impressed by large principles. . . . Fichte's Addresses do not profess to have in the first instance nationality for their subject. They profess to inquire whether there exists any grand comprehensive remedy for the evils with which Germany is afflicted. They find such a remedy where Turgot long before had looked for deliverance from the selfishness to which he traced all the abuses of the old régime, that is, in a grand system of national education. Fichte reiterates the favourite doctrine of modern Liberalism, that education as hitherto conducted by the Church has aimed only at securing for men happiness in another life, and that this is not enough, inasmuch as they need also to be taught how to bear themselves in the present life so as to do their duty to the state, to others and themselves. He is as sure as Turgot that a system of national education will work so powerfully upon the nation that in a few years they will not be recognisable, and he explains at great length what should be the nature of this system, dwelling principally upon the importance of instilling a love of duty for its own sake rather than for reward. The method to be adopted is that of Pestalozzi. Out of fourteen lectures the first three are entirely occupied with this. But then the subject is changed, and we find ourselves plunged into a long discussion of the peculiar characteristics which distinguish Germany from other nations and particularly other nations of German origin. At the present day this discussion, which occupies four lectures, seems hardly satisfactory; but it is a striking deviation from the fashion of that age. . . . But up to this point we perceive only that the subject of German nationality occupies Fichte's mind very much, and that there was more significance than we first remarked in the title, Addresses to the German Nation; otherwise we have met with nothing likely to seem of great importance to a statesman. But the eighth Lecture propounds the question, What is a Nation in the higher signification of the word, and what is patriotism? It is here that he delivers what might seem a commentary on the Spanish Revolution, which had not yet taken place. . . . Fichte proclaims the Nation not only to be different from the State, but to be something far higher and greater. . . . Applied to Germany this doctrine would lead to the practical conclusion that a united German State ought to be set up in which the separate German States should be absorbed. . . . In the lecture before us he contents himself with advising that patriotism as distinguished from loyalty to the State should be carefully inculcated in the new education, and should influence the individual German Governments. It would not indeed have been safe for Fichte to propose a political reform, but it rather appears that he thought it an advantage rather than a disadvantage that the Nation and the State should be distinct. . . . I should not have lingered so long over this book if it did not strike me as the prophetic or canonical book which announces and explains a great transition in modern Europe, and the prophecies of

which began to be fulfilled immediately after its publication by the rising in Spain. . . . It is this Spanish Revolution which when it has extended to the other countries we call the Anti-Napoleonic Revolution of Europe. It gave Europe years of unparalleled bloodshed, but at the same time years over which there broods a light of poetry; for no conception can be more profoundly poetical than that which now woke up in every part of Europe, the conception of the Nation. Those years also led the way to the great movements which have filled so much of the nineteenth century, and have rearranged the whole central part of the map of Europe on a more natural system."—J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 4, ch. 1 (v. 2).

A. D. 1808 (January).—Kehl, Cassel and Wesel annexed to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1807–1808 (NOVEMBER—FEBRUARY).

A. D. 1808 (April—December).—The Tugendbund, and Stein's relations to it.—"English people think of Stein almost exclusively in connexion with land laws. But the second and more warlike period of his Ministry has also left a faint impression in the minds of many among us, who are in the habit of regarding him as the founder of the Tugendbund. In August and September [1808], the very months in which Stein was taking up his new position, this society was attracting general attention, and accordingly this is the place to consider Stein's relation to it. That he was secretly animating and urging it on must have seemed at the time more than probable, almost self-evident. It aimed at the very objects which he had at heart, it spoke of him with warm admiration, and in general it used language which seemed an echo of his own. . . . Whatever his connexion with the Tugendbund may have been, it cannot have commenced till April, 1808, for it was in that month that the Tugendbund began its existence, and therefore nothing can be more absurd than to represent Stein as beginning to revolutionise the country with the help of the Tugendbund, for his revolutionary edict had been promulgated in the October before. . . . In his autobiography . . . Stein [says]: 'An effect and not the cause of this passionate national indignation at the despotism of Napoleon was the Tugendbund, of which I was no more the founder than I was a member, as I can assert on my honour and as is well known to its originators. About July, 1808, there was formed at Königsberg a society consisting of several officers, for example, Col. Gneisenau, Grolmann, &c., and learned men, such as Professor Krug, in order to combat selfishness and to rouse the nobler moral feelings; and according to the requirements of the existing laws they communicated their statutes and the list of their members to the King's Majesty, who sanctioned the former without any action on my part, it being my belief in general that there was no need of any other institute but to put new life into the spirit of Christian patriotism, the germ of which lay already in the existing institutions of State and Church. The new Society held its meetings, but of the proceedings I knew nothing, and when later it proposed to exert an indirect influence upon educational and military institutions I rejected the proposal as encroaching on the department of the civil and ecclesiastical governing bodies. As I was driven soon afterwards out of the public service, I know nothing.

of the further operations of this Society.' . . . He certainly seems to intend his readers to understand that he had not even any indirect or underhand connexion with it, but from first to last stood entirely aloof, except in one case when he interfered to restrain its action. It is even possible that by telling us that he had nothing to do with the step taken by the King when he sanctioned the statutes of the society he means to hint that, had his advice been taken, the society would not have been even allowed to exist. . . . The principal fact affirmed by Stein is indeed now beyond controversy; Stein was certainly not either the founder or a member of the Tugendbund. The society commonly known by that name, which however designated itself as the Moral and Scientific Union, was founded by a number of persons, of whom many were Freemasons, at Königsberg in the month of April. Professor Krug, mentioned by Stein, was one of them; Gneisenau and Grolmann, whom he also mentions, were not among the first members, and Gneisenau, it seems, was never a member. The statutes were drawn by Krug, Bardeleben and Baersch, and if any one person can be called the Founder of the Tugendbund, the second of these, Bardeleben, seems best to deserve the title. The Order of Cabinet by which the society was licensed is dated Königsberg, June 30th, and runs as follows: 'The revival of morality, religion, serious taste and public spirit, is assuredly most commendable; and, so far as the society now being formed under the name of a Virtue Union (Tugendverein) is occupied with this within the limits of the laws of the country and without any interference in politics or public administration, His Majesty the King of Prussia approves the object and constitution of the society.' . . . From Königsberg missionaries went forth who established branch associations, called Chambers, in other towns, first those of the Province of Prussia, Braunsberg, Elbing, Graudenz, Eylau, Hohenstein, Memel, Stallupöhnen; then in August and September Bardeleben spread the movement with great success through Silesia. The spirit which animated the new society could not but be approved by every patriot. They had been deeply struck with the decay of the nation, as shown in the occurrences of the war, and their views of the way in which it might be revived were much the same as those of Stein and Fichte. The only question was whether they were wise in organising a society in order to promulgate these views, whether such a society was likely to do much good, and also whether it might not by possibility do much harm. Stein's view, as he has given it, was that it was not likely to do much good, and that such an organisation was unnecessary. . . . It did not follow because he desired Estates or Parliaments that he was prepared to sanction a political club. . . . It may well have seemed to him that to suffer a political club to come into existence was to allow the guidance of the Revolution which he had begun to pass out of his hands. There appears, then, when we consider it closely, nothing unnatural in the course which Stein declares himself to have taken."—J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 4, ch. 3 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: T. Frost, *Secret Societies of the European Revolution*, v. 1, ch. 4.

A. D. 1808 (September—October).—Imperial conference and Treaty of Erfurt. See FRANCE: A. D. 1808 (SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER).

A. D. 1809 (January—June).—Outburst of Austrian feeling against France.—Reopening of war.—Napoleon's advance to Vienna.—His defeat at Aspern and perilous situation.—Austrian reverses in Italy and Hungary.—"The one man of all the Austrians who felt the least amount of hatred against France, was, perhaps, the Emperor. All his family and all his people—nobles and priests, the middle classes and the peasantry—evinced a feeling full of anger against the nation which had upset Europe. . . . By reason of the French, the disturbers and spoilers, the enemies of the human race, despisers of morality and religion alike, Princes were suffering in their palaces, workmen in their shops, business men in their offices, priests in their churches, soldiers in their camps, peasants in their huts. The movement of exasperation was irresistible. Every one said that it was a mistake to have laid down their arms; that they ought against France to have fought on to the bitter end, and to have sacrificed the last man and the last florin; that they had been wrong in not having gone to the assistance of Prussia after the Jena Campaign; and that the moment had arrived for all the Powers to coalesce against the common enemy and crush him. . . . All Europe had arrived at a paroxysm of indignation. What was she waiting for before rising? A signal. That signal Austria was about to give. And this time with what chances of success! The motto was to be 'victory or death.' But they were sure of victory. The French army, scattered from the Oder to the Tagus, from the mountains of Bohemia to the Sierra Morena, would not be able to resist the onslaught of so many nations eager to break their bonds. . . . Vienna, in 1809, indulged in the same language, and felt the same passions, that Berlin did in 1806. . . . The Landwehr, then only organized a few months, were impatiently awaiting the hour when they should measure themselves against the Veterans of the French army. Volunteers flocked in crowds to the colours. Patriotic subscriptions flowed in. . . . Boys wanted to leave school to fight. All classes of society vied with each other in zeal, courage, and a spirit of sacrifice. When the news was made public that the Archduke Charles had, on the 20th of February, 1809, been appointed Generalissimo, there was an outburst of joy and confidence from one end of the Empire to the other."—Imbert de Saint-Amand, *Memoirs of the Empress Marie Louise*, pt. 1, ch. 2.—"On receiving decisive intelligence of these hostile preparations, Napoleon returned with extraordinary expedition from Spain to Paris, in January, 1809, and gave orders to concentrate his forces in Germany, and call out the full contingents of the Confederation of the Rhine. Some further time was consumed by the preparations on either side. At last, on the 8th of April, the Austrian troops crossed the frontiers at once on the Inn, in Bohemia, in the Tyrol and in Italy. The whole burthen of the war rested on Austria alone, for Prussia remained neutral, and Russia, now allied to France, was even bound to make a show at least, though it were no more, of hostility to Austria. On the same day on which the Austrian forces crossed the frontiers, the Tyrol rose in insurrection [see below: A. D. 1809—1810 (APRIL—FEBRUARY)], and was swept clear of the enemy in four days, with the exception of a Bavarian garrison, that still held out in Kufstein. The French army was at this time

dispersed over a line of forty leagues in extent, with numerous undefended apertures between the corps; so that the fairest possible opportunity presented itself to the Austrians for cutting to pieces the scattered forces of the French, and marching in triumph to the Rhine. As usual, however, the archduke's early movements were subjected to most impolitic delays by the Aulic Council; and time was allowed Napoleon to arrive on the theatre of war (April 17), and repair the faults committed by his adjutant-general, Berthier. He instantly extricated his army from its perilous position—almost cut in two by the advance of the Austrians—and, beginning on the 19th, he beat the latter in five battles on five successive days, at Thaur, Abensberg, Landsbut, Eckmühl, and Ratisbon. The Archduke Charles retired into Bohemia to collect reinforcements, but General Hiller was, in consequence of the delay in repairing the fortifications of Linz, unable to maintain that place, the possession of which was important, on account of its forming a connecting point between Bohemia and the Austrian Oberland. Hiller, however, at least saved his honour by pushing forward to the Traun, and in a fearfully bloody encounter at Ebersberg, captured three French eagles, one of his colours alone falling into the enemy's hands. He was, nevertheless, compelled to retire before the superior forces of the French, and crossing over at Krems to the left bank of the Danube, he formed a junction with the Archduke Charles. The way was now clear to Vienna, which, after a slight show of defence, capitulated to Napoleon on the 12th of May. The Archduke Charles had hoped to reach the capital before the French, and to give battle to them beneath its walls; but as he had to make a circuit whilst the French pushed forward in a direct line, his plan was frustrated, and he arrived, when too late, from Bohemia. Both armies, separated by the Danube, stood opposed to one another in the vicinity of the imperial city. Both commanders were desirous of coming to a decisive engagement. The French had secured the island of Lobau, to serve as a mustering place, and point of transit across the Danube. The archduke allowed them to establish a bridge of boats, being resolved to await them on the Marchfeld. There it was that Rudolph of Habsburg, in the battle against Ottakar, had laid the foundation of the greatness of the house of Austria; and there the political existence of that house and the fate of the monarchy were now to be decided. Having crossed the river, Napoleon was received on the opposite bank, near Aspern and Esslingen, by his opponent, and, after a dreadful battle [in which Marshal Lannes was killed], that was carried on with unwearied animosity for two days, May 21st and 22nd, 1809, he was completely beaten, and compelled to fly for refuge to the island of Lobau. The rising stream had, meanwhile, carried away the bridge, Napoleon's sole chance of escape to the opposite bank. For two days he remained on the island with his defeated troops, without provisions, and in hourly expectation of being cut to pieces; the Austrians, however, neglected to turn the opportunity to advantage, and allowed the French leisure to rebuild the bridge, a work of extreme difficulty. During six weeks afterwards, the two armies continued to occupy their former positions under the walls of Vienna, on the right and left banks of the Danube, narrowly watching each other's movements, and preparing for a final

struggle. Whilst these events were in progress, the Archduke John had successfully penetrated into Italy, where he had totally defeated the Viceroy Eugene at Salice, on the 16th of April. Favoured by the simultaneous revolt of the Tyrolese, he might have obtained the most decisive results from this victory, but the extraordinary progress of Napoleon down the valley of the Danube rendered necessary the concentration of the whole forces of the monarchy for the defence of the capital. Having begun a retreat, he was pursued by Eugene, and defeated on the Piave, with great loss, on the 8th of May. Escaping thence, without further molestation, to Villach, in Carinthia, he received intelligence of the fall of Vienna, together with a letter from the Archduke Charles, of the 15th of May, directing him to move with all his forces upon Linz, to act on the rear and communications of Napoleon. Instead of obeying these orders, he thought proper to march into Hungary, abandoning the Tyrol and the whole projected operations on the Upper Danube to their fate. His disobedience was disastrous to the fortunes of his house, for it caused the fruits of the victory at Aspern to be lost. He might have arrived, with 50,000 men, on the 24th or 25th, at Linz, where no one remained but Bernadotte and the Saxons, who were incapable of offering any serious resistance. Such a force, concentrated on the direct line of Napoleon's communications, immediately after his defeat at Aspern, on the 22nd, would have deprived him of all means of extricating himself from the most perilous situation in which he had yet been placed since ascending the consular throne. After totally defeating Jellachich in the valley of the Muhr, Eugene desisted from his pursuit of the army of Italy, and joined Napoleon at Vienna. The Archduke John united his forces at Raab with those of the Hungarian insurrection, under his brother, the Palatine. The viceroy again marched against him, and defeated him at Raab on the 14th of June. The Palatine remained with the Hungarian insurrection in Komorn; Archduke John moved on to Presburg. In the north, the Archduke Ferdinand, who had advanced as far as Warsaw, had been driven back by the Poles under Poniatowsky, and by a Russian force sent by the Emperor Alexander to their aid, which, on this success, invaded Galicia."—W. K. Kelly, *Hist. of the House of Austria (Continuation of Coxe)*, ch. 4.

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789–1815, ch. 56–57 (v. 12).—Duke de Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 2, pt. 2, ch. 3–12.—Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 14 (v. 3).—Baron de Marbot, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 42–48.

A. D. 1809 (April–July).—**Risings against the French in the North.**—"A general revolt against the French had nearly taken place in Saxony and Westphalia, where the enormous burdens imposed on the people, and the insolence of the French troops, had kindled a deadly spirit of hostility against the oppressors. Everywhere the Tugendbund were in activity; and the advance of the Austrians towards Franconia and Saxony, at the beginning of the war, blew up the flame. The two first attempts at insurrection, headed respectively by Katt, a Prussian officer (April 3), and Dornberg, a Westphalian colonel (April 23), proved abortive; but the enterprise of the celebrated Schill was of a more formidable character. This enthusiastic patriot,

then a colonel in the Prussian army, had been compromised in the revolt of Dornberg; and finding himself discovered, he boldly raised the standard (April 29) at the head of 600 soldiers. His force speedily received accessions, but failing in his attempts on Wittenberg and Magdeburg, he moved towards the Baltic, in hope of succour from the British cruisers, and at last threw himself into Stralsund. Here he was speedily invested; the place was stormed (May 31), and the gallant Schill slain in the assault, a few hours only before the appearance of the British vessels — the timely arrival of which might have secured the place, and spread the rising over all Northern Germany. The Duke of Brunswick-Oels, with his 'black band' of volunteers, had at the same time invaded Saxony from Bohemia; and though then obliged to retreat, he made a second incursion in June, occupied Dresden and Leipsic, and drove the King of Westphalia into France. After the battle of Wagram he made his way across all Northern Germany, and was eventually conveyed, with his gallant followers, still 2,000 strong, to England."—*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe*, sect. 525–526.

A. D. 1809 (July–September).—Napoleon's victory at Wagram.—The Peace of Schönbrunn.—Immense surrender of Austrian territory.—"The operation of establishing the bridges between the French camp and the left bank of the Danube commenced on the night of the 30th of June; and during the night of the 4th of July the whole French army, passing between the villages of Enzersdorf and Mühlleuten, debouched on the Marchfeld, wheeling to their left. Napoleon was on horseback in the midst of them by daylight; all the Austrian fortifications erected to defend the former bridge were turned, the villages occupied by their army taken, and the Archduke Charles was menaced both in flank and rear, the French line of battle appuyed on Enzersdorf being at a right angle to his left wing. Under these circumstances the Archduke, retiring his left, attempted to outflank the French right, while Napoleon bore down upon his centre at Wagram. This village became the scene of a sanguinary struggle, and one house only remained standing when night closed in. The Archduke sent courier after courier to hasten the advance of his brother, between whom and himself was Napoleon, whose line on the night of the 5th extended from Loibersdorf on the right to some two miles beyond Wagram on the left. Napoleon passed the night in massing his centre, still determining to manoeuvre by his left in order to throw back the Archduke Charles on that side before the Archduke John could come up on the other. At six o'clock on the morning of the 6th of July he commanded the attack in person. Disregarding all risk, he appeared throughout the day in the hottest of the fire, mounted on a snow-white charger, Euphrates, a present from the Shah of Persia. The Archduke Charles as usual committed the error which Napoleon's enemies had not even yet learned was invariably fatal to them: extending his line too greatly he weakened his centre, at the same time opening tremendous assaults on the French wings, which suffered dreadfully. Napoleon ordered Lauriston to advance upon the Austrian centre with a hundred guns, supported by two whole divisions of infantry in column. The artillery, when within half cannon-shot, opened a terrific fire: nothing

could withstand such a shock. The infantry, led by Macdonald, charged; the Austrian line was broken and the centre driven back in confusion. The right, in a panic, retrograded; the French cavalry then bore down upon them and decided the battle, the Archduke still fighting to secure his retreat, which he at length effected in tolerably good order. By noon the whole Austrian army was abandoning the contest. Their defeat so demoralized them that the Archduke John, who came up on Napoleon's right before the battle was over, was glad to retire with the rest, unnoticed by the enemy. That evening the Marchfeld and Wagram were in possession of the French. The population of Vienna had watched the battle from the roofs and ramparts of the city, and saw the retreat of their army with fear and gloom. Between 300,000 and 400,000 men were engaged, and the loss on both sides was nearly equal. About 20,000 dead and 30,000 wounded strewed the ground; the latter were conveyed to the hospitals of Vienna. . . . Twenty thousand Austrians were taken prisoners, but the number would have been greater had the French cavalry acted with their usual spirit. Bernadotte, issuing a bulletin, almost assuming to himself the sole merit of the victory, was removed from his command. Macdonald was created a marshal of the empire on the morning after the battle. . . . The battle of Wagram was won more by good fortune than skill. Napoleon's strategy was at fault, and had the Austrians fought as stoutly as they did at Aspern, Napoleon would have been signally defeated. Had the Archduke John acted promptly and vigorously, he might have united with his brother's left—which was intact—and overwhelmed the French. . . . The defeated army retired to Znaim, followed by the French; but further resistance was abandoned by the Emperor of Austria. The Archduke Charles solicited an armistice on the 9th; hostilities ceased, and Napoleon returned to the palace of Schönbrunn while the plenipotentiaries settled the terms of peace. . . . English Ministers displayed another instance of their customary spirit of procrastination. Exactly eight days after the armistice of Znaim, which assured them that Austria was no longer in a position to profit by or co-operate with their proceedings, they sent more than 80,000 fighting men, under the command of Lord Chatham, to besiege Antwerp [see ENGLAND: A. D. 1809 (JULY–DECEMBER)]. . . . Operations against Naples proved equally abortive. . . . In Spain alone English arms were successful. Sir Arthur Wellesley won the battle of Talavera on the 28th of July [see SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY–JULY)]. . . . A treaty of peace between France and Austria was signed on the 14th of October at Vienna [sometimes called the Treaty of Vienna, but more commonly the Peace of Schönbrunn]. The Emperor of Austria ceded Salzburg and a part of Upper Austria to the Confederation of the Rhine; part of Bohemia, Cracow, and Western Galicia to the King of Saxony as Grand Duke of Warsaw; part of Eastern Galicia to the Emperor of Russia; and Trieste, Carniola, Friuli, Villach, and some part of Croatia and Dalmatia to France: thus connecting the kingdom of Italy with Napoleon's Illyrian possessions, making him master of the entire coast of the Adriatic, and depriving Austria of its last seaport. It was computed that the Emperor Francis gave up territory to the amount of

45,000 square miles, with a population of nearly 4,000,000. He also paid a large contribution in money."—R. H. Horne, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 32. —"The cessions made directly to Napoleon were the county of Görz, or Gorizia, and that of Montefalcone, forming the Austrian Friuli; the town and government of Trieste, Carniola, the circle of Villach in Carinthia, part of Croatia and Dalmatia, and the lordship of Râzuns in the Grison territory. All these provinces, with the exception of Râzuns, were incorporated by a decree of Napoleon, with Dalmatia and its islands, into a single state with the name of the Illyrian Provinces. They were never united with France, but always governed by Napoleon as an independent state. A few districts before possessed by Napoleon were also incorporated with them: as Venetian Istria and Dalmatia with the Bocca di Cattaro, Ragusa, and part of the Tyrol. . . . The only other articles of the treaty of much importance are the recognition by Austria of any changes made, or to be made, in Spain, Portugal, and Italy; the adherence of the Emperor to the prohibitive system adopted by France and Russia, and his engaging to cease all correspondence and relationship with Great Britain. By a decree made at Ratisbon, April 24th, 1809, Napoleon had suppressed the Teutonic Order in all the States belonging to the Rhenish Confederation, reannexed its possessions to the domains of the prince in which they were situated, and incorporated Mergentheim, with the rights, domains, and revenues attached to the Grand Mastership of the Order, with the Kingdom of Würtemberg. These dispositions were confirmed by the Treaty of Schönbrunn. The effect aimed at by the Treaty of Schönbrunn was to surround Austria with powerful states, and thus to paralyse all her military efforts. . . . The Emperor of Russia . . . was very ill satisfied with the small portion of the spoils assigned to him, and the augmentation awarded to the duchy of Warsaw. Hence the first occasion of coldness between him and Napoleon, whom he suspected of a design to re-establish the Kingdom of Poland."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, bk. 7, ch. 14 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789-1815, ch. 59-60 (v. 13).—Gen. Count M. Dumas, *Memoirs*, ch. 13 (v. 2).—E. Baines, *Hist. of the Wars of the French Rev.*, bk. 4, ch. 9 (v. 3).—J. C. Ropes, *The First Napoleon*, lect. 4.

A. D. 1809-1810.—Humboldt's reform of Public Instruction in Prussia. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—PRUSSIA: A. D. 1809.

A. D. 1809-1810 (April—February).—The revolt in the Tyrol.—Heroic struggle of Andrew Hofer and his countrymen.—"The Tyrol, for centuries a possession of Austria, was ceded to Bavaria by the Peace of Presburg in 1805. The Bavarians made many innovations, in the French style, some good and some bad; but the mountaineers, clinging to their ancient ways, resisted them all alike. They hated the Bavarians as foreign masters forced upon them; and especially detested the military conscription, to which Austria had never subjected them. The priests had an almost unlimited influence over these faithful Catholics, and the Bavarians, who treated them rudely, were regarded as innovators and allies of revolutionary France. Thus the country submitted restlessly to the yoke of the Rhine League until the spring of 1809. A secret un-

derstanding was maintained with Austria and the Archduke John, and the people never abandoned the hope of returning to their Austrian allegiance. When the great war of 1809 began, the Emperor Francis summoned all his people to arms. The Tyrolese answered the call. . . . They are a people trained in early life to the use of arms, and to activity, courage, and ready devices in hunting, and in traveling on their mountain paths. Austria could be sure of the faithfulness of the Tyrol, and made haste to occupy the country. When the first troops were seen entering the passes, the people arose and drove away the Bavarian garrisons. The alarm was soon sounded through the deepest ravines of the land. Never was there a more united people, and each troop or company chose its own officers, in the ancient German style, from among their strongest and best men. Their commanders were hunters, shepherds, priests: the former gamekeeper, Speckbacher; the innkeeper, Martin Teimer; the fiery Capuchin monk, Haspinger, whose sole weapon in the field was a huge ebony crucifix, and many more of like peaceful occupations. At the head of the whole army was a man who, like Saul, towered by a head above all others, while his handsome black beard fell to his girdle—Andrew Hofer, formerly an innkeeper at Passeyr—a man of humble piety and simple faithfulness, who fairly represented the people he led. He regarded the war as dutiful service to his religion, his emperor, and his country. The whole land soon swarmed with little bands of men, making their way to Innsprück (April, 1809), whence the Bavarian garrison fled. Meanwhile a small French corps came from Italy to relieve them. Though fired upon by the peasants from every ravine and hill, they passed the Brenner, and reached the Iselberg, near Innsprück. But here they were surrounded on every side, and forced to surrender. The first Austrian soldiers, under General Chasteler, then reached the capital, and their welcome was a popular festival. The liberators, as the Tyrolese soldiers regarded themselves, committed no cruelties, but carried on their enterprise in the spirit of a national jubilee. The tidings of the disasters at Regensburg [Ratisbon] now came upon them like a thunderbolt. The withdrawal of the Austrian army then left the Tyrol without protection. Napoleon treated the war as a mutiny, and set a price upon Chasteler's head. Neither Chasteler nor any of the Austrian officers with him understood the warfare of the peasantry. The Tyrolese were left almost wholly to themselves, but they resolved to defend their mountains. On May 11 the Bavarians under Wrede again set out from Salzburg, captured the pass of the Strub after a bloody fight, and then climbed into the valley of the Inn. They practiced frightful cruelties in their way. A fierce struggle took place at the little village of Schwatz; the Bavarians burned the place, and marched to Innsprück. Chasteler withdrew, and the Bavarians and French, under Wrede and Lefevre, entered the capital. The country again appeared to be subdued. But cruelty had embittered the people. Wrede was recalled, with his corps, by Napoleon; and now Hofer, with his South Tyrolese, recrossed the Brenner Pass. Again the general alarm was given, the leaders called to arms, and again every pass, every wall of rock, every narrow road was seized. The struggle took place at the Iselberg. The Bava-

rians, 7,000 in number, were defeated with heavy loss. The Tyrol now remained for several months undisturbed, during the campaign around Vienna. After the battle of Aspern, an imperial proclamation formally assured the Tyrolese that they should never be severed from the Austrian Empire; and that no peace should be signed unless their indissoluble union with the monarchy were recognized. The Tyrolese quietly trusted the emperor's promise, until the armistice of Znaim. But in this the Tyrol was not mentioned, and the French and their allies prepared to chastise the loyal and abandoned country."—C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 28.—"In the month of July, an army of 40,000 French and Bavarians attacked the Tyrol from the German side; while from Italy, General Rusca, with 18,000 men, entered from Clagenfurth, on the southern side of the Tyrolese Alps. Undismayed by this double and formidable invasion, they assailed the invaders as they penetrated into their fastnesses, defeated and destroyed them. The fate of a division of 10,000 men, belonging to the French and Bavarian army, which entered the Upper Innthal, or Valley of the Inn, will explain in part the means by which these victories were obtained. The invading troops advanced in a long column up a road bordered on the one side by the river Inn, there a deep and rapid torrent, where cliffs of immense height overhang both road and river. The vanguard was permitted to advance unopposed as far as Prutz, the object of their expedition. The rest of the army were therefore induced to trust themselves still deeper in this tremendous pass, where the precipices, becoming more and more narrow as they advanced, seemed about to close above their heads. No sound but of the screaming of the eagles disturbed from their eyries, and the roar of the river, reached the ears of the soldier, and on the precipices, partly enveloped in a hazy mist, no human forms showed themselves. At length the voice of a man was heard calling across the ravine, 'Shall we begin?'—'No,' was returned in an authoritative tone of voice, by one who, like the first speaker, seemed the inhabitant of some upper region. The Bavarian detachment halted, and sent to the general for orders; when presently was heard the terrible signal, 'In the name of the Holy Trinity, cut all loose!' Huge rocks, and trunks of trees, long prepared and laid in heaps for the purpose, began now to descend rapidly in every direction, while the deadly fire of the Tyrolese, who never throw away a shot, opened from every bush, crag, or corner of rock, which would afford the shooter cover. As this dreadful attack was made on the whole line at once, two-thirds of the enemy were instantly destroyed; while the Tyrolese, rushing from their shelter, with swords, spears, axes, scythes, clubs and all other rustic instruments which could be converted into weapons, beat down and routed the shattered remainder. As the vanguard, which had reached Prutz, was obliged to surrender, very few of the 10,000 invaders are computed to have extricated themselves from the fatal pass. But not all the courage of the Tyrolese, not all the strength of their country, could possibly enable them to defend themselves, when the peace with Austria had permitted Buonaparte to engage his whole immense means for the acquisition of these mountains. Austria too—Austria herself, in whose cause they had incurred

all the dangers of war, instead of securing their indemnity by some stipulations in the treaty, sent them a cold exhortation to lay down their arms. Resistance, therefore, was abandoned as fruitless; Hofer, chief commander of the Tyrolese, resigned his command, and the Bavarians regained the possession of a country which they could never have won back by their own efforts. Hofer, and about thirty chiefs of these valiant defenders of their country, were put to death [February, 1810], in poor revenge for the loss their bravery had occasioned. But their fame, as their immortal spirit, was beyond the power of the judge alike and executioner; and the place where their blood was shed, becomes sacred to the thoughts of freedom, as the precincts of a temple to those of religion."—Sir W. Scott, *Life of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 7.

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789-1815, ch. 58 (v. 12).—*Hist. of Hofer* (*Quart. Rev.*, July, 1817).—C. H. Hall, *Life of Andrew Hofer*.

A. D. 1810.—Annexation of the Hanse Towns and territory on the North Sea to France. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810 (FEBRUARY—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1810-1812.—Marriage of the Archduchess Marie Louise of Austria to Napoleon.—Alliance of German powers with Napoleon against Russia. See FRANCE: A. D. 1810-1812.

A. D. 1812.—The Russian campaign of Napoleon and its disastrous ending. See RUSSIA: A. D. 1812 (JUNE—SEPTEMBER), (SEPTEMBER), and (OCTOBER—DECEMBER).

A. D. 1812-1813.—The Teutonic uprising against Napoleon.—Beginning of the War of Liberation.—Alliance of Prussia and Russia.—"During Napoleon's march on Moscow and his fatal return, Macdonald remained on the Lower Dwina, before Riga, with an observation corps of Prussians and Poles, nor had he ever received an order to retreat from Napoleon. Learning of the misfortunes of the grand army, he went from the Dwina towards the Niemen. As he passed through Courland, General York, commander of the Prussian troops, allowed him to lead the way with the Poles, and then signed an agreement of neutrality with the Russians (December 30, 1812). The Prussian troops, from a military spirit of honor, had fought the Russians bravely; they retained some scruples relative to the worthy marshal under whom they served, and forsook without betraying him, that is, they left him time to escape. This was a most important event and the beginning of the inevitable defection of Germany. The attitude of Czar Alexander decided General York; the former was completely dazzled by his triumphs, and aspired to nothing less than to destroy Napoleon and liberate Europe, even France! With mingled enthusiasm and calculation, he promised all things to all men; on returning to Wilna, he granted an amnesty for all acts committed in Poland against Russian authority. On the one hand, he circulated a rumor that he was about to make himself King of Poland, and, on the other hand, he announced to the Prussians that he was ready to restore the Polish provinces taken from them by Napoleon. He authorized ex-Minister Stein to take possession, as we may say, of Old Prussia, just evacuated by the French, and to promise the speedy enfranchisement of Germany, protesting, at the same time, that he would not dispute 'the legitimate great-

ness' of France. The French army, on hearing of York's defection, left Königsberg with ten or twelve thousand sick men and eight or ten thousand armed troops, withdrawing to the Vistula and thence to Warta and Posen. General Rapp had succeeded in gathering at Dantzic, the great French depot of stores and reserves, 25,000 men, few of whom had gone through the Russian campaign, and a division of almost equal numbers occupied Berlin. The French had in all barely 80,000 men, from Dantzic to the Rhine, not including their Austrian and Saxon allies, who had fallen back on Warsaw and seemed disposed to fight no more. Murat, to whom Napoleon confided the remains of the grand army, followed the Emperor's example and set out to defend his Neapolitan kingdom, leaving the chief command to Prince Eugene. Great agitation prevailed around the feeble French forces still occupying Germany. The Russians themselves, worn out, did not press the French very hotly; but York and Stein, masters of Königsberg, organized and armed Old Prussia without awaiting authorization from the king, who was not considered as a free agent, being under foreign rule. Pamphlets, proclamations, and popular songs were circulated everywhere, provoking the people to rebellion. The idea of German union ran like wildfire from the Niemen to the Rhine; federal union, not unity in a single body or state, which was not thought of then.—H. Martin, *Popular Hist. of France from 1789*, v. 2, ch. 16.—“The king of Prussia had suddenly abandoned Berlin [January, 1813], which was still in the hands of the French, for Breslau, whence he declared war against France. A conference also took place between him and the emperor Alexander at Calisch [Kalisch], and, on the 28th of February, 1813, an offensive and defensive alliance was concluded between them. The hour for vengeance had at length arrived. The whole Prussian nation, eager to throw off the hated yoke of the foreigner, to obliterate their disgrace in 1806, to regain their ancient name, cheerfully hastened to place their lives and property at the service of the impoverished government. The whole of the able-bodied population was put under arms. The standing army was increased: to each regiment were appended troops of volunteers, Jaegers, composed of young men belonging to the higher classes, who furnished their own equipments: a numerous Landwehr, a sort of militia, was, as in Austria, raised besides the standing army, and measures were even taken to call out, in case of necessity, the heads of families and elderly men remaining at home, under the name of the Landsturm. The enthusiastic people, besides furnishing the customary supplies and paying the taxes, contributed to the full extent of their means towards defraying the immense expense of this general arming. Every heart throbbed high with pride and hope. . . . More loudly than even in 1809 in Austria was the German cause now discussed, the great name of the German empire now invoked in Prussia, for in that name alone could all the races of Germany be united against their hereditary foe. The celebrated proclamation, promising external and internal liberty to Germany, was, with this view, published at Calisch by Prussia and Russia. Nor was the appeal vain. It found an echo in every German heart, and such plain demonstrations of

the state of the popular feeling on this side the Rhine were made, that Davoust sent serious warning to Napoleon, who contemptuously replied, ‘Pah! Germans never can become Spaniards!’ With his customary rapidity he levied in France a fresh army 300,000 strong, with which he so completely awed the Rhenish confederation as to compel it once more to take the field with thousands of Germans against their brother Germans. The troops, however, reluctantly obeyed, and even the traitors were but lukewarm, for they doubted of success. Mecklenburg alone sided with Prussia. Austria remained neutral. A Russian corps under General Tettenborn had preceded the rest of the troops and reached the coasts of the Baltic. As early as the 24th of March, 1813, it appeared in Hamburg and expelled the French authorities from the city. The heavily oppressed people of Hamburg, whose commerce had been totally annihilated by the continental system, gave way to the utmost demonstrations of delight, received their deliverers with open arms, revived their ancient rights, and immediately raised a Hanseatic corps destined to take the field against Napoleon. Dörnberg, the ancient foe to France, with another flying squadron took the French division under Morand prisoner, and the Prussian, Major Hellwig (the same who, in 1806, liberated the garrison of Erfurt), dispersed, with merely 120 hussars, a Bavarian regiment 1,300 strong and captured five pieces of artillery. In January, the peasantry of the upper country had already revolted against the conscription, and, in February, patriotic proclamations had been disseminated throughout Westphalia under the signature of the Baron von Stein. In this month, also, Captain Maas and two other patriots, who had attempted to raise a rebellion, were executed. As the army advanced, Stein was nominated chief of the provisional government of the still unconquered provinces of Western Germany. The first Russian army, 17,000 strong, under Wittgenstein, pushed forward to Magdeburg, and, at Mökern, repulsed 40,000 French who were advancing upon Berlin. The Prussians, under their veteran general, Blücher, entered Saxony and garrisoned Dresden, on the 27th of March, 1813, after an arch of the fine bridge across the Elbe [had] been uselessly blown up by the French. Blücher, whose gallantry in the former wars had gained for him the general esteem and whose kind and generous disposition had won the affection of the soldiery, was nominated generalissimo of the Prussian forces, but subordinate in command to Wittgenstein, who replaced Kutusow as generalissimo of the united forces of Russia and Prussia. The Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia accompanied the army and were received with loud acclamations by the people of Dresden and Leipzig.”—W. Menzel, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 260 (v. 3).—Bernadotte, the adopted Crown Prince and expectant King of Sweden, had been finally thrown into the arms of the new Coalition against Napoleon, by the refusal of the latter to take Norway from Denmark and give it to Sweden. “The disastrous retreat of the French from Moscow . . . led to the signature of the Treaty of Stockholm on the 2d of March, 1813, by which England acceded to the union of Norway to Sweden, and a Swedish force was sent to Pomerania under General Sandels. On the 18th of May, 1813, Bernadotte

landed at Stralsund."—Lady Bloomfield, *Biog. Sketch of Bernadotte* (*Memoir of Lord Bloomfield*, v. 1, p. 31).

ALSO IN: J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 7 (v. 3).—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire*, bk. 47 (v. 4).

A. D. 1813 (April—May).—Battle of Lützen.—Humiliation of the King of Saxony.—“On the 14th April, Napoleon left Paris to assume the command of the army. Previous to his departure, with a view, perhaps, of paying a compliment to the Emperor of Austria, the Empress Marie Louise was appointed regent in his absence; but Prince Schwarzenberg, who had arrived on a special mission from Vienna, was treated only as the commander of an auxiliary corps, to which orders would immediately be transmitted. On the 16th he reached Mayence, where, for the last time, vassal princes assembled courtier-like around him; and on the 20th he was already at Erfurt, in the midst of his newly-raised army. The roads were everywhere crowded with troops and artillery, closing in towards the banks of the Saale. From Italy, Marshal Bertrand joined with 40,000 men, old trained soldiers; the Viceroy brought an equal number from the vicinity of Magdeburg; and Marshal Macdonald having, on the 29th, taken Merseburg by assault, the whole army, which Bado, the ablest and most accurate of the authors who have written on this campaign, estimates at 140,000 men, was assembled for action. With this mighty force Napoleon determined to seek out the enemy, and bring them quickly to battle. The Russian and Prussian armies were no sooner united, after the alliance concluded between the sovereigns, than they crossed the Elbe, occupied Dresden, which the King of Saxony had abandoned, and advanced to the banks of the Saale. General Blücher commanded the Prussians, and Count Wittgenstein the Russian corps; and, death having closed the career of old Marshal Kutusoff, . . . the command of both armies devolved upon the last mentioned officer. Informed of the rapid advance of the French, the allied monarchs joined their forces, which were drawn together in the plains between the Saale and the Elbe; their numerous cavalry giving them perfect command of this wide and open country. Napoleon, always anxious for battle, determined to press on towards Leipzig, behind which he expected to find the Allied army, who, as it proved, were much nearer than he anticipated. At the passage of the Rippach, a small stream that borders the wide plain of Lützen, he already encountered a body of Russian cavalry and artillery under Count Winzingerode; and as the French were weak in horse, they had to bring the whole of Marshal Ney's corps into action before they could oblige the Russians to retire. Marshal Bessieres, the commander of the Imperial Guard, was killed. . . . On the evening of the 1st of May, Napoleon established his quarters in the small town of Lützen. The Allies, conscious of the vast numerical superiority of the French, did not intend to risk a general action on the left bank of the Elbe; but the length of the hostile column of march, which extended from beyond Naumburg almost to the gates of Leipzig, induced Scharnhorst to propose an advance from the direction of Borna and Pegau against the right flank of the enemy, and a sudden attack on the centre of their line in the plain of Lützen. It was expected that a de-

cisive blow might be struck against this centre, and the hostile army broken before the distant wings could close up and take an effective part in the battle. The open nature of the country, well adapted to the action of cavalry, which formed the principal strength of the Allies, spoke in favour of the plan. . . . The bold attempt was immediately resolved upon, and the onset fixed for the following morning. The annals of war can hardly offer a plan of battle more skillfully conceived than the one of which we have here spoken; but unfortunately the execution fell far short of the admirable conception. Napoleon, with his Guards and the corps of Lauriston, was already at the gates of Leipzig, preparing for an attack on the city, when about one o'clock [May 2] the roar of artillery burst suddenly on the ear, and gathering thicker and thicker as it rolled along, proclaimed that a general action was engaged in the plain of Lützen,—proclaimed that the army was taken completely at fault, and placed in the most imminent peril. . . . The Allies, who, by means of their numerous cavalry, could easily mask their movement, had advanced unobserved into the plain of Lützen,” and the action was begun by a brigade of Blücher's corps attacking the French in the village of Great-Görschen (Gross-Görschen). “Reinforcements . . . poured in from both sides, and the narrow and intersected ground between the villages became the scene of a most murderous and closely-contested combat of infantry. . . . But no attempt was made to employ the numerous and splendid cavalry, that stood idly exposed, on open plain, to the shot of the French artillery. . . . When night put an end to the combat, Great-Görschen was the sole trophy of the murderous fight that remained in the hands of the Allies. . . . On the side of the Allies, 2,000 Russians and 8,000 Prussians had been killed or wounded: among the slain was Prince Leopold of Hessen-Homburg; among the wounded was the admirable Scharnhorst, who died a few weeks afterwards. . . . The loss sustained by the French is not exactly known; but . . . Jomini tells us that the 3d corps, to which he was attached as chief of the staff, had alone 500 officers and 12,000 men ‘hors de combat.’ Both parties laid claim to the victory: the French, because the Allies retired on the day after the action; the Allies, because they remained masters of part of the captured battlefield, had taken two pieces of artillery, and 800 prisoners. . . . The Allies alleged, or pretended perhaps, that it was their intention to renew the action on the following morning: in the Prussian army every man, from the king to the humblest soldier, was anxious indeed to continue the fray; and the wrath of Blücher, who deemed victory certain, was altogether boundless when he found the retreat determined upon. But . . . opinion has, by degrees, justified Count Wittgenstein's resolution to recross the Elbe and fall back on the reinforcements advancing to join the army. . . . On the 8th of May, Napoleon held his triumphal entrance into Dresden. . . . On the advance of the Allies, the Saxon monarch had retired to Ratisbon, and from thence to Prague, intending, as he informed Napoleon, to join his efforts to the mediation of Austria. Orders had, at the same time, been given to General Thielman, commanding the Saxon troops at Torgau, to maintain the most perfect neutrality, and to admit neither of the contending parties within the

walls of the fortress. Exasperated by this show of independence, Napoleon caused the following demands to be submitted to the King, allowing him only six hours to determine on their acceptance or refusal:—1. 'General Thielman and the Saxon troops instantly evacuate Torgau, and form the 7th corps under General Régnier; and all the resources of the country to be at the disposal of the Emperor, in conformity with the principles of the Confederation of the Rhine.' 2. 'The Saxon Cavalry'—some regiments had accompanied the King—'return immediately to Dresden.' 3. 'The King declares, in a letter to the Emperor, that he is still a member of the Confederation of the Rhine, and ready to fulfil all the obligations which it imposes upon him.' 'If these conditions are not immediately complied with,' says Napoleon in the instructions to his messenger, 'you will cause his Majesty to be informed that he is guilty of felony, has forfeited the Imperial protection, and has ceased to reign.' . . . Frederick Augustus, finding himself threatened with the loss of his crown by an overbearing conqueror already in possession of his capital, . . . yielded in an evil hour to those imperious demands, and returned to Dresden. . . . Fortune appeared again to smile upon her spoiled and favoured child; and he resolved, on his part, to leave no expedient untried to make the most of her returning aid. The mediation of Austria, which from the first had been galling to his pride, became more hateful every day, as it gradually assumed the appearance of an armed interference, ready to enforce its demands by military means. . . . Tidings having arrived that the allied army, instead of continuing their retreat, had halted and taken post at Bautzen, he immediately resolved to strike a decisive blow in the field, as the best means of thwarting the pacific efforts of his father-in-law."—Lt.-Col. J. Mitchell, *The Fall of Napoleon*, bk. 2, ch. 1 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1789–1815, ch. 75 (v. 13).—Duchess d'Abrantes, *Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 2, ch. 44.

A. D. 1813 (May–August).—Battle of Bautzen.—Armistice of Pleswitz.—Accession of Austria and Great Britain to the Coalition against Napoleon.—"While the Emperor paused at Dresden, Ney made various demonstrations in the direction of Berlin, with the view of inducing the Allies to quit Bautzen; but it soon became manifest that they had resolved to sacrifice the Prussian capital, if it were necessary, rather than forego their position. . . . Having replaced by wood-work some arches of the magnificent bridge over the Elbe at Dresden, which the Allies had blown up on their retreat, Napoleon now moved towards Bautzen, and came in sight of the position on the morning of the 21st of May. Its strength was obviously great. In their front was the river Spree: wooded hills supported their right, and eminences well fortified their left. The action began with an attempt to turn their right, but Barclay de Tolly anticipated this movement, and repelled it with such vigour that a whole column of 7,000 dispersed and fled into the hills of Bohemia for safety. The Emperor then determined to pass the Spree in front of the enemy, and they permitted him to do so, rather than come down from their position. He took up his quarters in the town of Bautzen, and his whole army bivouacked in presence of the Allies. The battle was resumed at daybreak on the 22d;

when Ney on the right, and Oudinot on the left, attempted simultaneously to turn the flanks of the position; while Soult and Napoleon himself directed charge after charge on the centre. During four hours the struggle was maintained with unflinching obstinacy; the wooded heights, where Blücher commanded, had been taken and retaken several times—the bloodshed on either side had been terrible—ere . . . the Allies perceived the necessity either of retiring, or of continuing the fight against superior numbers on disadvantageous ground. They withdrew accordingly; but still with all the deliberate coolness of a parade, halting at every favourable spot and renewing their cannonade. 'What,' exclaimed Napoleon, 'no results! not a gun! not a prisoner!—these people will not leave me so much as a nail.' During the whole day he urged the pursuit with impetuous rage, reproaching even his chosen generals as 'creeping scoundrels,' and exposing his own person in the very hottest of the fire." His closest friend, Duroc, Grand Master of the Palace, was mortally wounded by his side, before he gave up the pursuit. "The Allies, being strongly posted during most of the day, had suffered less than the French; the latter had lost 15,000, the former 10,000 men. They continued their retreat into Upper Silesia; and Buonaparte advanced to Breslau, and released the garrison of Glogau. Meanwhile the Austrian, having watched these indecisive though bloody fields, once more renewed his offers of mediation. The sovereigns of Russia and Prussia expressed great willingness to accept it; and Napoleon also appears to have been sincerely desirous for the moment of bringing his disputes to a peaceful termination. He agreed to an armistice [of six weeks], and in arranging its conditions agreed to fall back out of Silesia; thus enabling the allied princes to reopen communications with Berlin. The lines of country to be occupied by the armies, respectively, during the truce, were at length settled, and it was signed on the 1st of June [at Poischwitz, though the negotiations were mostly carried on at Pleswitz, whence the Armistice is usually named]. The French Emperor then returned to Dresden, and a general congress of diplomatists prepared to meet at Prague. England alone refused to send any representative to Prague, alleging that Buonaparte had as yet signified no disposition to recede from his pretensions on Spain, and that he had consented to the armistice with the sole view of gaining time for political intrigue and further military preparation. It may be doubted whether any of the allied powers who took part in the Congress did so with much hope that the disputes with Napoleon could find a peaceful end. . . . But it was of the utmost importance to gain time for the advance of Bernadotte; for the arrival of new reinforcements from Russia; for the completion of the Prussian organization; and, above all, for determining the policy of Vienna. Metternich, the Austrian minister, repaired in person to Dresden, and while inferior diplomatists wasted time in endless discussions at Prague, one interview between him and Napoleon brought the whole question to a definite issue. The Emperor . . . assumed at once that Austria had no wish but to drive a good bargain for herself, and asked broadly, 'What is your price? Will Illyria satisfy you? I only wish you to be neutral—I can deal with these Russians and Prussians single-

handed,' Metternich stated plainly that the time in which Austria could be neutral was past; that the situation of Europe at large must be considered; . . . that events had proved the impossibility of a steadfast peace unless the sovereigns of the Continent were restored to the rank of independence; in a word, that the Rhenish Confederacy must be broken up; that France must be contented with the boundary of the Rhine, and pretend no longer to maintain her usurped and unnatural influence in Germany. Napoleon replied by a gross personal insult: 'Come, Metternich,' said he, 'tell me honestly how much the English have given you to take their part against me.' The Austrian court at length sent a formal document, containing its ultimatum, the tenor of which Metternich had sufficiently indicated in this conversation. Talleyrand and Fouché, who had now arrived from Paris, urged the Emperor to accede to the proffered terms. They represented to him the madness of rousing all Europe to conspire for his destruction, and insinuated that the progress of discontent was rapid in France itself. Their arguments were backed by intelligence of the most disastrous character from Spain [see SPAIN: A. D. 1812-1814]. . . . Napoleon was urged by his military as well as political advisers, to appreciate duly the crisis which his affairs had reached. . . . He proceeded to insult both ministers and generals . . . and ended by announcing that he did not wish for any plans of theirs, but their service in the execution of his. Thus blinded by arrogance and self-confidence, and incapable of weighing any other considerations against what he considered as the essence of his personal glory, Napoleon refused to abate one iota of his pretensions—until it was too late. Then, indeed, . . . he did show some symptoms of concession. A courier arrived at Prague with a note, in which he signified his willingness to accede to a considerable number of the Austrian stipulations. But this was on the 11th of August. The day preceding was that on which, by the agreement, the armistice was to end. On that day Austria had to sign an alliance, offensive and defensive, with Russia and Prussia. On the night between the 10th and 11th, rockets answering rockets, from height to height along the frontiers of Bohemia and Silesia, had announced to all the armies of the Allies this accession of strength, and the immediate recommencement of hostilities."—J. G. Lockhart, *Life of Napoleon Buonaparte*, ch. 32-33.—"On the 14th of June Great Britain had become a party to the treaty concluded between Russia and Prussia. She had promised assistance in this great struggle; but no aid could have been more effectual than that which she was rendering in the Peninsula."—C. Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, ch. 32 (v. 7).

ALSO IN: G. R. Gleig, *The Leipzig Campaign*, ch. 7-16.—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire*, bk. 48-49 (v. 4).—Prince Metternich, *Memoirs*, 1773-1815, bk. 1, ch. 8 (v. 1).—J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 7, ch. 4-5 (v. 3).—J. Philippart, *Northern Campaigns*, 1812-1813, v. 2.

A. D. 1813 (August).—Great battle and victory of Napoleon at Dresden.—French defeats at Kulm, Gross-Beeren and the Katzbach.—"Dresden, during the armistice, had been converted by Napoleon into such a place of strength that it might be called one citadel. All the trees

in the neighbourhood, as well as those which had formed the ornament of the public gardens and walks of that beautiful capital, were cut down and converted into abattis and palisades; redoubts, field-works, and fosses had been constructed. The chain of fortresses garrisoned by French troops secured to Napoleon the rich valley of the Elbe. Hamburg, Dantzic, and many strong places on the Oder and Vistula were in his possession. . . . His army assembled at the seat of war amounted to nearly 300,000 men, including the Bavarian reserve of 25,000 under General Wrede, and he had greatly increased his cavalry. This powerful force was divided into eleven army corps, commanded by Vandamme, Victor, Bertrand, Ney, Lauriston, Marmont, Reynier, Poniatowski, Macdonald, Oudinot, and St. Cyr. Murat, who, roused by the news of the victories of Lutzen and Bautzen, had left his capital, was made commander-in-chief of all the cavalry. . . . Davoust held Hamburg with 20,000 men. Augereau with 24,000 occupied Bavaria. The armies of the allies were computed at nearly 400,000 men, including the divisions destined to invade Italy. Those ready for action at the seat of war in Germany were divided into three great masses,—the army of Bohemia, consisting mainly of Austrians commanded by Prince Schwarzenburg; the army of Silesia, commanded by Blücher; and the troops under the command of Bernadotte, stationed near Berlin. These immense hosts were strong in cavalry and artillery, and in discipline and experience far exceeded the French soldiers, who were nearly all young conscripts. Two Frenchmen of eminence were leaders in the ranks of the enemies of France,—Bernadotte and Moreau; Jomini, late chief of the engineer department in Napoleon's army, was a Swiss. These three men, well instructed by the great master of the art of war, directed the counsels of the allied Sovereigns and taught them how to conquer. Bernadotte pointed out that Napoleon lay in Dresden with his guard of five-and-twenty thousand men, while his marshals were stationed in various strong positions on the frontiers of Saxony. The moment a French corps d'armée was attacked Napoleon would spring from his central point upon the flank of the assailants, and as such a blow would be irresistible he would thus beat the allied armies in detail. To obviate this danger Bernadotte recommended that the first general who attacked a French division and brought Napoleon into the field should retreat, luring the Emperor onward in pursuit, when the other bodies of allied troops, simultaneously closing upon his rear, should surround him and cut him off from his base. This plan was followed: Blücher advanced from Silesia, menacing the armies of Macdonald and Ney, and Napoleon, with the activity expected, issued from Dresden on the 15th of August, rapidly reached the point of danger, and assumed the offensive. But he was unable to bring the Prussian general to a decisive action, for Blücher, continuing to retreat before him, the pursuit was only arrested by an estafette reporting on the 23rd that the main body of the allies threatened Dresden. On the 25th, at 4 in the afternoon, 200,000 allied troops led by Schwarzenburg appeared before that city. St. Cyr, who had been left to observe the passes of the Bohemian mountains with 20,000 men, retreated before the irresistible torrent and threw himself into the Saxon capital, which he prepared

to defend with his own forces and the garrison left by the Emperor. It was a service of the last importance. With Dresden Napoleon would lose his recruiting depôt and supplies of every kind. . . . The Austrian commander-in-chief deferred the attack till the following day, replying to the expostulations of Jomini that Napoleon was engaged in the Silesian passes. Early on the morning of the 26th the allies advanced to the assault in six columns, under cover of a tremendous artillery fire. They carried one great redoubt, then another, and closed with the defenders of the city at every point, shells and balls falling thick on the houses, many of which were on fire. St. Cyr conducted the defence with heroism; but before midday a surrender was talked of. . . . Suddenly, from the opposite bank of the Elbe columns of soldiers were seen hastening towards the city. They pressed across the bridges, swept through the streets, and with loud shouts demanded to be led into battle, although they had made forced marches from the frontiers of Silesia. Napoleon, with the Old Guard and cuirassiers, was in the midst of them. His enemies had calculated on only half his energy and rapidity, and had forgotten that he could return as quickly as he left. The Prussians had penetrated the Grosse Garten on the French left, and so close was the Russian fire that Wittgenstein's guns enfiladed the road by which Napoleon had to pass; consequently, to reach the city in safety, he was compelled to dismount at the most exposed part, and, according to Baron Odeleben (one of his aides-de-camp), creep along on his hands and knees (*ventre à terre*). Napoleon halted at the palace to reassure the King of Saxony, and then joined his troops who were already at the gates. Sallies were made by Ney and Mortier under his direction. The astonished assailants were driven back. The Young Guard recaptured the redoubts, and the French army deployed on the plateau lately in possession of their enemies. . . . The fury of the fight gradually slackened, and the armies took up their positions for the night. The French wings bivouacked to the right and left of the city, which itself formed Napoleon's centre. The allies were ranged in a semicircle cresting the heights. . . . They had not greatly the advantage in numbers, for Klenau's division never came up; and Napoleon, now that Victor and Marmont's corps had arrived, concentrated nearly 200,000 men. . . . The next day broke in a tempest of wind and rain. At six o'clock Napoleon was on horseback, and ordered his columns to advance. Their order of battle has been aptly compared to 'a fan when it expands.' Their position could scarcely have been worse. . . . Knowing that in case of disaster retreat would be almost an impossibility, Napoleon began an attack on both flanks of the allied army, certain that their defeat would demoralize the centre, which he could overwhelm by a simultaneous concentric attack, supported by the fire of 100 guns. The stormy weather which concealed their movements favoured them; and Murat turning and breaking the Austrian left, and Ney completely rolling up the Austrian right, the result was a decisive victory. By three in the afternoon of the 27th the battle was concluded, and the allies were in full retreat, pursued by the French. The roads to Bohemia and those to the south were barred by Murat's and Vandamme's corps, and the allied Sovereigns were

obliged to take such country paths and byways as they could find—which had been rendered almost impassable by the heavy rain. They lost 25,000 prisoners, 40 standards, 60 pieces of cannon, and many waggons. The killed and wounded amounted on each side to seven or eight thousand. The first cannon-shot fired by the guard under the direction of Napoleon mortally wounded Moreau while talking to the Emperor Alexander. . . . The French left wing, composed of the three corps of Vandamme, St. Cyr, and Marmont, were ordered to march by their left along the Pirna road in pursuit of the foe, who was retreating into Bohemia in three columns, and had traversed the gorges of the Hartz Mountains in safety, though much baggage, several ammunition waggons, and 2,000 prisoners, fell into the hands of the French. The Russians, under Ostermann, halted on the plain of Culm [or Kulm] for the arrival of Kleist's Prussians; the Austrians hurried along the Prague route. Vandamme marched boldly on, neglecting even the precaution of guarding the defile of Peterswald in his rear. Trusting to the rapid advance of the other French corps, he was lured on by the hope of capturing the allied Sovereigns in their headquarters at Toplitz. Barclay de Tolly, having executed a rapid détour from left to right, brought the bulk of his Russian forces to bear on Vandamme, who, on reaching Culm, was attacked in front and rear [August 29–30], surprised and taken, losing the whole of his artillery and between 7,000 and 8,000 prisoners; the rest of his corps escaped and rejoined the army. This disaster totally deranged Napoleon's plans, which would have led him to follow up the pursuit towards Bohemia in person. Oudinot was ordered to march against Bülow's corps at Berlin and the Swedes commanded by Bernadotte, taking with him the divisions of Bertrand and Reynier—a force of 80,000 men. Reynier, who marched in advance, fell in with the allies at Gross-Beeren, attacked them precipitately and suffered severely, his division, chiefly composed of Saxons, taking flight. Oudinot also sustained considerable losses, and retreated to Torgau on the Elbe. Girard, rallying out of Magdeburg with 5,000 or 6,000 men, was defeated near Leibnitz, with the loss of 1,000 men, and some cannon and baggage. Macdonald encountered Blücher in the plains between Wahlstadt and the Katzbach under disadvantageous circumstances [August 26], and was obliged to retire in disorder.—R. H. Horne, *Hist. of Napoleon*, ch. 37.—“The great battle of the Katzbach, the counterpart to that of Hohenlinden, [was] one of the most glorious ever gained in the annals of European fame. Its trophies were immense. . . . Eighteen thousand prisoners, 103 pieces of cannon, and 230 caissons, besides 7,000 killed and wounded, presented a total loss to the French of 25,000 men.”—Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, ch. 80, sect. 68 (v. 17).—“Of the battle of Kulm it is not too much to say that it was the most critical in the whole war of German liberation. The fate of the coalition was determined absolutely by its results. Had Vandamme been strong enough to keep his hold of Bohemia, and to block up from them the mouths of the passes, the allied columns, forced back into the exhausted mountain district through which they were retreating, must have perished for lack of food, or dissolved themselves.”—G. R. Gleig, *The Leipzig Campaign*, ch. 27.

ALSO IN: Baron Jomini, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 20 (v. 4).—Major C. Adams, *Great Campaigns in Europe, 1796 to 1870*, ch. 5.

A. D. 1813 (September—October).—French reverse at Dennewitz.—Napoleon's evacuation of Dresden.—Allied concentration at Leipsic.—Preparations for the decisive battle.—“The [allied] Army of the North had been nearly idle since the battle of Grossbeeren. The Prussian generals were extremely indignant against Bernadotte, whose slowness and inaction were intolerable to them. It took them, under his orders, a fortnight to advance as far as a good footman could march in a day. They then unexpectedly met a new French army advancing against them from a fortified camp at Wittenberg. Napoleon had now assigned to Marshal Ney—‘the bravest of the brave’—the work of beating ‘the Cossack hordes and the poor militia,’ and taking Berlin. Under him were Oudinot, Regnier, Bertrand, and Arrighi, with 70,000 men. On September 6 Tauenzien met their superior forces at Jüterbogk, but sustained himself valiantly through a perilous fight. Bernadotte was but two hours' march away, but as usual disregarded Bülow's request to bring aid. But Bülow himself brought up his corps on the right, and took the brunt of the battle, extending it through the villages south of Jüterbogk, of which Dennewitz was the centre. The Prussians took these villages by storm, and when evening came their victory was complete, though Bernadotte had not stretched out a hand to help them. . . . Bülow bore the name of Dennewitz afterward in honor of his victory. Ney reported to his master that he was entirely defeated. Napoleon unwisely ascribed his defeat entirely to the Saxons, who fought well that day for him, but for the last time. By his reproaches he entirely alienated the people from him. The French loss in this battle was 10,000 killed and wounded, and 10,000 prisoners, besides 80 guns. The Prussians lost in killed and wounded more than 5,000. Thus five victories had been won by the Allies in a fortnight, compensating fully for the loss of the battle of Dresden. The way to the Elbe lay open to the Army of the North. But Bernadotte continued to move with extreme slowness. Bülow and Tauenzien seriously proposed to Blücher to leave the Swedish prince, whom they openly denounced as a traitor. Blücher approached the Elbe across the Lausitz from Bohemia, and it would have been easy to cross the river and unite the two armies, threatening Napoleon's rear, and making Dresden untenable for him. Napoleon advanced in vain against Blücher to Bausitz. The Prussian general wisely avoided a battle. Then the emperor turned against the Army of Bohemia, but it was too strong in its position in the valley of Teplitz, with the mountains in its rear, to be attacked. Then again he moved toward Blücher, but again failed to bring about an action. At this time public opinion throughout Europe was undergoing a rapid change, and Napoleon's name was losing its magic. The near prospect of his fall made the nations he had oppressed eager and impatient for it, and his German allies and subjects lost all regard and hope for his cause. On October 8 the Bavarian plenipotentiary, General Wrede, concluded a treaty with Austria at Ried, by the terms of which Bavaria left Napoleon and joined the allies. This important defection, though it had been for some weeks expected, was

felt by the French emperor as a severe blow to his prospects. Napoleon's circle of movement around Dresden began to be narrowed. The Russian reserves under Bennigsen, 57,000 strong, were also advancing through Silesia toward Bohemia. Blücher was therefore not needed in Bohemia, and he pressed forward vigorously to cross the Elbe. His army advanced along the right bank of the Black Elster to its mouth above Wittenberg. On the opposite bank of the Elbe, in the bend of the stream, stands the village of Wartenburg, and just at the bend Blücher built two bridges of boats without opposition. On October 3 York's corps crossed the river. But now on the west side, among the thickets and swamps before the village, arose a furious struggle with a body of 20,000 French, Italians, and Germans of the Rhine League under Bertrand. York displayed eminent patience, coolness, and judgment, and won a decided victory out of a great danger. Bernadotte, though with much hesitation, also crossed the Elbe at the mouth of the Mulde, and the army of the North and of Silesia were thus united in Napoleon's rear. It was now evident that the successes of these armies had brought the French into extreme danger, and the allied sovereigns resolved upon a concerted attack. Leipsic was designated as the point at which the armies should combine. Napoleon could no longer hold Dresden, lest he should be cut off from France by a vastly superior force. The partisan corps of the allies were also growing bolder and more active far in Napoleon's rear, and on October 1 Czernicheff drove Jerome out of Cassel and proclaimed the kingdom of Westphalia dissolved. This was the work of a handful of Cossacks, without infantry and artillery; but though Jerome soon returned, the moral effect of this sudden and easy overthrow of one of Napoleon's military kingdoms was immense. On October 7 Napoleon left Dresden, and marched to the Mulde. Blücher's forces were arrayed along both sides of this stream, below Düben. But he quietly and successfully retired, on perceiving Napoleon's purpose to attack him, and moved westward to the Saale, in order to draw after him Bernadotte and the Northern army. The plan was successful, and the united armies took up a position behind the Saale, extending from Merseburg to Alsleben, Bernadotte occupying the northern end of the line next to the Elbe. Napoleon, disappointed in his first effort, now formed a plan whose boldness astonished both friend and foe. He resolved to cross the Elbe, to seize Berlin and the Marches, now uncovered, and thus, supported by his fortresses of Magdeburg, Stettin, Dantzic, and Hamburg, where he still had bodies of troops and magazines, to give the war an entirely new aspect. But the murmurs of his worn-out troops, and even of his generals, compelled him to abandon this plan, which was desperate, but might have been effectual. The suggestion of it terrified Bernadotte, whose province of Lower Pomerania would be threatened, and he would have withdrawn in headlong haste across the Elbe had not Blücher persisted in detaining him. Napoleon now resolved to march against the Bohemian army at Leipsic. On October 14, on approaching the city from the north, he heard cannon-shots on the opposite side. It was the advanced guard of the main army, which was descending from the Erz-Gebirge range, after a

sharp but indecisive cavalry battle with Murat at the village of Liebertwolkwitz, south of Dresden. In the broad, thickly settled plains around Leipsic, the armies of Europe now assembled for the final and decisive conflict. Napoleon's command included Portuguese, Spaniards, Neapolitans, and large contingents of Germans from the Rhine League, as well as the flower of the French youth; while the allies brought against him Cossacks and Calmucks, Swedes and Magyars, besides all the resources of Prussian patriotism and Austrian discipline. Never since the awful struggle at Chalons, which saved Western civilization from Attila, had there been a strife so well deserving the name of 'the battle of the nations.' West of the city of Leipsic runs the Pleisse, and flows into the Elster on the northwest side. Above their junction, the two streams run for some distance near one another, inclosing a sharp angle of swampy land. The great highway to Lindenau from Leipsic crosses the Elster, and then runs southwesterly to Lützen and Weissenfels. South of the city and east of the Pleisse lie a number of villages, of which Wachau, Liebertwolkwitz, and Probstheida, nearer the city, were important points during the battle. The little river Partha approaches the city on the east, and then runs north, reaching the Elster at Gohlis. Napoleon occupied the villages north, east and south of the city, in a small circle around it."—C. T. Lewis, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 30, sect. 7-11.

ALSO IN: E. Baines, *Hist. of the Wars of the French Rev.*, bk. 4, ch. 23 (v. 3).

A. D. 1813 (October).—"The Battle of the Nations."—"The town of Leipsic has four sides and four gates. . . . On the south is the rising ground called the Swedish Camp, and another called the Sheep-walk, bordering on the banks of the Pleisse. To this quarter the Grand Army of the Allies was seen advancing on the 15th of October. Buonaparte made his arrangements accordingly. Bertrand and Poniatowski defended Lindenau and the east side of the city, by which the French must retreat. Augereau was posted farther to the left, on the elevated plain of Wachau, and on the south, Victor, Lauriston, and Macdonald confronted the advance of the Allies with the Imperial Guards placed as a reserve. On the north, Marmont was placed between Mœckern and Euterist, to make head against Blücher, should he arrive in time to take part in the battle. On the opposite quarter, the sentinels of the two armies were within musket-shot of each other, when evening fell. . . . The number of men who engaged the next morning was estimated at 136,000 French, and 230,000 on the part of the Allies. . . . Napoleon remained all night in the rear of his own Guards, behind the central position, facing a village called Gossa, occupied by the Austrians. At day-break on the 16th of October the battle began. The French position was assailed along all the southern front with the greatest fury. . . . The Allies having made six desperate attempts, . . . all of them unsuccessful, Napoleon in turn assumed the offensive. . . . This was about noon. The village of Gossa was carried by the bayonet. Macdonald made himself master of the Swedish Camp; and the eminence called the Sheep-walk was near being taken in the same manner. The impetuosity of the French had fairly broken through the centre of the Allies, and Napoleon

sent the tidings of his success to the King of Saxony, who ordered all the bells in the city to be rung. . . . The King of Naples, with Latour-Maubourg and Kellermann, poured through the gap in the enemy's centre at the head of the whole body of cavalry, and thundered forward as far as Magdeburg, a village in the rear of the Allies, bearing down General Rayefskoi with the Grenadiers of the Russian reserve. At this moment, while the French were disordered by their own success, Alexander, who was present, ordered forward the Cossacks of his Guard, who, with their long lances, bore back the dense body of cavalry that had so nearly carried the day. Meantime, as had been apprehended, Blücher arrived before the city, and suddenly came into action with Marmont, being three times his numbers. He in consequence obtained great and decided advantages; and before night-fall had taken the village of Mœckern, together with 20 pieces of artillery and 2,000 prisoners. But on the south side the contest continued doubtful. Gossa was still disputed. . . . General Mehrfeldt fell into the hands of the French. The battle raged till night-fall, when it ceased by mutual consent. . . . The armies slept on the ground they had occupied during the day. The French on the southern side had not relinquished one foot of their original position, though attacked by such superior numbers. Marmont had indeed been forced back by Blücher, and compelled to crowd his line of defence nearer the walls of Leipsic. Thus pressed on all sides with doubtful issues, Buonaparte availed himself of the capture of General Mehrfeldt to demand an armistice and to signify his acceptance of the terms proposed by the Allies, but which were now found to be too moderate. . . . Napoleon received no answer till his troops had recrossed the Rhine; and the reason assigned is, that the Allies had pledged themselves solemnly to each other to enter into no treaty with him 'while a single individual of the French army remained in Germany.' . . . The 17th was spent in preparations on both sides, without any actual hostilities. At eight o'clock on the morning of the 18th they were renewed with tenfold fury. Napoleon had considerably contracted his circuit of defence, and the French were posted on an inner line, nearer to Leipsic, of which Probstheida was the central point. . . . Barclay, Wittgenstein, and Kleist advanced on Probstheida, where they were opposed by Murat, Victor, Augereau, and Lauriston, under the eye of Napoleon himself. On the left Macdonald had drawn back his division to a village called Stoetteritz. Along this whole line the contest was maintained furiously on both sides; nor could the terrified spectators, from the walls and steeples of Leipsic, perceive that it either receded or advanced. About two o'clock the Allies forced their way . . . into Probstheida; the camp-followers began to fly; the tumult was excessive. Napoleon . . . placed the reserve of the Old Guard in order, led them in person to recover the village, and saw them force their entrance ere he withdrew to the eminence from whence he watched the battle. . . . The Allies, at length, felt themselves obliged to desist from the murderous attacks on the villages which cost them so dear; and, withdrawing their troops, kept up a dreadful fire with their artillery. The French replied with equal spirit,

though they had fewer guns; and, besides, their ammunition was falling short. Still, however, Napoleon completely maintained the day on the south of Leipsic, where he commanded in person. On the northern side, the yet greater superiority of numbers placed Ney in a precarious situation; and, pressed hard both by Blücher and the Crown-Prince, he was compelled to draw nearer the town, and had made a stand on an eminence called Heiterblick, when on a sudden the Saxons, who were stationed in that part of the field, deserted from the French and went over to the enemy. In consequence of this unexpected disaster, Ney was unable any longer to defend himself. It was in vain that Buonaparte dispatched his reserves of cavalry to fill up the chasm that had been made; and Ney drew up the remainder of his forces close under the walls of Leipsic. The battle once more ceased at all points. . . . Although the French army had thus kept its ground up to the last moment on these two days, yet there was no prospect of their being able to hold out much longer at Leipsic. . . . All things counselled a retreat, which was destined (like the rest of late) to be unfortunate. . . . The retreat was commenced in the night-time; and Napoleon spent a third harassing night in giving the necessary orders for the march. He appointed Macdonald and Poniatowski . . . to defend the rear. . . . A temporary bridge which had been erected had given way, and the old bridge on the road to Lindenau was the only one that remained for the passage of the whole French army. But the defence of the suburbs had been so gallant and obstinate that time was allowed for this purpose. At length the rear-guard itself was about to retreat, when, as they approached the banks of the river, the bridge blew up by the mistake of a sergeant of a company of sappers who . . . set fire to the mine of which he had charge before the proper moment. This catastrophe effectually barred the escape of all those who still remained on the Leipsic side of the river, except a few who succeeded in swimming across, among whom was Marshal Macdonald. Poniatowski . . . was drowned in making the same attempt. In him, it might be said, perished the last of the Poles. About 25,000 French were made prisoners of war, with a great quantity of artillery and baggage."—W. Hazlitt, *Life of Napoleon*, ch. 50 (v. 3).—"The battle of Leipsic was over. Already had the allied sovereigns entered the town, and forcing, not without difficulty, their way through the crowd, passed on to the market-place. Here, the house in which the King of Saxony had lodged was at once made known to them by the appearance of the Saxon troops whom Napoleon had left to guard their master. . . . Moreover, the King himself . . . stood bare-headed on the steps of the stairs. But the Emperor of Russia, who appears at once to have assumed the chief direction of affairs, took no notice of the suppliants. . . . The battle of Leipsic constitutes one of those great hinges on which the fortunes of the world may be said from time to time to turn. The importance of its political consequence cannot be overestimated. . . . As a great military operation, the one feature which forces itself prominently upon our notice is the enormous extent of the means employed on both sides to accomplish an end. Never since the days when Persia poured her millions into Greece

had armies so numerous been marshalled against each other. Nor does history tell of trains of artillery so vast having been at any time brought into action with more murderous effect. . . . About 1,800 pieces, on the one side, were answered, during two days, by little short of 1,000 on the other. . . . We look in vain for any manifestations of genius or military skill, either in the combinations which rendered the battle of Leipsic inevitable, or in the arrangements according to which the attack and defence of the field were conducted. . . . It was the triumph, not of military skill, but of numbers."—G. R. Gleig, *The Leipsic Campaign*, ch. 41.—"No more here than at Moscow must we seek in the failure of the leader's talents the cause of such deplorable results,—for he was never more fruitful in resource, more bold, more resolute, nor more a soldier,—but in the illusions of pride, in the wish to regain at a blow an immense fortune which he had lost, in the difficulty of acknowledging to himself his defeat in time, in a word, in all those errors which we may discern in miniature and caricature in an ordinary gambler, who madly risks riches acquired by folly; errors which are found on a large and terrible scale in this gigantic gambler, who plays with human blood as others play with money. As gamblers lose their fortunes twice,—once from not knowing where to stop, and a second time from wishing to restore it at a single cast,—so Napoleon endangered his at Moscow by wishing to make it exorbitantly large, and in the Dresden campaign by seeking to restore it in its full extent. The cause was always the same, the alteration not in the genius, but in the character, by the deteriorating influence of unlimited power and success."—A. Thiers, *Hist. of the Consulate and the Empire*, bk. 50 (v. 4).

Also in: Duke de Rovigo, *Memoirs*, v. 3, pt. 2, ch. 17.—J. C. Ropes, *The First Napoleon*.—Baron de Marbot, *Memoirs*, v. 2, ch. 38–39.

A. D. 1813 (October–December).—Retreat of Napoleon beyond the Rhine.—Battle of Hanau.—Fall of the kingdom of Westphalia.—Surrender of French garrisons and forces.—Liberation achieved.—"Blücher, with Langeron and Sacken, moved in pursuit of the French army, which, disorganised and dejected, was wending its way towards the Rhine. At the passage of the Unstrutt, at Freyberg, 1,000 prisoners and 18 guns were captured by the Prussian hussars; but on the 23d the French reached Erfurth, the citadels and magazines of which afforded them at once security and relief from their privations. Here Napoleon halted two days, employed in reorganising his army, the thirteen corps of which were now formed into six, commanded by Victor, Ney, Bertrand, Augereau, Marmont, and Macdonald, and amounting in all to less than 90,000 men; while twice that number were left blockaded in the fortresses on the Elbe, the Oder, and the Vistula. On the 25th, after parting for the last time with Murat, who here quitted him and returned to Naples, he resumed his march, retreating with such rapidity through the Thuringian forest, that the Cossacks alone of the pursuing army could keep up with the retiring columns—while the men dropped, exhausted by fatigue and hunger, or deserted their ranks by hundreds; so that when the fugitive host approached the Maine, not more than 50,000 remained effective round their colours—10,000 had fallen or been made prisoners, and at least 30,000 were straggling

in the rear. But here fresh dangers awaited them. After the treaty of the 8th October, by which Bavaria had acceded to the grand alliance, an Austro-Bavarian force under Marshal Wrede had moved in the direction of Frankfort, and was posted, to the number of 45,000 men, in the oak forest near Hanau across the great road to Mayence, and blocking up entirely the French line of retreat. The battle commenced at 11 A. M. on the 30th; but the French van, under Victor and Macdonald, after fighting its way through the forest, was arrested, when attempting to issue from its skirts, by the concentric fire of 70 pieces of cannon, and for four hours the combat continued, till the arrival of the guards and main body changed the aspect of affairs. Under cover of the terrible fire of Drouot's artillery, Sebastiani and Nansouty charged with the cavalry of the guard, and overthrew everything opposed to them, and Wrede at length drew off his shattered army behind the Kinzig. Hanau was bombarded and taken, and Mortier and Marmont, with the rear divisions, cut their way through on the following day, with considerable loss to their opponents. The total losses of the Allies amounted to 10,000 men, of whom 4,000 were prisoners; and the victory threw a parting ray of glory over the long career of the revolutionary arms in Germany. On the 2d of November the French reached Mayence, and Napoleon, after remaining there six days to collect the remains of his army, set out for Paris, where he arrived on the 9th; and thus the French eagles bade a final adieu to the German plains. In the mean time, the Allied troops, following closely on the footsteps of the retreating French, poured in prodigious strength down the valley of the Maine. On the 5th of November the Emperor Alexander entered Frankfort in triumph, at the head of 20,000 horse; and on the 9th the fortified post of Hochheim, in advance of the tête-du-pont of Mayence at Cassel, was stormed by Giulay. From the heights beyond the town the victorious armies of Germany beheld the winding stream of the Rhine; a shout of enthusiasm ran from rank to rank as they saw the mighty river of the Fatherland, which their arms had liberated; those in the rear hurried to the front, and soon a hundred thousand voices joined in the cheers which told the world that the war of independence was ended and Germany delivered. Nothing now remained but to reap the fruits of this mighty victory; yet so vast was the ruin that even this was a task of time and difficulty. The rickety kingdom of Westphalia fell at once, never more to rise; the revolutionary dynasty in Berg followed its fate; and the authority of the King of Britain was re-established by acclamation in Hanover, at the first appearance of Bernadotte and Benningsen. The reduction of Davoust, who had been left in Hamburg with 25,000 French and 10,000 Danes, was an undertaking of more difficulty; and against him Walmoden and Bernadotte moved with 40,000 men. The French marshal had taken up a position on the Stecknitz; but, fearful of being cut off from Hamburg, he retired behind the Bille on the advance of the Allies, separating himself from the Danes, who were compelled to capitulate. The operations of the Crown-Prince against Denmark, the ancient rival of Sweden, were now pushed with a vigour and activity strongly contrasting with his lukewarmness in the general campaign; and the court of Copenhagen, seeing its dominions on the point

of being overrun, signed an armistice on the 15th December, on which was soon after based a permanent treaty [of Kiel — see SCANDINAVIAN STATES: A. D. 1813-1814]. . . . When Napoleon (Oct. 7) marched northwards from Dresden, he had left St. Cyr in that city with 30,000 men, opposed only by a newly-raised Russian corps under Tolstoi, which St. Cyr, by a sudden attack, routed with the loss of 3,000 men and 10 guns. But no sooner was the battle of Leipsic decided, than Dresden was again blockaded by 50,000 men under Klenau and Tolstoi; and St. Cyr, who was encumbered with a vast number of sick and wounded, and was almost without provisions, was obliged, after a fruitless sortie on the 6th November, to surrender on the 11th, on condition of being sent with his troops to France. The capitulation, however, was disallowed by Schwartzemberg, and the whole were made prisoners of war — a proceeding which the French, not without some justice, declaim against as a gross breach of faith — and thus no less than 32 generals, 1,795 officers, and 33,000 rank and file, with 240 pieces of cannon, fell into the power of the Allies. The fall of Dresden was soon followed by that of the other fortresses on the Vistula and the Oder. Stettin, with 8,000 men and 350 guns, surrendered on the 21st November; and Torgau, which contained the military hospitals and reserve parks of artillery left by the grand army on its retreat from the Elbe, yielded at discretion to Tauenzien (Dec. 26), after a siege of two months. But such was the dreadful state of the garrison, from the ravages of typhus fever, that the Allies dared not enter this great pest-house till the 10th January; and the terrible epidemic which issued from its walls made the circuit, during the four following years, of every country in Europe. Dantzic, with its motley garrison of 35,000 men, had been blockaded ever since the Moscow retreat; but the blockading corps, which was not of greater strength, could not confine the French within the walls; and Rapp made several sorties in force during the spring and summer, by which he procured abundance of provisions. It was not till after the termination of the armistice of Pleswitz that the siege was commenced in form; and after sustaining a severe bombardment, Rapp, deprived of all hope by the battle of Leipsic, capitulated (Nov. 29) with his garrison, now reduced by the sword, sickness, and desertion, to 16,000 men. Zamosc, with 3,000 men, surrendered on the 22d December, and Modlin, with 1,200, on the 25th; and at the close of the year, France retained beyond the Rhine only Hamburg, Magdeburg, and Wittenberg, on the Elbe; Custrin and Glogau on the Oder; and the citadels of Erfurth and Würzburg, which held out after the capitulation of the towns."—*Epitome of Alison's Hist. of Europe, sect. 737-742* (ch. 82, v. 17, in complete work).—"The princes of the Confederation of the Rhine, with the exception of the captive King of Saxony, and one or two minor princes, deserted Napoleon, and entered into treaties with the Allies."—T. H. Dyer, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 4, p. 538.

ALSO IN: M. Bourrienne, *Private Memoirs of Napoleon*, v. 4, ch. 16.—*The Year of Liberation: Journal of the Defence of Hamburg*.—J. Philippart, *Campaign in Germany and France, 1813*, v. 1, pp. 230-278.

A. D. 1814.—The Allies in France and in possession of Paris.—Fall of Napoleon. See

FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (JANUARY—MARCH), and (MARCH—APRIL).

A. D. 1814 (May).—Readjustment of French boundaries by the Treaty of Paris. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814 (APRIL—JUNE).

A. D. 1814-1815.—The Congress of Vienna.—Its territorial and political readjustments. See VIENNA, THE CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1814-1820.—Reconstruction of Germany.—The Germanic Confederation and its constitution.—“Germany was now utterly disintegrated. The Holy Roman Empire had ceased to exist; the Confederation of the Rhine had followed it; and from the Black Forest to the Russian frontier there was nothing but angry ambitions, vengeance, and fears. If there was ever to be peace again in all these wide regions, it was clearly necessary to create something new. What was to be created was a far more difficult question; but already, on the 30th of May 1814, the powers had come to some sort of understanding, if not with regard to the means to be pursued, at least with regard to the end to be attained. In the Treaty of Paris we find these words: ‘Les états de l’Allemagne seront indépendants et unis par un lien fédératif.’ But how was this to be effected? There were some who wished the Holy Roman Empire to be restored. . . . Of course neither Prussia, Bavaria, nor Wurtemberg, could look kindly upon a plan so obviously unfavourable to them; but not even Austria really wished it, and indeed it had few powerful friends. Then there was a project of a North and South Germany, with the Maine for boundary; but this was very much the reverse of acceptable to the minor princes, who had no idea of being grouped like so many satellites, some around Austria and some around Prussia. Next came a plan of reconstruction by circles, the effect of which would have been to have thrown all the power of Germany into the hands of a few of the larger states. To this all the smaller independent states were bitterly opposed, and it broke down, although supported by the great authority of Stein, as well as by Gagern. If Germany had been in a later phase of political development, public opinion would perhaps have forced the sovereigns to consent to the formation of a really united Fatherland with a powerful executive and a national parliament—but the time for that had not arrived. What was the opposition of a few hundred clear-sighted men with their few thousand followers, that it should prevail over the masters of so many legions? What these potentates cared most about were their sovereign rights, and the dream of German unity was very readily sacrificed to the determination of each of them to be, as far as be possibly could, absolute master in his own dominions. Therefore it was that it soon became evident that the results of the deliberation on the future of Germany would be, not a federative state, but a confederation of states—a Staaten-Bund, not a Bundes-Staat. There is no doubt, however, that much mischief might have been avoided if all the stronger powers had worked conscientiously together to give this Staaten-Bund as national a character as possible. . . . Prussia was really honestly desirous to effect something of this kind, and Stein, Hardenberg, William von Humboldt, Count Münster, and other statesmen, laboured hard to bring it about. Austria, on the other hand, aided by Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and Baden, did all she could

to oppose such projects. Things would perhaps have been settled better than they ultimately were, if the return of Napoleon from Elba had not frightened all Europe from its propriety, and turned the attention of the sovereigns towards warlike preparations. . . . The document by which the Germanic Confederation is created is of so much importance that we may say a word about the various stages through which it passed. First, then, it appears as a paper drawn up by Stein in March 1814, and submitted to Hardenberg, Count Münster, and the Emperor Alexander. Next, in the month of September, it took the form of an official plan, handed by Hardenberg to Metternich, and consisting of forty-one articles. This plan contemplated the creation of a confederation which should have the character rather of a Bundes-Staat than of a Staaten-Bund; but it went to pieces in consequence of the difficulties which we have noticed above, and out of it, and of ten other official proposals, twelve articles were sublimated by the rival chemistry of Hardenberg and Metternich. Upon these twelve articles the representatives of Austria, Prussia, Hanover, and Wurtemberg, deliberated. Their sittings were cut short partly by the ominous appearance which was presented in the autumn of 1814 by the Saxon and Polish questions, and partly by the difficulties from the side of Bavaria and Wurtemberg, which we have already noticed. The spring brought a project of the Austrian statesman Wessenberg, who proposed a Staaten-Bund rather than a Bundes-Staat; and out of this and a new Prussian project drawn up by W. von Humboldt, grew the last sketch, which was submitted on the 23d of May 1815 to the general conference of the plenipotentiaries of all Germany. They made short work of it at the last, and the Federal-Act (Bundes-Acte) bears date June 8th, 1815. This is the document which is incorporated in the principal act of the Congress of Vienna, and placed under the guarantee of eight European powers, including France and England. Wurtemberg, Baden, and Hesse-Homburg, did not form part of the Confederation for some little time—the latter not till 1817; but after they were added to the powers at first consenting, the number of the sovereign states in the Confederation was altogether thirty-nine. . . . The following are the chief stipulations of the Federal Act. The object of the Confederation is the external and internal security of Germany, and the independence and inviolability of the confederate states. A diète fédérative (Bundes-Versammlung) is to be created, and its attributions are sketched. The Diet is, as soon as possible, to draw up the fundamental laws of the Confederation. No state is to make war with another on any pretence. All federal territories are mutually guaranteed. There is to be in each state a ‘Landständische Verfassung’—‘il y aura des assemblées d’états dans tous les pays de la Confédération.’ Art. 14 reserves many rights to the mediatised princes. Equal civil and political rights are guaranteed to all Christians in all German States, and stipulations are made in favour of the Jews. The Diet did not actually assemble before the 5th of November 1816. Its first measures, and, above all, its first words, were not unpopular. The Holy Allies, however, pressed with each succeeding month more heavily upon Germany, and got at last the control of the Confederation entirely

into their hands. The chief epochs in this sad history were the Congress of Carlsbad, 1819—the resolutions of which against the freedom of the press were pronounced by Gentz to be a victory more glorious than Leipzig; the ministerial conferences which immediately succeeded it at Vienna; and the adoption by the Diet of the Final Act (Schluss Acte) of the Confederation on the 8th of June 1820. The following are the chief stipulations of the Final Act:—The Confederation is indissoluble. No new member can be admitted without the unanimous consent of all the states, and no federal territory can be ceded to a foreign power without their permission. The regulations for the conduct of business by the Diet are amplified and more carefully defined. All quarrels between members of the Confederation are to be stopped before recourse is had to violence. The Diet may interfere to keep order in a state where the government of that state is notoriously incapable of doing so. Federal execution is provided for in case any government resists the authority of the Diet. Other articles declare the right of the Confederation to make war and peace as a body, to guard the rights of each separate state from injury, to take into consideration the differences between its members and foreign nations, to mediate between them, to maintain the neutrality of its territory, to make war when a state belonging to the Confederation is attacked in its non-federal territory if the attack seems likely to endanger Germany.”—M. E. G. Duff, *Studies in European Politics*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, pt. 8 (v. 3).—E. Hertslet, *The Map of Europe by Treaty*, v. 1, no. 26 (*Text of Federative Constitution*).—See, also, VIENNA: CONGRESS OF.

A. D. 1815.—Napoleon's return from Elba.—The Quadruple Alliance.—The Waterloo campaign and its results. See FRANCE: A. D. 1814-1815.

A. D. 1815.—Final Overthrow of Napoleon.—The Allies again in Paris.—Second treaty with France.—Restitutions and indemnities.—French frontier of 1790 re-established. See FRANCE: A. D. 1815 (JUNE), (JULY-NOVEMBER).

A. D. 1815.—The Holy Alliance. See HOLY ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1817-1820.—The Burschenschaft.—Assassination of Kotzebue.—The Karlsbad Conference.—“In 1817, the students of several Universities assembled at the Wartburg in order to celebrate the tercentenary of the Reformation. In the evening, a small number of them, the majority having already left, were carried away by enthusiastic zeal, and, in imitation of Luther, burnt a number of writings recently published against German freedom, together with other emblems of what was considered hateful in the institutions of some of the German States. These youthful excesses were viewed by the Governments as symptoms of grave peril. At the same time, a large number of students united to form one great German Burschenschaft [association of students], whose aim was the cultivation of a love of country, a love of freedom, and the moral sense. Thereupon increased anxiety on the part of the Governments, followed by vexatious police interference. Matters grew worse in consequence of the rash act of a fanatical student, named Sand. It became known that the Russian

Government was using all its powerful influence to have liberal ideas suppressed in Germany, and that the play-wright Kotzebue had secretly sent to Russia slanderous and libellous reports on German patriots. Sand travelled to Mannheim and thrust a dagger into Kotzebue's heart. The consequences were most disastrous to the cause of freedom in Germany. The distrust of the Governments reached its height: it was held that this bloody deed must needs be the result of a wide-spread conspiracy: the authorities suspected demagogues everywhere. Ministers, of course at the instigation of Metternich, met at Karlsbad, and determined on repressive measures. These were afterwards adopted by the Federal Diet at Frankfort, which henceforth became an instrument in the hands of the Emperor Francis and his Minister for guiding the internal policy of the German States. Accordingly, the cession of state-constitutions was opposed, and prosecutions were instituted throughout Germany against all who identified themselves with the popular movement; many young men were thrown into prison; gymnastic and other societies were arbitrarily suppressed; a rigid censorship of the press was established, and the freedom of the Universities restrained; various professors, among them Arndt, whose songs had helped to fire the enthusiasm of the *Freiheitskämpfer*—the soldiers of Freedom—in the recent war, were deprived of their offices; the Burschenschaft was dissolved, and the wearing of their colours, the future colours of the German Empire, black, red, and gold, was forbidden. . . . The Universities continued to uphold the national idea; the Burschenschaft soon secretly revived as a private association, and as early as 1820 there again existed at most German Universities, Burschenschaften, which, though their aims were not sharply defined, bore a political colouring and placed the demand for German Unity in the foreground.”—G. Krause, *The Growth of German Unity*, ch. 8.

A. D. 1817-1840.—Tendencies towards Germanic union and Prussian leadership.—The Zollverein.—“In Austria, in the decades succeeding the wars of liberation, there reigned the most immovable quiet. The much-praised system of government consisted in unthinking inactivity. The Emperor Francis, a man with the nature of a subaltern official, hated anything that approached to a constitution, and a saying of his was often quoted: ‘Totus mundus stultizat et vult habere constitutiones novas.’ Metternich's power rested on the ‘dead motionlessness’ of affairs. As far as his German policy was concerned his aim was to hold fast to the preponderating influence of Austria over the German states, but not to undertake any responsibilities towards them. . . . As for Prussia, in spite of the great sacrifices which she had made, she emerged from the diplomatic negotiations and intrigues of the Vienna Congress with the most unfavorable disposition of territory imaginable. To the five million inhabitants that had remained to her five and a half millions were added in districts that had belonged to more than a hundred different territories and had stood under the most varied laws. There began now for this state a time well filled with quiet work, the aim and object being to create a whole out of the various parts.”—Bruno-Gebhardt, *Lehrbuch der deutschen Geschichte* (trans. from the Ger-

man), v. 2, pp. 501-504.—“The German confederation was, on the whole, provisional in its character; this fact comes out more and more plainly with each thorough analysis and illustration of its constitution and of its institutions. . . . Technically the emperor of Austria had the honorary direction of the confederation; practically he possessed as emperor of Germany little or no power. . . . In reality the strongest member of the German confederation was the kingdom of Prussia. . . . Only gradually, in the various heads, did the opinion begin to form of the historical vocation of Prussia to take her place at the head of the German confederation or, possibly, of a new German empire. Gradually this opinion ripened into a firmer and firmer conviction and gained more and more supporters. The more evidently impossible an actual guidance of Germany by Austria became, the more conscious did men grow of the danger of the whole situation should the dualism be allowed to continue. In consequence of this the idea of the Prussian hegemony began to be viewed with constantly increasing favor. A great step forward in this direction was taken by the Prussian government when it called into being the Zollverein [or customs-union]. The Zollverein laid iron bands around the separate parts of the German nation. It was utterly impossible to think of forming a customs-union with Austria, for all economic interests were as widely different as possible; on purely material grounds the division between Austria and Prussia showed itself to be a necessity. On the other hand the economic bonds between Prussia and the rest of the German lands grew stronger from day to day. This material union was the prelude to the political one: the Zollverein was the best and most effectual preparation for the German federal state or for the German empire of later days.”—W. Maurenbrecher, *Gründung des deutschen Reichs*, pp. 4, 5.—“Paul Pfizer wrote in 1831 his ‘Correspondence of Two Germans,’ the first writing in the German language in which liberation from Austria and union with Prussia was put down as the solution of the German question, and in which faith in Prussia was made a part of such love to the German fatherland as should be no longer a mere dream. . . . ‘So little as the dead shall rise again this side the grave, so little will Austria, which once held the heritage of German fame and German glory, ever again become for Germany what she has once been.’”—W. Oncken, *Das Zeitalter des Kaisers Wilhelm* (trans. from the German), v. 1, pp. 69, 70.—The formation of the Zollverein “was the most important occurrence since the wars of liberation: a deed of peace of more far-reaching consequences and productive of more lasting results than many a battle won. The economic blessings of the Zollverein soon began to show themselves in the increasing sum total of the amount of commerce and in the regularly growing customs revenues of the individual states. These revenues, for example, increased between 1834 and 1842 from 12 to 21 million thalers. Foreign countries began to look with respect and in part also with envy on this commercial unity of Germany and on the results which could not fail to come. . . . A second event happened in Germany in 1834, less marked in its beginnings and yet scarcely less important in its results than the Zollverein. Between Leipzig and Dresden the first large railroad in Germany was

started, the first mesh in that network of roads that was soon to branch out in all directions and spread itself over all Germany. . . . A direct political occurrence, independent of the Zollverein and the railroads, was, in the course of the thirties, to assist in awakening and strengthening the idea of unity in the German people by making evident and plain the lack of such unity and its disastrous consequences. This was the Hanoverian ‘coup d’état’ of the year 1837. . . . In that year William IV. of England died without direct successors. . . . Hanover came into the hands of the Duke of Cumberland, Ernest Augustus. . . . The new king, soon after his inauguration, refused to recognize the constitution that had been given to Hanover in 1833, on the ground that his ratification as next heir to the throne had not been asked at that time. . . . By persistent efforts Ernest Augustus . . . in 1840 brought about a constitution that suited him. Still more than this constitutional struggle itself did a single incident connected with it occupy and excite public opinion far and wide. Seven professors of the Göttingen university protested against the abrogation of the constitution of 1833. . . . Without more ado they were dismissed from their positions. . . . The brave deed of the Göttingen professors and the new act of violence committed against them caused intense excitement throughout all Germany. . . . In the course of the forties the idea of nationality penetrated more and more all the pores of German opinion and gave to it more and more, by pressure from all sides, the direction of a great and common goal. At first there were only isolated attempts at reform . . . but soon the national needs outgrew such single expressions of good will. . . . A tendency began to show itself in the public opinion of Germany to accept the plan of a Prussian leadership of all un-Austrian Germany.”—K. Biedermann, *Dreissig Jahre deutscher Geschichte*, v. 1, pp. 9-91.

A. D. 1819-1847.—Arbitrary rulers and discontented subjects.—The ferment before revolution.—Formation of the Zollverein.—“The history of Germany during the thirty years of peace which followed [the Congress of Carlsbad] is marked by very few events of importance. It was a season of gradual reaction on the part of the rulers, and of increasing impatience and enmity on the part of the people. Instead of becoming loving families, as the Holy Alliance designed, the states (except some of the little principalities) were divided into two hostile classes. There was material growth everywhere; the wounds left by war and foreign occupation were gradually healed; there was order, security for all who abstained from politics, and a comfortable repose for such as were indifferent to the future. But it was a sad and disheartening period for the men who were able to see clearly how Germany, with all the elements of a freer and stronger life existing in her people, was falling behind the political development of other countries. The three days’ Revolution of 1830, which placed Louis Philippe on the throne of France, was followed by popular uprisings in some parts of Germany. Prussia and Austria were too strong, and their people too well held in check, to be affected; but in Brunswick the despotic Duke, Karl, was deposed, Saxony and Hesse-Cassel were obliged to accept co-rulers

(out of their reigning families) and the English Duke, Ernest Augustus, was made viceroy of Hannover. These four States also adopted a constitutional form of government. The German Diet, as a matter of course, used what power it possessed to counteract these movements, but its influence was limited by its own laws of action. The hopes and aspirations of the people were kept alive, in spite of the system of repression, and some of the smaller States took advantage of their independence to introduce various measures of reform. As industry, commerce and travel increased, the existence of so many boundaries, with their custom-houses, taxes and other hindrances, became an unendurable burden. Bavaria and Württemberg formed a customs union in 1828, Prussia followed, and by 1836 all of Germany except Austria was united in the Zollverein (Tariff Union) [see **TARIFF LEGISLATION (GERMANY): A. D. 1833**], which was not only a great material advantage, but helped to inculcate the idea of a closer political union. On the other hand, however, the monarchical reaction against liberal government was stronger than ever. Ernest Augustus of Hannover arbitrarily overthrew the constitution he had accepted, and Ludwig I. of Bavaria, renouncing all his former professions, made his land a very nest of absolutism and Jesuitism. In Prussia, such men as Stein, Gneisenau, and Wilhelm von Humboldt had long lost their influence, while others of less personal renown, but of similar political sentiments, were subjected to contemptible forms of persecution. In March, 1835, Francis II. of Austria died, and was succeeded by his son, Ferdinand I., a man of such weak intellect that he was in some respects idiotic. On the 7th of June, 1840, Frederick William III. of Prussia died, and was also succeeded by his son, Frederick William IV., a man of great wit and intelligence, who had made himself popular as Crown-prince, and whose accession the people hailed with joy, in the enthusiastic belief that better days were coming. The two dead monarchs, each of whom had reigned 43 years, left behind them a better memory among their people than they actually deserved. They were both weak, unstable and narrow-minded; had they not been controlled by others, they would have ruined Germany; but they were alike of excellent personal character, amiable, and very kindly disposed towards their subjects so long as the latter were perfectly obedient and reverential. There was no change in the condition of Austria, for Metternich remained the real ruler, as before. In Prussia a few unimportant concessions were made, an amnesty for political offences was declared, Alexander von Humboldt became the king's chosen associate, and much was done for science and art; but in their main hope of a liberal reorganization of the government, the people were bitterly deceived. Frederick William IV. took no steps towards the adoption of a Constitution; he made the censorship and the supervision of the police more severe; he interfered in the most arbitrary and bigoted manner in the system of religious instruction in the schools; and all his acts showed that his policy was to strengthen his throne by the support of the nobility and the civil service, without regard to the just claims of the people. Thus, in spite of the external quiet and order, the political atmosphere gradually became more sultry and disturbed. . . . There were signs of im-

patience in all quarters; various local outbreaks occurred, and the aspects were so threatening that in February, 1847, Frederick William IV. endeavored to silence the growing opposition by ordering the formation of a Legislative Assembly. But the provinces were represented, not the people, and the measure only emboldened the latter to clamor for a direct representation. Thereupon, the king closed the Assembly, after a short session, and the attempt was probably productive of more harm than good. In most of the other German States, the situation was very similar; everywhere there were elements of opposition, all the more violent and dangerous, because they had been kept down with a strong hand for so many years."—B. Taylor, *Hist. of Germany*, ch. 37.

ALSO IN: C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 2, ch. 5 and 7.—See, also, **AUSTRIA: A. D. 1815-1835**.

A. D. 1820-1822.—The Congresses of Troppau, Laybach and Verona. See **VERONA, THE CONGRESS OF**.

A. D. 1835-1846.—Death of the Emperor Francis I. of Austria.—Accession of Ferdinand I.—Extinction of the Polish republic of Cracow.—Its annexation to Austria. See **AUSTRIA: A. D. 1815-1846**.

A. D. 1839-1840.—The Turko-Egyptian question and its settlement.—Quadruple Alliance. See **TURKS: A. D. 1831-1840**.

A. D. 1848 (March).—Revolutionary outbreaks.—The King of Prussia heads a national movement.—Mistaken battle of soldiers and citizens at Berlin.—"The French revolution of February, the flight of Louis Philippe and the fall of the throne of the barricades, and the proclamation of a republic, had kindled from one end to the other of Europe the enthusiasm of the republican party. The conflagration rapidly extended itself. The Rhenish provinces of Prussia, whose near neighbourhood and former connexion with France made them more peculiarly combustible, broke out with a cry for the most extensive reforms; that is to say, for representative institutions, the passion for which had spread over the whole of Germany. . . . The reform fever which had attacked the Rhenish provinces quickly spread to the rest of the body politic. The urban populace—a class in all countries rarely incited to agitation—took the lead. They were headed by the students. Breslau, Königsberg, and Berlin, were in violent commotion. In the month of March, a great open air meeting was held at Berlin: it ended in a riot. The troops were called out to act against the mob. For near a week, Berlin was in a state of chronic disturbance. The troops acted with great firmness. The mob gathered together, but did not show much fight; but they were dispersed with difficulty, and continued to offer a passive resistance to the soldiers. On the 15th, ten persons were said to have been killed, and over 100 wounded. At the same time, similar scenes were being enacted at Breslau and Königsberg, where several persons lost their lives. A deputation from the Rhenish provinces arrived at Berlin on the 18th, bearing a petition from Cologne to the king for reform. He promised to grant it. . . . Finding he could not keep the movement in check, he resolved to put himself at the head of it. It was probably the only course open to him, if he would preserve his crown. . . . The king must

have previously had the questions which were agitating Germany under careful consideration; for he at once published a proclamation embodying the whole of them: the unity of Germany, by forming it into a federal state, with a federal representation; representative institutions for the separate states; a general military system for all Germany, under one federal banner; a German fleet; a tribunal for settling disputes between the states, and a right for all Germans to settle and trade in any part of Germany they thought fit; the whole of Germany formed into one customs union, and included in the Zollverein; one system of money, weights, and measures; and the freedom of the press. These were the subjects touched upon. . . . The popularity of the proclamation with the mob-leaders was unbounded, and the mob shouted. Every line of it contained their own ideas, vigorously expressed. Their delight was proportionate to their astonishment. A crowd got together at the palace to express their gratitude; the king came out of a window, and was loudly cheered. Two regiments of dragoons unluckily mistook the cheering for an attack, and began pushing them back by forcing their horses forward. . . . Unfortunately, as the conflict (if conflict it could be called, which was only a bout of which could push hardest) was going forward, two musket-shots were fired by a regiment of infantry. It appears that the muskets went off accidentally. No one was injured by them. It is not clear they were not blank cartridges; but the people took fright. They imagined that there was a design to slaughter them. At once they rushed to arms; barricades were thrown up in every street. . . . Sharpshooters placed themselves in the windows and behind the barricades, and opened a fire on the soldiery. These, exasperated by what they thought an unfair species of fighting, were by no means unwilling for the fray. . . . The troops carried barricade after barricade, and gave no quarter even to the unresisting. As they took the houses, they slaughtered all the sharpshooters they found in them, not very accurately discriminating those engaged in hostilities from those who were not. Horrible cruelties were committed on both sides. . . . The fight raged for fifteen hours. Either the king lost his head when it began, or the troops, having their blood up, would not stop. . . . The firing began at two o'clock on the 18th of March, and the authorities succeeded in withdrawing the troops and stopping it the next morning at five o'clock, they having been during that time successful at all points. . . . The king put out a manifesto at seven o'clock, declaring that the whole business arose from an unlucky misunderstanding between the troops and the people, as it unquestionably did, and the people appear to have been aware of the fact and ashamed of themselves. . . . A general amnesty was proclaimed for all parties concerned, and orders were given to form at once a burgher guard to supply the place of the military, who were to be withdrawn. A new ministry was appointed, of a liberal character. . . . The troops were marched out of the town, and were cheered by the people. . . . It is estimated that, of the populace, about 200 were killed: 187 received a public funeral. No accurate account of the wounded can be obtained. . . . Of the troops, according to the official returns, there fell 3 officers and 17 non-

commissioned officers and privates; of wounded there were 14 officers, 14 non-commissioned officers, and 225 privates, and 1 surgeon. . . . The king's object was to divert popular enthusiasm into another channel; he therefore assumed the lead in the regeneration of Germany. On the 21st he issued a proclamation, enlarging on these views, and rode through the streets with the proscribed German tricolor on his helmet, and was vociferously cheered as he passed along. Prussia was not the first of the German states where the old order of things was overturned. During the whole of the month of March, Germany underwent the process of revolution. . . . On the 3d of March . . . the new order of things . . . began at Wurtemberg. The Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt abdicated. In Bavaria, things took a more practical turn. The people insisted on the dismissal of the king's mistress, Lola Montez: she was sent away, but, trusting to the king's dotage, she came back, police or no police — was received by the king — he created her Countess of Lansfeldt. This was a climax to which the people were not prepared to submit. . . . The king was compelled to expel her, to annul her patent of naturalization, and resume the grant he had made of property in her favour. This was more than he could stand, and he shortly after abdicated in favour of his heir. In Saxony the king gave way, after his troops had refused to act, and the freedom of the press was established, and other popular demands granted. In Vienna, the old system of Metternich was abolished, after a revolution which was little more than a street row. The king of Hanover refused to move, but was eventually induced to receive Stube as one of his ministers, who had been previously in prison for his opinions. However, he was firmer than most of his brother monarchs, and his country suffered less than the rest of Germany in consequence."—E. S. Cayley, *The European Revolutions of 1848*, v. 2: *Germany*, ch. 2.

ALSO IN: C. E. Maurice, *The Revolutionary Movement of 1848–9*, ch. 7.

A. D. 1848 (March–September).—Election and meeting of the National Assembly at Frankfurt.—Resignation of the Diet.—Election of Archduke John to be Administrator of Germany.—Powerlessness of the new government.—Troubles rising from the Schleswig-Holstein question.—Outbreak at Frankfurt.—The setting in of Reaction.—“In south-western Germany the liberal party set itself at the head of the movement. . . . The Heidelberg assembly of March 5th, consisting of the former opposition leaders in the various Chambers, issued a call to the German nation, and chose a commission of seven men, who were to make propositions with regard to a permanent parliament and to summon a preliminary parliament at Frankfurt. This preliminary parliament assembled in St. Paul's church, March 31st. . . . The majority, consisting of constitutional monarchists, resolved that an assembly chosen by direct vote of the people . . . should meet in the month of May, with full and sovereign power to frame a constitution for all Germany. . . . These measures did not satisfy the radical party, whose leaders were Hecker and Struve. As their proposition to set up a sovereign assembly, and republicanize Germany, was rejected, they left Frankfurt, and held in the highlands of Baden popular

meetings at which they demanded the proclamation of the republic. A Hesse-Darmstadt corps under Frederic von Gagern . . . was sent to disperse them. An engagement took place at Kandern, in which Gagern was shot, but Hecker and his followers were put to flight. . . . The disturbances in Odenwald, and in the Main and Tauber districts, once the home of the peasant war, were of a different description. There the country people rose against the landed proprietors, destroyed the archives, with the odious tithe and rental books, and demolished a few castles. The Diet, which in the meantime continued its illusory existence, thought to extricate itself from the present difficulties by a few concessions. It . . . invited the governments to send confidential delegates to undertake, along with its members, a revision of the constitution of the confederation. . . . These confidential delegates, among them the poet Uhland, from Würtemberg, began their work on the 30th of March. The elections for the National Assembly stirred to their innermost fibres the German people, dreaming of the restoration of their former greatness. May 18th about 320 delegates assembled in the Imperial Hall, in the Römer (the Rathhaus), at Frankfort. . . . Never has a political assembly contained a greater number of intellectual and scholarly men—men of character and capable of self-sacrifice; but it certainly was not the forte of these numerous professors and jurists to conduct practical politics. The moderate party was decidedly in the majority. . . . It was decided . . . that a provisional central executive should be created in the place of the Diet, and created, not by the National Assembly in concert with the princes, but by the National Assembly alone. June 27th, following out the bold conception of its president, the assembly decided to appoint an irresponsible administrator, with a responsible ministry; and June 29th, Archduke John of Austria was chosen Administrator of Germany by 436 votes out of 546. He made his entry into Frankfort July 11th, and entered upon his office on the following day. The hour of the Diet had struck, apparently for the last time. It resigned its authority into the hands of the Administrator, and, after an existence of 32 years, left the stage unmourned. Archduke John was a popular prince, who found more pleasure in the mountain air of Tyrol and Styria than in the perfumed atmosphere of the Vienna court. But, as a novice 66 years of age, he was not equal to the task of governing, and as a thorough Austrian he lacked a heart for all Germany. The main question for him and for the National Assembly was, what force they could apply in case the individual governments refused obedience to the decrees issued in the name of the National Assembly. This was the Achilles's heel of the German revolution. . . . Orders were issued by the federal minister of war that all the troops of the Confederation should swear allegiance to the federal administrator on the 6th of August; but Prussia and Austria, with the exception of the Vienna garrison, paid no attention to these orders; Ernest Augustus, in Hanover, successfully set his hard head against them, and only the lesser states obeyed. . . . There certainly was no other way out of the difficulty than by the formation of a parliamentary army. . . . Instead of meeting these dangers resolutely, and in a common-sense

way, the Assembly left matters to go as they would, outside of Frankfort. One humiliation was submitted to after another, while the Assembly, husing itself for months with a theoretical question, as if it were a juristic faculty, entered into a detailed consideration of the fundamental rights of the German people. The Schleswig-Holstein question, which had just entered upon a new phase of its existence, was the first matter of any importance to manifest the disagreement between the central administration and the separate governments; and it opened, as well, a dangerous gulf in the Assembly itself. The question at issue was one of succession [see SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK): A. D. 1848-1862]. . . . The Estates of the duchies [Schleswig and Holstein] established a provisional government, applied at Frankfort for the admission of Schleswig into the German confederation, and besought armed assistance both there and at Berlin. The preliminary parliament [this having occurred in April, before the meeting of the National Assembly] approved the application of Schleswig for admission, and commissioned Prussia, in conjunction with the 10th army corps of the Confederation, to occupy Schleswig and Holstein. On the 21st of April, 1848, General Wrangel crossed the Eider as commander of the forces of the Confederation; and on the 23d, in conjunction with the Schleswig-Holstein troops, he drove the Danes out of the Danewerk. On the following day the Danes were defeated at Oeversee by the 10th army corps, and all Schleswig-Holstein was free. Wrangel entered Jutland and imposed a war tax of 3,000,000 thalers (about \$2,250,000). He meant to occupy this province until the Danes—who, owing to the inexcusable smallness of the Prussian navy, were in a position unhindered to injure the commerce of the Baltic—had indemnified Prussia for her losses; but Prussia, touched to the quick by the destruction of her commerce, and intimidated by the threatening attitude of Russia, Sweden, and England, recalled her troops, and concluded an armistice at Malmö, in Sweden, on the 26th of August. All measures of the provisional government were pronounced invalid; a common government for the duchies was to be appointed, one half by Denmark, and the other by the German confederation; the Schleswig troops were to be separated from those of Holstein; and the war was not to be renewed before the 1st of April, 1849—i. e., not in the winter, a time unfavorable for the Danes. This treaty was unquestionably no masterpiece on the part of the Prussians. All the advantage was on the side of the conquered Danes. . . . It was not merely the radicals who urged, if not the final rejection, at least a provisional cessation of the armistice, and the countermanding of the order to retreat. . . . A bill to that effect, demanded by the honor of Germany, had scarcely been passed by the majority, on the 5th of September, when the moderate party reflected that such action, involving a breach with Prussia, must lead to civil war and revolution, and call into play the wildest passions of the already excited people. In consequence of this the previous vote was rescinded, and the armistice of Malmö accepted by the Assembly, after the most excited debates, September 16th. This gave the radicals a welcome opportunity to appeal to the fists of the lower classes, and imitate the June outbreak of the social democrats in Paris. . . .

A collision ensued [September 18]; barricades were erected, but were carried by the troops without much bloodshed. . . . General Auerswald and Prince Lichnowsky, riding on horseback near the city, were followed by a mob. They took refuge in a gardener's house on the Bornheimer-heide, but were dragged out and murdered with the most disgraceful atrocities. Thereupon the city was declared in a state of siege, all societies were forbidden, and strong measures were taken for the maintenance of order. The March revolution had passed its season, and reaction was again beginning to bloom. . . . Reaction drew moderate men to its side, and then used them as stepping-stones to immoderation."—W. Müller, *Political Hist. of Recent Times*, sect. 17.

ALSO IN: Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, 1815-1852, ch. 53.

A. D. 1848-1849.—Revolutionary risings in Austria and Hungary.—Bombardment of Vienna.—The war in Hungary.—Abdication of the Emperor Ferdinand.—Accession of Francis Joseph. See AUSTRIA: A. D. 1848-1849.

A. D. 1848-1850.—The Prussian National Assembly, and its dissolution.—The work and the failure of the National Assembly of Frankfurt.—Refusal of the imperial crown by the King of Prussia.—End of the movement for Germanic unity.—"The elections for the new Prussian Constituent Assembly, as well as for the Frankfurt Parliament, were to take place (May 1). The Prussian National Assembly was to meet May 22. The Prussian people, under the new election law, if left to themselves, would have quietly chosen a body of competent representatives; but the revolutionary party thought nothing could be done without the ax and the musket. . . . The people of Berlin, from March to October, were . . . really in the hands of the mob. . . . The newly-elected Prussian National Assembly was opened by the king, May 21. . . . One of the first resolutions proceeded from Behrend of the Extreme Left. 'The Assembly recognizes the revolution, and declares that the combatants who fought at the barricades, on March 18 and 19, merit the thanks of the country.' . . . The motion was rejected. On issuing from the building into the street, after the sitting, the members who had voted against it, were received by the mob with threats and insults. . . . In the evening of the same day, in consequence of the rejection of the Behrend resolution, the arsenal was attacked by a large body of laborers. The burgher-guard were not prepared, and made a feeble defense. There was a great riot. The building was stormed and partially plundered. . . . The sketch of a constitution proposed by the king was now laid before the Assembly. It provided two Chambers—a House of Lords, and a House of Commons. The last to be elected by the democratic electoral law; the first to consist of all the princes of the royal house in their own right, and, in addition, 60 members from the wealthiest of the kingdom to be selected by the king, their office hereditary. This constitution was immediately rejected. On the rejection of the constitution the ministry Camphausen resigned. . . . The Assembly, elected exclusively to frame a constitution, instead of performing its duty . . . attempted to legislate, with despotic power, on subjects over which it had no jurisdiction. As the drama drew nearer its close, the

Assembly became more open in its intention to overthrow the monarchy. On October 12 discussions began upon a resolution to strike from the king's title the words, 'By the grace of God,' and to abolish all titles of nobility and distinctions of rank. The Assembly building, during the sitting, was generally surrounded by threatening crowds. . . . Of course, during this period business was suspended, and want, beggary, and drunkenness, as well as lawless disorder, increased. . . . The writer was one day alone in the diplomatic box, following an excited debate. A speaker in the tribune was urging the overthrow of the monarchy, when suddenly the entire Assembly was struck mute with stupefaction. The Prince of Prussia, the late Emperor William I., supposed to be in England, in terror for his life, appeared at the door, accompanied by two officers, all three in full uniform, and marched directly up to the tribune. The Assembly could not have been more astounded had old Barbarossa himself, with his seven-hundred-years-long beard, marched into the hall out of his mountain cave. . . . After a slight delay, the President, Mr. von Grabow, accorded the tribune to the prince. He ascended and made a short address, which was listened to, with breathless attention, by every individual present. He spoke with the assurance of an heir to a throne which was not in the slightest danger of being abolished; but he spoke with the modesty and good sense of a prince who frankly accepted the vast transformation which the government had undergone, and who intended honestly to endeavor to carry out the will of the whole nation. . . . This was one of many occasions on which the honesty and superiority of the prince's character made itself felt even by his enemies. . . . Berlin was now thoroughly tired of street tumults and the horn of the burgher-guard. . . . The Prussian troops which had been engaged in the Schleswig-Holstein war, were now placed under General Wrangel. . . . He proceeded without delay to encircle the city with the 25,000 troops. At the same time, a cabinet order of the king (September 21) named a new ministry. . . . At this moment, the revolution over all Europe was nearly exhausted. Cavaignac had put down the June insurrection. The Prussian flag waved above the flag of Germany. The Frankfurt Parliament was rapidly dying out. . . . On November 2, Count Brandenburg stated to the Assembly that the king had requested him to form a new ministry. . . . On the same day, Count Brandenburg, with his colleagues, appeared in the hall of the Prussian National Assembly, and announced his desire to read a message from his Majesty the King. . . . 'As the debates are no longer free in Berlin, the Assembly is hereby adjourned to November 27. It will then meet, and thereafter hold its meetings, not in Berlin, but in Brandenburg' (fifty miles from Berlin). After reading the message, Count Brandenburg, his colleagues, and all the members of the Right retired. . . . The Assembly . . . adjourned, and met again in the evening. . . . On November 10, the Assembly met again. Their debates were interrupted by General Wrangel, who had entered Berlin by the Brandenburg gate, at the head of 25,000 troops. . . . An officer from General Wrangel entered the hall and politely announced that he had received orders to disperse the Assembly. The members submitted, and left the hall. . . . An order was

now issued dissolving the burgher-guard. On the 12th, Berlin was declared in a state of siege. . . . During the state of siege, the Assembly met again under the presidency of Mr. von Unruh. A body of troops entered the hall, and commanded the persons present to leave it. President von Unruh declared he could not consistently obey the order. There was, he said, no power higher than the Assembly. The soldiers did not fire on him, or cut him down with their sabers; but good-naturedly lifted his chair with him in it, and gently deposited both in the street. . . . On November 27, Count Brandenburg went to Brandenburg to open the Assembly; but he could not find any. It had split into two parts. . . . There was no longer a quorum. Thus the Prussian National Assembly disappeared. On December 5, appeared a royal decree, dissolving the National Assembly. . . . Then appeared a provisional octroyirte electoral law, for the election of two Chambers. . . . The new Chambers met February 26, 1849. . . . Prussia had thus closed the revolution of 1848, as far as she was concerned. Bismarck was elected member of the Second Chamber." Meantime, in the Frankfort Parliament, "the great question, Austria's position with regard to the new Germany, came up in the early part of November, 1848. Among many propositions, we mention three: I. Austria should abandon her German provinces. . . . II. Austria should remain as a separate whole, with all her provinces. . . . III. The Austrian plan. All the German States, and all the Austrian provinces (German and non-German), should be united into one gigantic empire . . . with Austria at the head. . . . Meanwhile, the debates went on upon the questions: What shall be the form, and who shall be the chief of what may be called the Prussian-Germany? Among the various propositions (all rejected) were the following: I. A Directory, consisting of Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Württemberg, and Saxony. II. The King of Prussia and Emperor of Austria to alternate in succession every six years, as Emperor. III. A chief magistracy, to which every German citizen might aspire. IV. Revival of the old Bundestag, with certain improvements. On January 23, 1849, the resolution that one of the reigning German princes should be elected, with the title of Emperor of Germany, was adopted (258 against 211). As it was plain the throne could be offered to no one but Prussia, this was a breach between the Parliament and Austria. . . . The first reading of the constitution was completed, February 3, 1849. The middle and smaller German States declared themselves ready to accept it, but the kingdoms remained silent. . . . The real question before the Parliament was, whether Prussia or Austria should be leader of Germany. . . . On March 27, the hereditability passed by a majority of four. On March 28, the constitution, with the democratic electoral law, universal suffrage, the ballot, and the suspensive veto, was voted and accepted. . . . President Simson then called the name of each member to vote upon the question of the Emperor. There were 290 votes for Frederic William IV. . . . A deputation, consisting of 80 of the most distinguished members, was immediately sent to Berlin to communicate to the king his election as Emperor. . . . To the offer of the crown, his Majesty replied he 'could not accept without the consent of all the governments, and without having more carefully examined the

constitution.' . . . Austria instantly rejected the constitution, protested against the authority of the Parliament, and recalled all her representatives from Frankfort. The King of Württemberg accepted; but rejected the House of Hohenzollern as head of the Empire. Bavaria, Hanover, Saxony, rejected; 28 of the smaller German States accepted. In these were included the free-cities Hamburg, Bremen, Lubeck. . . . On April 28, Prussia addressed a circular note to the governments, inviting them to send representatives to Berlin, for the purpose of framing a new constitution. The note added: In case of any attempt to force the Frankfort constitution upon the country, Prussia was ready to render to the governments all necessary assistance. . . . On May 3, an insurrection broke out in Saxony. . . . On May 6, Prussian troops appeared, called by the Saxon government, and attacked the barricades. The battle lasted three days. . . . The insurgents abandoned the city. Dresden was declared in a state of siege. . . . The King of Prussia now recalled [from the Frankfort Parliament] all the Prussian representatives. . . . By the gradual disappearance of most of the moderate members . . . the Parliament, now a mere revolutionary committee, dwindled down to about 100 members. A resolution, proposed by Carl Vogt, was passed to transfer the sittings to Stuttgart. . . . On June 6, the Rump Parliament in Stuttgart elected a central government of its own. . . . The Assembly was then dispersed. . . . The German revolutions commenced and ended in the Grand Duchy of Baden. . . . By a mutiny in the regular army, it intrenched itself in the first-class fortress, Rastadt. There were, in all, three attempts at revolution in Baden [and one in the Palatinate]. . . . A large number of the leaders were tried and shot. . . . It was for taking part in this insurrection that Gottfried Kinkel was sentenced to imprisonment for life in the fortress of Spandau. Carl Schurz aided him in escaping."—T. S. Fay, *The Three Germanys*, ch. 25-26 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: C. A. Fyfe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 3, ch. 2.—H. von Sybel, *The Founding of the German Empire*, bk. 2-5 (v. 1-2).—See, also, CONSTITUTION OF PRUSSIA.

A. D. 1848-1862.—Opening of the Schleswig-Holstein question.—War with Denmark. See SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK): A. D. 1848-1862.

A. D. 1853-1875.—Commercial treaties with Austria and France.—Progress towards free trade. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (GERMANY): A. D. 1853-1892.

A. D. 1861-1866.—Advent of King William I. and Prince Bismarck in Prussia.—The "Blood and Iron Speech."—Reopening of the Schleswig-Holstein question.—Conquest of the duchies by Prussia and Austria. —Consequent quarrel and war.—King Frederick William IV. [of Prussia], never a man of strong head, had for years been growing weaker and more eccentric. In 1857, symptoms of softening of the brain began to show themselves. That disorder so developed itself that in October, 1857, he gave a delegation to the Prince of Prussia [his brother] to act as regent; but the first commission was only for three months. The Prince's commission was renewed from time to time; but it soon became apparent that Frederick William's case was hopeless, and his brother was formally installed as Regent in October, 1858. Ultimately

the King died in January, 1861, and his brother succeeded to the throne as William I. In September, 1862, Otto von Bismarck became the new King's chief minister, with General Roon for Minister of War, appointed to carry out a reorganization of the Prussian army which King William had determined to effect. "Otto von Bismarck-Schoenhausen, born April, 1, 1815, was a Junker [squire, aristocrat] from top to toe, but from the very first, as was the case with all the Junkers of Prussia, Pomerania and the Mark, his life had been thoroughly merged in that of the Prussian state. He had first called attention to himself in 1847 at the general diet [Vereinigter Landtag]. In 1849 he came forward in the chamber of deputies, in 1850 in the Union Parliament at Frankfort — always as the goad of the extreme right, and each time his appearance gave the signal for a violent conflict. Perfectly unsparing of all his opponents, very anti-liberal but very Prussian, very national-minded, in spite of being such a Junker, Bismarck flared up with especial violence against the democratic attacks on the army and the monarchy. . . . To Frankfort Bismarck came as the sworn defender of the policy of reaction. . . . In Frankfort, too, he learned thoroughly to know German affairs: the utter weakness of the Confederation and the misery of having so many petty states. . . . To his mind the goal of Prussian policy was to drive Austria out of Germany and then to bring about a subordination of the other German states to Prussia. . . . Nor did he make the least secret of his warlike attitude towards Austria. When an Austrian arch-duke, who was passing through, once asked him maliciously whether all the many decorations which he wore on his breast had been won by bravery in battle: 'All gained before the enemy, all gained here in Frankfort,' was the ready answer. In the year 1859 came the complications between Austria and Italy, the latter being joined by France. This Italian war between Austria and France thoroughly roused the German nation. . . . Many wanted to protect Austria, others showed a disinclination to enter the lists for Austria's rule over Italy. . . . Bismarck's advice at this time was that Prussia should side against Austria and should join Italy. In the spring of 1859, however, he was transferred from Frankfort on the Main to St. Petersburg: 'put on ice on the Neva,' as he said himself, 'like champagne for future use.' . . . In June, 1859, in view of the Italian war, it had been decreed in Prussia that the army should be mobilized and kept in readiness to fight. . . . When, later, in the summer of this year, the probability of war had gone by, the Landwehr was not dismissed but, on the contrary, a beginning was made with a new formation of regiments which had already been planned and talked over. . . . On February 10, 1860, the question of the military reorganization was laid before the diet, where doubts and objections were raised against it. . . . On the 4th of May, at the same time when the law about civil marriages was rejected, the land-tax, by which the cost of the army-reorganization was to have been covered, was refused by the Upper House. The liberals were disappointed and angered. The ministry was soon in a bad dilemma: should it give way to the liberal opposition and dissolve the newly formed regiments? The expedient that was thought of seemed clever enough but it led in

reality to a blind alley and was productive of the most baneful consequences. The ministry moved a single grant of 9,000,000 thalers for the purpose of completing the army and maintaining its efficiency on the former footing. The motion was carried on May 15, 1860, by a vote of 315 against 2. . . . The new elections for the house of deputies in December, 1861, produced a diet of an entirely different stamp from that of 1858. . . . The moderate majority was now to atone for the sin of not having come to any real arrangement with the ministry on the army question; for the new majority came to Berlin with the full intention of crushing the army-reform. . . . The chief task of the newly formed ministry of 1862 was to solve the military question, for the longer it had remained in abeyance the more complicated had the matter become. The newly-elected diet had been in session since the 19th of May. . . . The battle cry of the majority of the diet was that all further demands of the government for the military reform were to be refused. . . . By September, 1862, the belligerent and uncompromising attitude of the liberal majority had induced King William to lay aside his earlier distrust of Bismarck. He allowed him to be summoned and placed him at the head of the ministry. Most stirring was the first audience which Bismarck had with his king in the Park of Babelsberg on September 23. The king first of all laid before Bismarck the declaration of his abdication. Very much startled, Bismarck said: 'To that it should never be allowed to come!' The king replied that he had tried everything and knew no other alternative. His convictions, contrary to which he could not act, contrary to which he could not reign, forbade him to relinquish the army-reorganization. Thereupon Bismarck explained to the king his own different view of the matter and closed with the request that his Majesty might abandon all thoughts of abdication. The king then asked the minister if he would undertake to carry on the government without a majority and without a budget. Bismarck answered both questions in the affirmative and with the utmost decision. . . . The alliance between the king and his minister was closed and cemented on that 23rd of September in Babelsberg to endure for all time." —W. Maurenbrecher, *Gründung des deutschen Reichs* (trans. from the German), p. 13.—A week later, Bismarck made his famous "Blood and Iron" speech in the Prussian Diet, when he said: "It is a fact, the great self-assertion of individuality among us makes constitutional government very hard in Prussia. . . . We are perhaps too 'cultured' to tolerate a constitution; we are too critical; the ability to pass judgment on measures of the government or acts of the legislature is too universal; there is a large number of 'Catilinarian Characters' [existences in the original] in the land whose chief interest is in revolutions. All this may sound paradoxical; yet it proves how hard constitutional life is in Prussia. The people are too sensitive about the faults of the government; as if the whole did not suffer when this or that individual minister blunders. Public opinion is changeable, the press is not public opinion; every one knows how the press originates; the representatives have the higher task of directing opinion, of being above it. To return once more to our people: our blood is too hot, we are fond of bearing an armor

too large for our small body; now let us utilize it. Germany does not look at Prussia's liberalism but at its power. Let Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden indulge in liberalism, yet no one will assign to them the rôle of Prussia; Prussia must consolidate its might and hold it together for the favorable moment, which has been allowed to pass unheeded several times. Prussia's boundaries, as determined by the Congress of Vienna, are not conducive to its wholesome existence as a sovereign state. Not by speeches and resolutions of majorities the mighty problems of the age are solved—that was the mistake of 1848 and 1849—but by Blood and Iron.”—*Die Politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarck* (trans. from the German) v. 2, pp. 20, 28-30.—Bismarck found his first opportunity for the aggrandizement of Prussia in a reopening of the Sleswig-Holstein question, which came about in November, 1863, when “Frederic of Denmark died, and Prince Christian succeeded to the throne of that kingdom. Already before his accession, the duchies were possessions of the Danish monarchy, but had in certain respects a separate administrative existence. This Denmark, in the year of Christian's accession, had materially infringed in the case of Sleswig, by a law which virtually incorporated that duchy with the Danish monarchy. The German Confederation protested against this ‘Danification’ of Sleswig, and having pronounced a decree of Federal execution against the new King of Denmark as Duke of Holstein and, in virtue of that duchy, a member of the German Confederation, sent into Holstein Federal troops belonging to the smaller States of the Confederation. The Confederation, as a collective body, favoured the establishment of the independence of the duchies, and had with it the wishes probably of the great mass of the German nation. But the independence of Sleswig and Holstein scarcely suited the views of Bismarck. He desired the annexation to Prussia of at all events Holstein, because in Holstein is the great harbour of Kiel, all important in view of the new fleet with which he purposed equipping Prussia; if Sleswig could be compassed along with Holstein, so much the better. But there were two difficulties in Bismarck's way. Prussia was a co-signatory of the Treaty of London. If he were to grasp at the duchies single-handed, a host of enemies might confront him. England was burning to take up arms in the cause of the father of the beautiful princess she had adopted as her own. The German Confederation would oppose Prussia's naked effort to aggrandise herself; and Austria, in the double character of a party to the Treaty of London and of a member of the Confederation, would rejoice in the opportunity to strike a blow at a power of whose rising pretensions she had begun to be jealous. The wily Bismarck had to dissemble. He made the proposal to Austria that the two states should ignore their participation as individual States in the Treaty of London, and that as corporate members of the German Confederation they should constitute themselves the executors of the Federal decree, and put aside the minor states whose troops had been charged with that office. Austria acceded. It was a bad hour for her when she did, yet she moves no compassion for the misfortunes which befell her as the issue. . . . The Diet had to submit. The Austro-Prussian troops marched through Holstein into Sles-

wig, and on the 2nd of February, 1864, struck at the Danes occupying the Dannewerke. . . . The venerable Marshal Wrangel was commander-in-chief of the combined forces until after the fall of Düppel, when Prince Frederic Charles succeeded him in that position; but throughout the campaign the control of the dispositions was mainly exercised by the Red Prince. But neither strategy nor tactics were very strenuously brought into use for the discomfiture of the unfortunate Danes. Their ruin was wrought partly because of the overwhelmingly superior force of their allied opponents, partly because of their own unpreparedness for war in almost everything save the possession of heroic bravery; but most of all by the fire of the needle-gun and the Prussian advantage in the possession of rifled artillery. Only part of the Prussian infantry had used the needle-gun in the reduction of the Baden insurrection in 1848; now, however, the whole army was equipped with it. . . . In their retreat from the Dannewerke into the Düppel position, the Danes suffered severely from the inclemency of the weather, and fought a desperate rear-guard engagement with the Austrians. . . . The Prussians undertook the task of reducing Düppel; the Austrians marched northward into Jutland, and driving back the Danish troops they encountered in their march, sat down before the fortress of Fredericia, and swept the Little Belt with their cannon. The sieges, both of Düppel and of Fredericia, were conducted with extreme inertness.” But the former was taken and the latter abandoned. “The Danish war was terminated by the Treaty of Vienna on the 30th October, 1864, under which the duchies of Sleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg were handed over to the sovereigns of Austria and Prussia. . . . Out of the Danish war of 1864 grew almost inevitably the war of 1866, between Prussia and Austria. The wolves quite naturally wrangled over the carcase. . . . The condominium of the two Powers in the duchies produced constant friction, which was probably Bismarck's intention, especially as Prussia had taken care to keep stationed in them twice as many troops as Austria had left there. Relations were becoming very strained when in August, 1865, the Emperor Francis Joseph and King William met at the little watering-place of Gastein, and from their interview originated the short-lived arrangement known as the Convention of Gastein. By that compact, while the two Powers preserved the common sovereignty over the duchies, Austria accepted the administration of Holstein, Prussia undertaking that of Sleswig. Prussia was to have rights of way through Holstein to Sleswig, was given over the right of construction of a North Sea and Baltic Canal; and while Kiel was constituted a Federal harbour, Prussia was authorised to construct there the requisite fortifications and marine establishments, and to maintain an adequate force for the protection of these. Assuming the arrangement to be provisional, as on all hands it was regarded, Prussia clearly had the advantage under it. . . . But the Gastein Convention contained another provision—that Austria should sell to Prussia all her rights in the duchy of Lauenburg (an outlying appanage of Holstein) for the sum of 2,500,000 thalers: thus making market of rights of which she was but a trustee for the German Confederation. The Convention of Gastein

pleased nobody, but that mattered little to Bismarck. . . . Bickerings recommenced before the year 1865 was out, and early in 1866 Austria began to arm. . . . In March, 1866, a secret treaty was formed between Italy and Prussia. . . . Prussia threw the Convention of Gastein to the winds by civilly but masterfully turning the Austrian brigade of occupation out of Holstein. Then Austria in the Federal Diet, complaining that by this act Prussia had disturbed the peace of the German Confederation, moved for a decree of Federal execution against that state, to be enforced by the Confederation's armed strength. On the 14th June, Austria's motion was carried by the Diet, its last act; for Prussia next day wrecked the flimsy organisation of the German Confederation, by declaring war against three of its component members, Hanover, Hesse, and Saxony. There was no formal declaration of war between Austria and Prussia, only a notification of intended hostile action sent by the Prussian commanders to the Austrian foreposts. On the 17th the Emperor Francis Joseph published his war manifesto; King William on the 18th emitted his to 'My People'; on the 20th, Italy declared war against Austria and Bavaria."—A. Forbes, *William of Germany*, ch. 7-8.—See, also, SCANDINAVIAN STATES (DENMARK): A. D. 1848-1862.

ALSO IN: H. von Sybel, *The Founding of the German Empire*, bk. 9-16 (v. 3-4).—C. Lowe, *Prince Bismarck*, ch. 5-7 (v. 1), and app. A, B, C (v. 2).—J. G. L. Heseckiel, *Life of Bismarck*, bk. 5, ch. 3.—Count von Beust, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 22-28.


A. D. 1863.—First Socialist Party. See SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: A. D. 1862-1864.

A. D. 1866.—The Seven Weeks War.—Defeat of Austria.—Victory and Supremacy of Prussia.—Her Absorption of Hanover, Hesse, Nassau, Frankfurt and Schleswig-Holstein.—Formation of the North German Confederation.—Exclusion of Austria from the Germanic organization.—"Prussia had built excellent railroads throughout the country, and quietly placed her troops on the frontier; within 14 days she had 500,000 men under arms. By the end of May they were on the frontiers ready for action, while Austria was only half prepared, and her allies only beginning to arm. On the 14th of June the diet, by a vote of nine to six, had ordered the immediate mobilization of a federal army; whereupon Prussia declared the federal compact dissolved and extinguished. In Vienna and the petty courts men said, 'Within fourteen days after the outbreak of hostilities the allied armies will enter Berlin in triumph and dictate peace; the power of Prussia will be broken by two blows.' The Legitimists were exultant; even the majority of the democracy in South Germany joined with the Ultramontane party in shouting for Austria. On the 10th of June, Bismarck laid before the German governments the outlines of a new federal constitution, but was not listened to; on the 15th he made proposals to the states in the immediate neighborhood of Prussia for a peace on these foundations, and demanded their neutrality, adding that if they declined his peaceful offers he would treat them as enemies. The cabinets of Dresden and Hanover, of Cassel and Wiesbaden, declined them. Immediately, on the night of the 15th and 16th of June, Prussian troops entered Hanover, Hesse and Saxony. In four

or five days Prussia had disarmed all North Germany, and broken all resistance from the North Sea to the Main. On the 18th of June, the Prussian general Bayer entered Cassel; the Elector was surprised at Wilhelmshöhe. As he still refused all terms he was arrested by the direct order of the king of Prussia and sent as a prisoner to Stettin. On the 17th, General Vogel von Falkenstein entered Hanover. King George with his army of 18,000 men sought to escape to South Germany. After a gallant struggle at Langensalza on the 27th, his brave troops were surrounded. The King capitulated on the 29th. His army was disbanded, he himself allowed to go to Vienna. On the 18th the Prussians were in Dresden; on the 19th, in Leipzig; by the 20th, all Saxony except the fortress of Königstein was in their hands. The king and army of Saxony, on the approach of the Prussians, had left the country by the railroads to Bohemia to form a junction with the Austrians. The Saxon army consisted of 23,000 men and 60 cannon. Every one had expected Austria to occupy a country of such strategic value as Saxony before the Prussians could touch it. The Austrian army consisted of seven corps, 180,000 infantry, 24,000 cavalry, 762 guns. The popular opinion had forced the emperor to make Benedek the commander-in-chief in Bohemia. Everything there was new to him. The Prussians were divided into three armies: the army of the Elbe, 40,000 men, under Herwarth von Bittenfeld; the first army, 100,000 men, under Prince Frederick Charles; the second or Silesian army under the Crown Prince, 116,000 strong. The reserve consisted of 24,000 Landwehr. The whole force in this quarter numbered 280,000 men and 800 guns. . . . The Prussians knew what they were fighting for. To the Austrians the idea of this war was something strange. At Vienna, Benedek had spoken against war; after the first Prussian successes, he had in confidence advised the emperor to make peace as soon as possible. As he was unable, from want of means, to attack, he concentrated his army between Josephstadt and the county of Glatz. He thought only of defence. . . . On the 23rd of June the great Prussian army commenced contemporaneously its march to Bohemia from the Riesengebirge, from Lusatia, from Dresden. It advanced from four points to Josephstadt-Königgrätz, where the junction was to take place. Bismarck had ordered, from financial as well as political reasons, that the war must be short. The Prussian armies had at all points debouched from the passes and entered Bohemia before a single Austrian corps had come near these passes. . . . In a couple of days Benedek lost in a series of fights against the three Prussian advancing armies nearly 35,000 men; five of his seven corps had been beaten. He concentrated these seven corps at Königgrätz in the ground before this fortress; he determined to accept battle between the Elbe and the Bistritz. He had, however, previously reported to the emperor that his army after its losses was not in a condition for a pitched battle. He wished to retire to Moravia and avoid a battle till he had received reinforcements. This telegram of Benedek arrived in the middle of the exultation which filled the court of Vienna after hearing of the victory over the Italians at Custoza [see

ITALY: A. D. 1862-1866]. The emperor replied by ordering him briefly to give battle immediately. Benedek, on the 1st of July, again sent word to the emperor, 'Your majesty must conclude peace.' Yet on these repeated warnings came the order to fight at once. Benedek had provided for such an answer by his arrangements for July the 2nd. He had placed his 500 guns in the most favorable positions, and occupied the country between the Elbe and the little river Bistritz for the extent of a league. As soon as the Prussians heard of this movement they resolved to attack the Austrians on the 3d. On the 2d the king, accompanied by Count Bismarck, Von Roon and Von Moltke, had joined the army. He assumed command of the three armies. The Crown Prince and Herwarth were ordered to advance against Königgrätz. Part of the Crown Prince's army were still five German miles from the intended battle ground. Prince Frederick Charles and Herwarth had alone sustained the whole force of Austria in the struggle around Sadowa, which began at 8 o'clock in the morning. Frederick Charles attacked in the centre over against Sadowa; Herwarth on the right at Nechanitz; the Crown Prince was to advance on the left from Königinhof. The Crown Prince received orders at four o'clock in the morning; he could not in all probability reach the field before one or two o'clock after noon. All depended on his arrival in good time. Prince Frederick Charles forced the passage of the Bistritz and took Sadowa and other places, but could not take the heights. His troops suffered terribly from the awful fire of the Austrian batteries. The King himself and his staff came under fire, from which the earnest entreaties of Bismarck induced him to retire. About one o'clock the danger in the Prussian centre was great. After five hours of fighting they could not advance, and began to talk of retreat. On the right, things were better. Herwarth had defeated the Saxons, and threatened the Austrian left. Yet, if the army of the Crown Prince did not arrive, the battle was lost, for the Prussian centre was broken. But the Crown Prince brought the expected succor. About two o'clock came the news that a part of the Crown Prince's army had been engaged since one o'clock. The Austrians, attacked on their right flank and rear, had to give way in front. Under loud shouts of 'Forward,' Prince Frederick Charles took the Wood of Sadowa at three, and the heights of Lipa at four o'clock. At this very time, four o'clock, Benedek had already given orders to retreat. . . . From the . . . first the Prussians were superior to the Austrians in ammunition, provisions and supplies. They had a better organization, better preparation, and the needle-gun, which proved very destructive to the Austrians. The Austrian troops fought with thorough gallantry. . . . Respecting this campaign, an Austrian writes: 'Given in Vienna a powerful coterie which reserves to itself all the high commands and regards the army as its private estate for its own private benefit, and defeat is inevitable.' The Austrians lost at Sadowa, according to the official accounts at Vienna, 174 cannon, 18,000 prisoners, 11 colors, 4,190 killed, 11,900 wounded, 21,400 missing, including the prisoners. The Prussians acknowledged a loss of only 10,000 men. The result of the battle was heavier for Austria than the loss

in the action and the retreat. The armistice which Benedek asked for on the 4th of July was refused by the Prussians; a second request on the 10th was also rejected. On the 5th of July the emperor of Austria sought the mediation of France to restore peace. . . . All further movements were put a stop to by the five days' armistice, which began on the 22d of July at noon, and was followed by an armistice for four weeks. . . . Hostilities were at an end on Austrian territory when the war began on the Main against the allies of Austria. The Bavarian army, under the aged Prince Charles, distinguished itself by being driven by the less numerous forces of Prussia under General Falkenstein across the Saale and the Main. . . . The eighth federal army corps of 50,000 men, composed of contingents from Baden, Würtemberg, Electoral Hesse, Hesse-Darmstadt, Nassau, and 12,000 Austrians under Prince Alexander of Hesse, was so mismanaged that the Würtemberg contingent believed itself sold and betrayed. . . . On the 16th of July, in the evening, Falkenstein entered Frankfurt, and in the name of the king of Prussia took possession of this Free City, of Upper Hesse and Nassau. Frankfurt, on account of its Austrian sympathies, had to pay a contribution of six millions of gulden to Falkenstein, and on the 19th of July a further sum of nineteen millions to Manteuffel, the successor of Falkenstein. The latter sum was remitted when the hitherto Free City became a Prussian city. Manteuffel, in several actions from the 23d to the 26th of July, drove the federal army back to Würzburg; Göben defeated the army of Baden at Werbach, and that of Würtemberg at Tauberbischofsheim; before this the eighth federal army corps joined the Bavarian army, and on the 25th and 26th of July the united forces were defeated at Gersheim and Rossbrunn, and on the 27th, the citadel of Würzburg was invested. The court of Vienna had abandoned its South German allies when it concluded the armistice; it had not included its allies either in the armistice or the truce. . . . On the 29th of July, the Baden troops marched off homewards in the night, the Austrians marched to Bohemia, the Bavarians purchased an armistice by surrendering Würzburg to the Prussians. Thus of the eighth army corps, the Würtembergers and Hessians alone kept the field. On the 2d of August these remains of the eighth army corps were included in the armistice of Nicholsburg. . . . On the 23d of August peace was signed between Austria and Prussia at Prague. Bismarck treated Austria with great consideration, and demanded only twenty millions of thalers as war indemnity; Würtemberg had to pay eight millions of gulden, Baden six millions, Hesse-Darmstadt three millions, Bavaria thirty millions of gulden. The Würtemberg minister, Varnbüler, and the Baden minister, Freydorf, offered to form an offensive and defensive alliance with Prussia for the purpose of saving the ruling families, and in alarm lest Bavaria and Hesse-Darmstadt might seek in their territories compensation for cessions to Prussia. Bavaria also formed an alliance with Prussia, and ceded a small district in the north. Hesse-Darmstadt ceded Hesse-Homburg and some pieces of territory, and entered the North German Confederation, giving to Prussia the right of keeping a garrison in



GERMANY

AFTER THE CONGRESS OF
VIENNA
1815.

PRUSSIAN



AUSTRIAN



THE BOUNDARY OF THE GERMAN CONFEDERATION, AS
ARRANGED BY THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA, IS SHOWN BY
THE HEAVY RED LINE.



THE NETHERLANDS

SHOWING THE CHANGES OF 1830-1839.

THE TERRITORY LOST BY THE KING OF HOLLAND
IS SHOWN IN BORDER COLOR.
THE ALTERATIONS IN THE WESTERN BOUNDARY OF
THE GERMAN CONFEDERATION IN 1834 ARE SHOWN
BY THE DOTTED RED LINES.

GERMANY

AFTER THE PEACE OF
PRAGUE
1866.

(SHOWING ALSO THE REORGANIZATION OF THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRE 1867.)

PRUSSIAN

AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN

THE BOUNDARY OF THE NORTH GERMAN CONFEDERATION IS SHOWN BY THE HEAVY RED LINE.
THE BLUE BORDER LINE RUN THROUGH THE CENTRE OF THE AUSTRO HUNGARIAN EMPIRE SHOWS
THE DIVISION OF THE CIS-LEITHAN AND TRANS-LEITHAN KINGDOMS.



Mainz. Austria renounced her claims on Schleswig and Holstein, acknowledged the dissolution of the German Confederation and a modification of Germany by which Austria was excluded. It recognized the creation of the North German Confederation, the union of Venetia to Italy, the territorial alterations in North Germany. Prussia acknowledged the territorial possessions of Austria with the sole exception of Venetia; and also of Saxony; and undertook to obtain the assent of the King of Italy to the peace. Prussia announced the incorporation of Schleswig-Holstein, the Free City of Frankfort, the Kingdom of Hanover, the Electorate of Hesse, and the Duchy of Nassau, subject to the payment of annual incomes to the deposed princes. The Kingdom of Saxony, the two Mecklenburgs, the Hanse-towns, Oldenburg, Brunswick, and the Thuringian states entered the North German Confederation. Prussia now contained twenty-four millions of inhabitants, or including the Northern Confederation, twenty-nine millions. The military forces of the Confederation were placed under the command of Prussia. The states north of the Main were at liberty to form a Southern Confederation, the connection of which with the Northern Confederation was to be a subject of future discussion. Moreover, Bavaria, Baden and Württemberg had engaged 'in case of war to place their whole military force at the disposal of Prussia,' and Prussia guaranteed their sovereignty and the integrity of their territory. Saxony paid ten millions of thalers as a war indemnity. Prussia received on the whole, as war indemnities, eighty-two millions of gulden. Thus ended in the year 1866 the struggle [known as the Seven Weeks War] between Austria and Prussia for the leadership of Germany."—W. Zimmermann, *Popular Hist. of Germany*, bk. 6, ch. 3 (v. 4).

ALSO IN: H. von Sybel, *The Founding of the German Empire*, bk. 17-20 (v. 5).—Major C. Adams, *Great Campaigns in Europe from 1796 to 1870*, ch. 10.—Count von Beust, *Memoirs*, v. 1, ch. 29-34.—G. B. Malleon, *The Refounding of the German Empire*, ch. 6-10.

A. D. 1866-1867.—**Foreshadowings of the new Empire.**—"We may make the statement that in the autumn of 1866 the German Empire was founded. . . . The Southern States were not yet members of the Confederation, but were already, to use an old expression, relatives of the Confederation (*Bundesverwandte*) in virtue of the offensive and defensive alliances with Prussia and of the new organization of the Tariff Union. . . . The natural and inevitable course of events must here irresistibly break its way, unless some circumstance not to be foreseen should throw down the barriers beforehand. How soon such a crisis might take place no one could at that time estimate. But in regard to the certainty of the final result there was in Germany no longer any doubt. . . . Three-fourths of the territory of this Empire was dominated by a Government that was in the first place efficient in military organization, guided by the firm hand of King William, counselled by the representatives of the North German Sovereigns, and recognized by all the Powers of Europe. The opening of that Parliament was near at hand, that should in common with this Government determine the limitations to be placed upon the powers of the Confederation in its rela-

tion to the individual states and also the functions of the new Reichstag in the legislation and in the control of the finances of the Confederation. . . . It was, in the first place, certain that the functions of the future supreme Confederate authority would be in general the same as those specified in the Imperial Constitution of 1849. . . . The most radical difference between 1849 and 1866 consisted in the form of the Confederate Government. The former period aimed at the appointment of a Constitutional and hereditary emperor, with responsible ministers, to the utter exclusion of the German sovereigns: whereas now the plan included all of these sovereigns in a Confederate Council (*Bundesrath*) organized after the fashion of the old Confederate Diet, with committees for the various branches of the administration, and under the presidency of the King of Prussia, who should occupy a superior position in virtue of the conduct, placed in his hands once for all, of the foreign policy, the army and the navy, but who otherwise in the Confederate Council, in spite of the increase of his votes, could be outvoted like every other prince by a decree of the Majority. . . . Before the time of the peace-conferences, when all definite arrangements of Germany's future seemed suspended in the balance and undecided, the Crown Prince Frederick William, who in general had in mind for the supreme head of the Confederation a higher rank and position of power than did the King, maintained that his father should bear the title of King of Germany. Bismarck reminded him that there were other Kings in Germany: the Kings of Hanover, of Saxony, etc. 'These,' was the reply, 'will then take the title of Dukes.' 'But they will not agree to that.' 'They will have to!' cried His Royal Highness. After the further course of events, the Crown Prince indeed gave up his project; but in the early part of 1867 he asserted that the King should assume the title of German Emperor, arguing that the people would connect no tangible idea with the title of President of the Confederation, whereas the renewal of the imperial dignity would represent to them the actual incorporation of the unity finally attained, and the remembrance of the old glory and power of the Empire would kindle all hearts. This idea, as we have experienced and continue to experience its realization, was in itself perfectly correct. But it was evidently at that time premature: a North German empire would have aroused no enthusiasm in the north, and would have seriously hindered the accomplishment of the national aim in the south. King William rejected this proposition very decidedly: in his own simple way he wished to be nothing more than Confederate Commander-in-chief and the first among his peers."—H. von Sybel, *The Founding of the German Empire by William I.*, bk. 20, ch. 4 (v. 5).

A. D. 1866-1870.—**Territorial concessions demanded by France.—Rapid progress of German unification.—The Zollparlament.—The Luxemburg question.—French determination for war.**—"The conditions of peace . . . left it open to the Southern States to choose what relationship they would form with the Northern Confederation. This was a compromise between Bismarck and Napoleon, the latter fearing a United Germany, the former preferring to restrict himself to what was attainable at the time, and taking care not to humiliate or seriously to injure

Austria, whose friendship he foresaw that Germany would need. Meanwhile Napoleon's interference continued. Scarcely had Benedetti, who had followed Bismarck to the battle-fields, returned to Berlin, when he received orders from his Government to demand not less than the left bank of the Rhine as a compensation for Prussia's increase of territory. For this purpose he submitted the draft of a treaty by which Prussia was even to bind herself to lend an active support to the cession of the Bavarian and Hessian possessions west of the Rhine! . . . Bismarck would listen to no mention of ceding German territory. 'Si vous refusez,' said the conceited Corsican, 'c'est la guerre.'—'Eh bien, la guerre,' replied Bismarck calmly. Just as little success had Benedetti with King William. 'Not a clod of German soil, not a chimney of a German village,' was William's kingly reply. Napoleon was not disposed at the time to carry out his threat. He disavowed Benedetti's action, declaring that the instructions had been obtained from him during his illness and that he wished to live in peace and friendship with Prussia. Napoleon's covetousness had at least one good effect; it furthered the work of German union. Bavaria and Württemberg, who during the war had sided with Austria, had at first appealed to Napoleon to mediate between them and Prussia. But when the Ministers of the four South German States appeared at Berlin to negotiate with Bismarck, and Benedetti's draft-treaty was communicated to them, there was a complete change of disposition. They then wished to go much further than the Prussian Statesman was prepared to go: they asked, in order to be protected from French encroachments, to be admitted into the North German Confederation. But Bismarck would not depart from the stipulations of the Treaty of Nikolsburg. The most important result of the negotiations was that secret treaties were concluded by which the Southern States bound themselves to an alliance with the Northern Confederation for the defence of Germany, and engaged to place their troops under the supreme command of the Prussian King in the event of any attack by a foreign Power. In a military sense Klein-Deutschland was now one, though not yet politically. . . . That Prussia was the truly representative German State had been obvious to the thoughtful long before: the fact now stood out in clear light to all who would open their eyes to see. Progress had meanwhile been made with the construction of the North German Confederation, which embraced all the States to the north of the river Main. Its affairs were to be regulated by a Reichstag elected by universal suffrage and by a Federal Council formed of the representatives of the North German Governments. In a military sense it was a Single State, politically a Confederate State, with the King of Prussia as President. This arrangement was not of course regarded as final: and in his speech from the throne to the North German Reichstag, King William emphasized the declaration that Germany, so long torn, so long powerless, so long the theatre of war for foreign nations, would henceforth strive to recover the greatness of her past. . . . A first step towards 'bridging over the Main,' i. e., causing South and North to join hands again, was taken by the creation of a Zollparlament, or Customs Parliament, which

was elected by the whole of Klein-Deutschland, and met at Berlin, henceforth the capital of Germany. It was also a step in advance that Baden and Hesse-Darmstadt signed conventions, by which their military system was put on the same footing as that of the North German Confederation. Baden indeed would willingly have entered into political union with the North, had the same disposition prevailed at the time in the other South German States. The National Liberals however had to contend with strong opposition from the Democrats in Württemberg, and from the Ultramontanes in Bavaria. The latter were hostile to Prussia on account of her Protestantism, the former on account of the stern principles and severe discipline that pervaded her administration. . . . In the work of German unification the Bonapartes have an important share. . . . By outraging the principle of nationality, Napoleon I. had re-awakened the feeling of nationality among Germans: Napoleon III., by attempting to prevent the unification of Germany, actually hastened it on. . . . When King William had replied that he would not yield up an inch of German soil, 'patriotic pangs' at Prussian successes and the thirst for 'compensation' continued to disturb the sleep of the French Emperor, and as he was unwilling to appear baffled in his purpose, he returned to the charge. On the 16th of August, 1866, through his Ambassador Benedetti, he demanded the cession of Landau, Saarbrücken, Saarlouis, and Luxemburg, together with Prussia's consent to the annexation of Belgium by France. If that could not be obtained, he would be satisfied with Luxemburg and Belgium; he would even exclude Antwerp from the territory claimed that it might be created a free town. Thus he hoped to spare the susceptibilities of England. As a gracious return he offered the alliance of France. After his first interview Benedetti gave up his demand for the three German towns, and submitted a new scheme, according to which Germany should induce the King of the Netherlands to a cession of Luxemburg, and should support France in the conquest of Belgium; whilst, on his part, Napoleon would permit the formation of a federal union between the Northern Confederation and the South German States, and would enter into a defensive and offensive alliance with Germany. Count Bismarck treated these propositions, as he himself has stated, 'in a dilatory manner,' that is to say, he did not reject them, but he took good care not to make any definite promises. When the Prussian Prime Minister returned from his furlough to Berlin, towards the end of 1866, Benedetti resumed his negotiations, but now only with regard to Luxemburg, still garrisoned by Prussian troops as at the time of the old Germanic Confederation. Though the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg did not belong to the new North German Confederation, Bismarck was not willing to allow it to be annexed by France. Moltke moreover declared that the fortress could only be evacuated by the Prussian troops if the fortifications were razed. But without its fortifications Napoleon would not have it. And when, with regard to the Emperor's intentions upon Belgium, Prussia offered no active support, but only promised observance of neutrality, France renounced the idea of an alliance with Prussia, and entered into direct

negotiations with the King of Holland, as Grand-Duke of Luxemburg. Great excitement was thereby caused in Germany, and, as a timely warning to France, Bismarck surprised the world with the publication of the secret treaties between Prussia and the South German States. But when it became known that the King of Holland was actually consenting to the sale of his rights in Luxemburg to Napoleon, there was so loud a cry of indignation in all parts of Germany, there was so powerful a protest in the North German Parliament against any sale of German territory by the King of Holland, that Count Bismarck, himself surprised at the vigour of the patriotic outburst, declared to the Government of the Hague that the cession of Luxemburg would be considered a *casus belli*. This peremptory declaration had the desired effect: the cession did not take place. This was the first success in European politics of a united Germany, united not yet politically, but in spirit. That was satisfactory. A Conference of the Great Powers then met in London [May, 1867]: by its decision, Luxemburg was separated from Germany, and,—to give some kind of satisfaction to the Emperor of the French,—was formed into a neutral State. From a national point of view, that was unsatisfactory. . . . The danger of an outbreak of war between France and Germany had only been warded off for a time by the international settlement of the Luxemburg question. . . . In the early part of July, 1870, Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, at the request of the Spanish Government, became a candidate for the Spanish throne. Napoleon III. seized the occasion to carry into effect his hostile intentions against Germany.”—G. Krause, *The Growth of German Unity*, ch. 13-14.

ALSO IN: E. Simon, *The Emperor William and his Reign*, ch. 9-10 (v. 1).—C. A. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe*, v. 3, ch. 5-6.

A. D. 1870 (June-July).—“The Hohenzollern incident.”—French Declaration of War. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JUNE-JULY).

A. D. 1870 (September-December).—The Germanic Confederation completed.—Federation of the German States.—“Having decided on taking Strasburg and Metz from France” Prussia “could only justify that conquest by considerations of the safety of South Germany, and she could only defend these interests by effecting the union of North and South. She found it necessary to realise this union at any price, even by some concessions in favour of the autonomy of those States, and especially of Bavaria. Such was the spirit in which negotiations were opened, in the middle of September, 1870, between Bavaria and Prussia, with the participation of Baden, Wurtemberg and Hesse-Darmstadt. . . . Prussia asked at first for entire and unreserved adhesion to the Northern Confederation, a solution acceptable to Baden, Wurtemberg and Hesse-Darmstadt, but not to Bavaria, who demanded for herself the preservation of certain rights, and for her King a privileged position in the future Confederation next to the King of Prussia. The negotiations with Baden and Hesse-Darmstadt came to a conclusion on the 15th of November; and on the 25th, Wurtemberg accepted the same arrangement. These three States agreed to the constitution, slightly modified, of the Northern Confederation; the

new treaties were completed by military conventions, establishing the fusion of the respective Corps d’Armée with the Federal Army of the North, under the command of the King of Prussia. The Treaty with Bavaria was signed at Versailles on the 23rd of November. The concessions obtained by the Cabinet of Munich were reduced to mere trifles. . . . The King of Bavaria was allowed the command of his army in time of peace. He was granted the administration of the Post-Office and partial autonomy of indirect contributions. A committee was conceded, in the Federal Council, for Foreign Affairs, under the Presidency of Bavaria. The right of the King of Prussia, as President of this Council, to declare war, was made conditional on its consent. Such were the Treaties submitted on the 24th of November to the sanction of the Parliament of the North, assembled in an Extraordinary Session. They met with intense opposition from the National Liberal and from the Progressive Party,” but “the Parliament sanctioned the treaties on the 10th of December. According to the Treaties, the new association received the title of Germanic Confederation, and the King of Prussia that of its President. These titles were soon to undergo an important alteration. The King of Bavaria, satisfied with the concessions, more apparent than real, made by the Prussian Cabinet to his rights of sovereignty, consented to defer to the wishes of King William. On the 4th of December, King Louis addressed him [King William] a letter, informing him that he had invited the Confederate sovereigns to revive the German Empire and confer the title of Emperor on the President of the Confederation. . . . The sovereigns immediately gave their consent, so that the Imperial titles could be introduced into the new Constitution before the final vote of the Parliament of the North. . . . To tell the truth, King William attached slight importance to the votes of the various Chambers. He was not desirous of receiving his new dignity from the hands of a Parliament; the assent of the sovereigns was in his eyes far more essential.”—E. Simon, *The Emperor William and his Reign*, ch. 13 (v. 2).

ALSO IN: G. Freytag, *The Crown Prince and the Imperial Crown*.

A. D. 1870-1871.—Victorious war with France.—Siege of Paris.—Occupation of the city.—Enormous indemnity exacted.—Acquisition of Alsace and part of Lorraine. See FRANCE: A. D. 1870 (JULY-AUGUST) to 1871 (JANUARY-MAY).

A. D. 1871 (January).—Assumption of the Imperial dignity by King William, at Versailles.—“Early in December the proposition came from King Ludwig of Bavaria to King William, that the possession of the presidential rights of the Confederacy vested in the Prussian monarch should be coupled with the imperial title. The King of Saxony spoke to the same purport; and in one day a measure providing for the amendment of the Constitution by the substitution of the words ‘Emperor’ and ‘Empire’ for ‘President’ and ‘Confederation’ was passed through the North German Parliament, which voted also an address to his Majesty, from which the following is an extract: ‘The North German Parliament, in unison with the Princes of Germany, approaches with the prayer that your Majesty will deign to consecrate the work of

unification by accepting the Imperial Crown of Germany. The Teutonic Crown on the head of your Majesty will inaugurate, for the re-established Empire of the German nation, an era of power, of peace, of well-being, and of liberty secured under the protection of the laws.' The address of the German Parliament was presented to the King at Versailles on Sunday, the 18th of December, by its speaker, Herr Simson, who, as speaker of the Frankfort Parliament in 1848, had made the identical proffer to William's brother and predecessor [see above: A. D. 1848-1850]. . . . The formal ratification of assent to the Prussian King's assumption of the imperial dignity had yet to be received from the minor German States; but this was a foregone conclusion, and the unification of Germany really dates from that 18th of December, and from the solemn ceremonial in the prefecture of Versailles."—A. Forbes, *William of Germany*, ch. 12.—King William's formal assumption of the Imperial dignity took place on the 18th of January, 1871. "The Crown Prince was entrusted with all the preparations for the ceremony. Every regiment in the army of investment was instructed to send its colours in charge of an officer and two non-commissioned officers to Versailles, and all the higher officers who could be spared from duty were ordered to attend, for the army was to represent the German nation at this memorable scene. The Crown Prince escorted his father from the Prefecture to the palace of Versailles, where all the German Princes or their representatives were assembled in the Galerie des Glaces. A special service was read by the military chaplains, and then the Emperor, mounting on the dais, announced his assumption of Imperial authority, and instructed his Chancellor to read the Proclamation issued to the whole German nation. Then the Crown Prince, as the first subject of the Empire, came forward and performed the solemn act of homage, kneeling down before his Imperial Father. The Emperor raised him and clasped to his arms the son who had toiled and fought and borne so great a share in achieving what many generations had desired in vain."—R. Rodd, *Frederick, Crown Prince and Emperor*, ch. 5.

ALSO IN: C. Lowe, *Prince Bismarck*, ch. 9 (v. 1).

A. D. 1871 (April).—The Constitution of the new Empire.—By a proclamation dated April 16, 1871, the German Emperor ordered, "in the name of the German Empire, by and with the consent of the Council of the Confederation and of the Imperial Diet," that "in the place of the Constitution of the German Confederation," as agreed to in November 1870, there be substituted a Constitution for the German Empire,—the text of which appeared as an appendix to this imperial decree. For a full translation of the text see CONSTITUTION OF GERMANY.

ALSO IN: E. Hertslet, *The Map of Europe by Treaty*, v. 3, No. 442.

A. D. 1871-1873.—The Gold Standard. See MONEY AND BANKING: A. D. 1871-1873.

A. D. 1871-1879.—Organization of the government of Alsace-Lorraine as an imperial province.—"How to garner the territorial harvest of the war—Alsace-Lorraine—was a question which greatly vexed the parliamentary mind. Several possible solutions had presented themselves. The conquered provinces might be made

neutral territory, which, with Belgium on one side, and Switzerland on the other, would thus interpose a continuous barrier against French aggression from the mouth of the Rhine to its source. But one fatal objection, among several others, to the adoption of this course, was the utter lack, in the Alsace-Lorrainers, of the primary condition of the existence of all neutral States—a determination on the part of the neutralised people themselves to be and remain neutral. And none knew better than Bismarck that it would take years of the most careful nursing to reconcile the kidnapped children of France to their adoptive parent. For him, the only serious question was whether Alsace-Lorraine should be annexed to Prussia, or be made an immediate Reichsland (Imperial Province). 'From the very first,' he said, 'I was most decidedly for the latter alternative, first—because there is no reason why dynastic questions should be mixed up with political ones; and, secondly—because I think it will be easier for the Alsatians to take to the name of "German" than to that of "Prussian," the latter being detested in France in comparison with the other.' In its first session, accordingly, the Diet was asked to pass a law incorporating Alsace-Lorraine with the Empire, and placing the annexed provinces under a provisional dictatorship till the 1st January, 1874, when they would enter into the enjoyment of constitutional rights in common with the rest of the nation. But the latter clause provoked much controversy. . . . A compromise was ultimately effected by which the duration of the dictatorship, or period within which the Imperial Government alone was to have the right of making laws for Alsace-Lorraine, was shortened till 1st January, 1873; while the Diet, on the other hand, was only to have supervision of such loans or guarantees as affected the Empire. In the following year, however, the Diet came to the conclusion that, after all, the original term fixed for the dictatorship was the more advisable of the two, and prolonged it accordingly. For the next three years, therefore, the Reichsland was governed from the Wilhelmstrasse, as India is ruled from Downing Street. . . . In the beginning of 1874 . . . fifteen deputies from Alsace-Lorraine—now thus far admitted within the pale of the Constitution—took their seats in the second German Parliament. Of these fifteen deputies, five were out-and-out French Protesters, and the rest Clericals—seven of the latter being clergymen, including the Bishops of Metz and Strasburg. They entered the Diet in a body, with much theatrical pomp, the clergy wearing their robes; and one of the French Protesters—bearing the unfortunate name of Teutsch—immediately tabled a motion that the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine, having been annexed to Germany without being themselves consulted, should now be granted an opportunity of expressing their opinion on the subject by a plébiscite. . . . The motion of French M. Teutsch, who spoke fluent German, was of course rejected; whereupon he and several of his compatriots straightway returned home, and left the Diet to deal with the interests of their constituents as it liked. Those of his colleagues who remained behind only did so to complain of the 'intolerable tyranny' under which the provinces were groaning, and to move for the repeal of the law (of December, 1871) which invested the local Government with dictatorial powers. . . . Believing

home-rule to be one of the best guarantees of federal cohesion, Bismarck determined to try the effect of this cementing agency on the newest part of the Imperial edifice; and, in the autumn of 1874, he advised the Emperor to grant the Alsace-Lorrainers (not by law, but by ordinance, which could easily be revoked) a previous voice on all bills to be submitted to the Reichstag on the domestic and fiscal affairs of the provinces. . . . In the following summer (June, 1875), therefore, there met at Strasburg the first Landesausschuss, or Provincial Committee, composed of delegates, thirty in number, from the administrative District Councils. . . . So well, indeed, on the whole, did this arrangement work, that within two years of its creation the Landesausschuss was invested with much broader powers. . . . Thus it came about that, while the Reichsland continued to be governed from Berlin, the making of its laws was more and more confined to Strasburg. . . . The party of the Irreconcilables had been gradually giving way to the Autonomists, or those who subordinated the question of nationality to that of home-rule. Rapidly gaining in strength, this latter party at last (in the spring of 1879) petitioned the Reichstag for an independent Government, with its seat in Strasburg, for the representation of the Reichsland in the Federal Council, and for an enlargement of the functions of the Provincial Committee. Nothing could have been more gratifying to Bismarck than this request, amounting, as it did, to a reluctant recognition of the Treaty of Frankfurt on the part of the Alsace-Lorrainers. He therefore replied that he was quite willing to confer on the provinces 'the highest degree of independence compatible with the military security of the Empire.' The Diet, without distinction of party, applauded his words; and not only that, but it hastened to pass a bill embodying ideas at which the Chancellor himself had hinted in the previous year. By this bill, the government of Alsace-Lorraine was to centre in a Statthalter, or Imperial Viceroy, living at Strasburg, instead of, as heretofore, in the chancellor. . . . Without being a Sovereign, this Statthalter was to exercise all but sovereign rights. . . . For this high office the Emperor selected the brilliant soldier-statesman, Marshal Manteuffel. . . . Certainly, His Majesty could not possibly have chosen a better man for the responsible office, which the Marshal assumed on the 1st October, 1879. Henceforth, the conquered provinces entered an entirely new phase of their existence. . . . Whether the Reichsland will ever ripen into an integral part of Prussia, or into a regular Federal State with a Prussian prince for its Sovereign, the future alone can show."—C. Lowe, *Prince Bismarck*, ch. 14 (v. 2).

A. D. 1873-1887.—The Culturkampf.—The "May Laws" and their repeal.—"The German Culturkampf, or civilization-fight, as its illustrious chief promoter is said to have named it, may equally well be styled the religion combat, or education strife. . . . The arena of the Culturkampf in Germany is, strictly speaking, Prussia and Hesse Darmstadt—pre-eminently the former. According to the last census, taken December 1, 1880, the population of Prussia is 27,278,911. Of these, the Protestants are 17,645,463, being 64.7 per cent., and the Catholics 9,205,136, or 34.1 per cent., of the total population. The remainder are principally Jews, amounting to

363,790, or 1.334 per cent. It was on the 9th of January, 1873, that Dr. Falk, Minister of Public Worship, first introduced into the Prussian Diet the bills, which were afterwards to be known as the May Laws [so called because they were generally passed in the month of May, although in different years, but also called the Falk Laws, from the Minister who framed them]. These laws, which, for the future, were to regulate the relations of Church and State, purported to apply to the Evangelical or united Protestant State Church of Prussia . . . as well as to the Catholic Church. Their professed main objects were: first, to insure greater liberty to individual lay members of those churches; secondly, to secure a German and national, rather than an 'Ultramontane' and non-national, training for the clergy; and, thirdly, to protect the inferior clergy against the tyranny of their superiors—which simply meant, as proved in the sequel, the withdrawal of priests and people, in matters spiritual, from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and the separation of Catholic Prussia from the Centre of Unity; thus substituting a local or national Church, bound hand and foot, under State regulation, for a flourishing branch of the Universal Church. To promote these objects, it was provided, that all Ecclesiastical seminaries should be placed under State control; and that all candidates for the priesthood should pass a State examination in the usual subjects of a liberal education; and it was further provided, that the State should have the right to confirm or to reject all appointments of clergy. These bills were readily passed: and all the religious orders and congregations were suppressed, with the provisional exception of those which devoted themselves to the care of the sick; and all Catholic seminaries were closed. . . . The Bishops refused to obey the new laws, which in conscience they could not accept; and they subscribed a collective declaration to this effect, on the 26th of May 1873. On the 7th of August following, Pope Pius IX. addressed a strong letter of remonstrance to the Emperor William; but entirely without effect, as may be seen in the Imperial reply of the 5th of September. In punishment of their opposition, several of the Bishops and great numbers of their clergy were fined, imprisoned, exiled, and deprived of their salaries. Especially notable among the victims of persecution, were the venerable Archbishop of Cologne, Primate of Prussia, the Bishop of Munster, the Prince Bishop of Breslau, the Bishop of Paderborn, and Cardinal Ledochowski, Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, on whom, then in prison, a Cardinal's hat was conferred by the Pope, in March 1875, as a mark of sympathy, encouragement, and approval. . . . The fifteen Catholic dioceses of Prussia comprised, in January 1873, a Catholic aggregate of 8,711,535 souls. They were administered by 4,627 parish-priests, and 3,812 coadjutor-priests, or curates, being a total of 8,439 clergy. Eight years later, owing to the operation of the May Laws, there were exiled or dead, without being replaced, 1,770 of these clergy, viz., 1,125 parish-priests, and 645 coadjutor-priests; and there were 601 parishes, comprising 644,697 souls, quite destitute of clerical care, and 584 parishes, or 1,501,994 souls, partially destitute thereof. Besides these 1,770 secular priests, dead or exiled, and not replaced, there were the regular clergy (the members of religious

orders), all of whom had been expelled."—J. N. Murphy, *The Chair of Peter*, ch. 29.—"Why was the Kulturkampf undertaken? This is a question often asked, and answered in different ways. That Ultramontanism is a danger to the Empire is the usual explanation; but proof is not producible. . . . Ultramontanism, as it is understood in France and Belgium, has never taken root in Germany. It was represented by the Jesuits, and when they were got rid of, Catholicism remained as a religion, but not as a political factor. . . . The real purpose of the Kulturkampf has been, I conceive, centralisation. It has not been waged against the Roman Church only, for the same process has been followed with the Protestant Churches. It was intolerable in a strong centralising Government to have a Calvinist and a Lutheran Church side by side, and both to call themselves Protestant. It interfered with systematic and neat account-keeping of public expenditure for religious purposes. Consequently, in 1839, the King of Prussia suppressed Calvinism and Lutheranism, and established a new Evangelical Church on their ruins, with constitution and liturgy chiefly of his own drawing up. The Protestant churches of Baden, Nassau, Hesse, and the Bavarian Palatinate have also been fused and organised on the Prussian pattern. In Schleswig-Holstein and in Hanover existed pure Lutherans, but they, for uniformity's sake, have been also recently unified and melted into the Landeskirche of Prussia. A military government cannot tolerate any sort of double allegiance in its subjects. Education and religion, medicine and jurisprudence, telegraphs and post-office, must be under the jurisdiction of the State. . . . From the point of view of a military despotism, the May laws are reasonable and necessary. As Germany is a great camp, the clergy, Protestant and Catholic, must be military chaplains amenable to the general in command. . . . I have no doubt whatever that this is the real explanation of the Kulturkampf, and that all other explanations are excuses and inventions. . . . The Chancellor, when he began the crusade, had probably no idea of the opposition he would meet with, and when the opposition manifested itself, it irritated him, and made him more dogged in pursuing his scheme."—S. Baring-Gould, *Germany, Present and Past*, ch. 13 (v. 2).—"The passive resistance of the clergy and laity, standing on their own ground, and acting together in complete agreement, succeeded in the end. The laity had recognised their own priests, even when suspended by government, and had resolutely refused to receive others; and both priests and laity insisted upon the Church regulating its own theological education. Prussia and Baden became weary of the contest. In 1880 and 1881 the 'May Laws' were suspended, and, after negotiation with Leo XIII., they were to a large extent repealed. By this change, completed in April, 1887, the obligations of civil marriage and the vesting of Catholic property in the hands of lay trustees were retained, but the legislative interference with the administration of the Church, including the education required for the priesthood, was wholly abandoned. The Prussian Government had entirely miscalculated its power with the Church."—The same, *The Church in Germany*, ch. 21.—By the Bill passed in 1887, "all religious congregations which existed before the passing of the law of May 31,

1875, were to be allowed to re-establish themselves, provided their objects were purely religious, charitable, or contemplative. . . . The Society of Jesus, which is a teaching order, was not included in this permission. But Prince Bismarck's determination never to readmit the Jesuits is well known. . . . The Bill left very few vestiges of the May laws remaining."—*Annual Register*, 1887, pt. 1, p. 245. See PAPACY: A. D. 1870-1874.

ALSO IN: C. Lowe, *Prince Bismarck*, ch. 12-13.

A. D. 1878-1879.—Adoption of the Protective policy. See TARIFF LEGISLATION (GERMANY): A. D. 1853-1892.

A. D. 1878-1893.—The Socialist Parties.—Socialistic Measures. See SOCIAL MOVEMENTS: A. D. 1875-1893; 1883-1889.

A. D. 1882.—The Triple Alliance. See TRIPLE ALLIANCE.

A. D. 1884-1894.—Colonization in Africa.—Territorial seizures.—The Berlin Conference. See AFRICA: A. D. 1883; 1884-1891; and after.

A. D. 1888.—Death of the Emperor William I.—Accession and death of Frederick III.—Accession of William II.—The Emperor William died on the 9th of March, 1888. He was succeeded by his son, proclaimed under the title of Frederick III. The new Emperor was then at San Remo, undergoing treatment for a mortal malady of the throat. He returned at once to Berlin, where an unfavorable turn of the disease soon appeared. "Consequently an Imperial decree, dated the 21st of March, was addressed to the Crown Prince and published, expressing the wish of the Emperor that the Prince should make himself conversant with the affairs of State by immediate participation therein. His Imperial Highness was accordingly entrusted with the preparation and discharge of such State business as the Emperor should assign to him, and he was empowered in the performance of this duty to affix all necessary signatures, as the representative of the Emperor, without obtaining an especial authorisation on each occasion. . . . The insidious malady from which the Emperor suffered exhibited many fluctuations," but the end came on the 15th of June, his reign having lasted only three months. He was succeeded by his eldest son, who became Emperor William II.—*Eminent Persons: Biographies reprinted from The Times*, v. 4, pp. 112-115.

ALSO IN: R. Rodd, *Frederick, Crown Prince and Emperor*.—G. Freytag, *The Crown Prince*.

A. D. 1888.—The end of the Free Cities.—"The last two cities to uphold the name and traditions of the Hanseatic League, Hamburg and Bremen, have been incorporated into the German Zoll Verein, thus finally surrendering their old historical privileges as free ports. Lübeck took this step some twenty-two years ago [1866], Hamburg and Bremen not till October, 1888—so long had they resisted Prince Bismarck's more or less gentle suasions to enter his Protection League. . . . They, and Hamburg in particular, held out nobly, jealous, and rightly jealous, of the curtailment of those privileges which distinguished them from the other cities of the German Empire. It was after the foundation of this empire that the claim of the two cities to remain free ports was conceded and ratified in the Imperial Constitution of April, 1871, though the privilege, in the case of Hamburg, was restricted to the city and port, and

withdrawn from the rest of the State, which extends to the mouth of the Elbe and embraces about 160 square miles, while the free-port territory was reduced to 28 square miles. This was the first serious interference with the city's liberty, and others followed, perhaps rather of a petty, annoying, than of a seriously aggressive, character, but enough to show the direction in which the wind was blowing. It was in 1880 that the proposal to include Hamburg in the Customs Union was first politically discussed. . . . In May, 1881, . . . was drafted a proposal to the effect that the whole of the city and port of Hamburg should be included in the Zoll Verein." After long and earnest discussion the proposition was adopted by the Senate and the House of Burgesses. "The details for carrying into effect this conclusion have occupied seven years, and the event was finally celebrated with great pomp, the Emperor William II. coming in person to enhance the solemnity of the sacrifice brought by the burghers of the erst free city for the common weal of the German Fatherland. . . . The last and only privilege the three once powerful Hanseatic cities retain is that of being entitled, like the greatest States in the empire, to send their own representatives to the Bundesrath and to the Reichstag."—H. Zimmern, *The Hansa Towns*, period 3, ch. 8, note.

A. D. 1888-1889.—Prussian Free School laws. See EDUCATION, MODERN: EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.—PRUSSIA: 1885-1889.

A. D. 1889-1890.—Rupture between Emperor William II. and Chancellor Bismarck.—Retirement of the great Chancellor.—Soon after the accession of William II., signs of discord between the young Emperor and the veteran statesman, Chancellor Bismarck, began to appear. "In March, 1889, the Minister of Finance had drawn up a Bill for the reform of the income tax, which had been sanctioned by the Emperor; suddenly Prince Bismarck interfered, declaring that it was against the agrarian interest, and the Landtag, summoned expressly to vote that Bill, was dismissed 're inacta.' Count Waldersee, the Chief of the General Staff, an eminent and independent man, and standing high in favour, had for years been a thorn in the Chancellor's side, who looked upon him as a possible rival; he had tried to overthrow him under Frederic III., but had not succeeded, Moltke protesting that the general was indispensable to the army. When Waldersee, in the summer of 1889, accompanied the Emperor to Norway, a letter appeared in the *Hamburger Nachrichten*, to the effect that in a Memoir he had directed his sovereign's attention to the threatening character of the Russian armaments, and had advised, in contradiction to the Chancellor's policy, the forcing of war upon Russia. The Count from Trondhjem addressed a telegraphic denial to the paper, stating that he had never presented such a Memoir; but the *Nachrichten* registered this declaration in a garbled form and in small type, and the *Norddeutsche Zeitung*, which at the same time had published an article, to the effect that according to General von Clausewitz, war is only the continuation of a certain policy, and that therefore the Chief of the General Staff must needs be under the order of the Foreign Minister, took no notice of the Count's protest. . . . In the winter session of the Reichstag the Government presented a Bill tending to make the law against Social-Democracy

a permanent one, but even the pliant National Liberals objected to the clause that the police should be entitled to expel Social-Democrats from the large towns. They would have been ready to grant that permission for two years, but the Government did not accept this, and the Bill fell to the ground. The reason, which at that time was not generally understood, was, that there existed already a hitch between the policy of the Chancellor and that of the Emperor, who had arrived at the conviction that the law against Social Democrats was not only barren, but had increased their power. This difference was accentuated by the Imperial decree of February 4 in favour of the protection of children's and women's labour, which the Chancellor had steadily resisted, and by the invitation of an international conference for that end. Prince Bismarck resigned the Ministry of Commerce, and was replaced by Herr von Berlepsch, who was to preside at the conference. The elections for the Reichstag were now at hand, a new surprise was expected for maintaining the majority obtained by the cry of 1887; but it did not come, and the result was a crushing defeat of the Chancellor. Perhaps even then the Emperor had discerned that he could not go on with Bismarck, and that it would be difficult to get rid of him, if he obtained another majority for five years. At least it seems certain that William II. already in the beginning of February had asked General von Caprivi whether he would be ready to take the Chancellor's place. Affairs were now rapidly pushing to a crisis. Bismarck asked the Emperor that, in virtue of a Cabinet order of 1852, his colleagues should be bound to submit beforehand to him any proposals of political importance before bringing it to the cognizance of the Sovereign. The Emperor refused, and insisted upon that order being cancelled. The last drop which made the cup overflow was an interview of the Chancellor with Windthorst. The Emperor, calling upon Bismarck the next morning, asked to hear what had passed in that conversation; the Chancellor declined to give any account of it, as he could not submit his intercourse with deputies to any control, and added that he was ready to resign."—*The Change of Government in Germany* (*Fortnightly Review*, August, 1890), pp. 301-304.—"Early on the 17th of March the Emperor sent word that he was waiting for Bismarck's resignation. The Prince refused to resign, on grounds of conscience and of self-respect. . . . The Emperor must dismiss him. A second messenger came, in the course of the day, with a direct order from the Emperor that the Prince should send in his resignation within a given number of hours. At the same time Bismarck was informed that the Emperor intended to make him Duke of Lauenburg. The Prince responded that he might have had that title before if he had wished it. He was then assured (referring to the grounds on which he had previously declined the title) that the Emperor would pledge himself to secure such a legislative grant as would suffice for the proper maintenance of the ducal dignity. Bismarck declined this also, declaring that he could not be expected to close such a career as his had been 'by running after a gratuity such as is given to a faithful letter-carrier at New Year's.' His resignation, of course, he would send in as soon as possible, but he owed it to himself and to his duty to draw up a proper memorial. This he

took two days to write. . . . He has since repeatedly demanded the publication of this memorial, but without success. . . . On March 20, the Emperor, in a most graciously worded letter (which was immediately published), accepted Bismarck's 'resignation.' . . . The immediate nomination of his successor [General von Caprivi] forced Bismarck to quit the Chancellor's official residence in such haste that . . . 'Bismarck himself compared his exit to the expulsion of a German family from Paris in 1870.'"—*Nation*, March 22, 1894 (reviewing '*Das deutsche Reich zur Zeit Bismarcks*,' by Dr. Hans Blum).

A. D. 1890.—Settlement of African claims with England.—Acquisition of Heligoland. See AFRICA: A. D. 1884-1891.

A. D. 1894.—Reconciliation of Bismarck with the Emperor.—In January, 1894, the complete rupture of friendly relations between Prince Bismarck and the Emperor, and the Emperor's government, which had existed since the dismissal of the former, was terminated by a dramatic reconciliation. The Emperor made a peace-offering, upon the occasion of the Prince's recovery from an illness, by sending his congratulations, with a gift of wine. Prince Bismarck responded amiably, and was then invited to Berlin, to be entertained as a guest in the royal palace. The invitation was accepted, the visit promptly made on the 26th of January, and an enthusiastic reception was accorded to the venerable ex-chancellor at the capital, by court and populace alike.

A. D. 1895.—The present organization of the modern German Empire.—"The idea of the unity of the empire in its purest and most unadulterated form is most clearly typified by the German diet. This assembly, resulting from general elections of the whole people, shows all the clefts and schisms which partisanship and the spirit of faction have simultaneously brought about among the different classes of the people and among their representatives. But there . . . never has been a single case where in taking a vote North Germans have come forward in a body against South Germans or vice versa, or where small and medium states have been pitted against the one large state. . . . How indispensable a parliamentary organ which actually represents the unity of the people is to every state in a confederation is best shown by the energy with which the Prussian government again and again demanded a German parliament at the very time when it fairly despaired about coming to an understanding with its own body of representatives. In the middle between the head of the empire and such a diet as we have described is the place occupied by the Federal Council (Bundesrath): not until we have made this clear to ourselves can we fully understand the nature of this latter institution. Each of its members is the plenipotentiary of his sovereign just as were the old Regensburg and Frankfort envoys. It is a duty, for instance, for Bavaria's representative to investigate each measure proposed and to see whether it is advantageous or not for the land of Bavaria. The Federal Council is and is meant to be the speaking-tube by which the voice of the separate interests shall reach the ear of the legislator. But all the same, held together as it is by the firm stability of the seventeen votes which it holds itself and by the balancing power of the emperor and of the diet, it is the place where daily habit educates the

representatives of the individual states to see that by furthering the welfare of the common fatherland they take the best means of furthering their own local interests. Taken each by himself the plenipotentiaries represent their own individual states; taken as a whole the assembly represents a conglomeration of all the German states. It is the upholder of the sovereignty of the empire. If, then, the federal council already represents the whole empire, still more is this true of the general body of officials, constituted through appointment by the emperor, although with a considerable amount of co-operation on the part of the federal council. The imperial chancellor is the responsible minister of the emperor for the whole of the empire. At his side is the imperial chancery, a body of officials who, in turn, have to do in each department with the affairs of the whole empire. The imperial court, too, in spite of all its limitations, is none the less a court for the whole empire. Not less clearly is the territorial unity expressed in the unity of legislation. In the circumstances in which we left the old empire there could scarcely be any question any longer of real imperial legislation. Under the confederation beginnings were made, nor were they unsuccessful; but once again it was primarily the struggle against the strivings for unity that chiefly impelled the princes to united action. The 'Carlsbad Decrees' placed limits to separate territorial legislation to an extent that even the imperial legislation of to-day would not venture upon in many ways. The empire of the year 1848 at once took up the idea of imperial legislation; a '*Reichsgesetzblatt*' [imperial legislative gazette] was issued. In this the imperial ministry, after first passing them in the form of a decree, published among other things a set of rules regulating exchange. The plan was broached of drawing up a code of commercial law for all Germany for the benefit of that class of the population to which a uniform regulation of its legal relationships was an actual question of life and death. So firmly rooted was such legislation in the national needs that even the reaction of the fifties did not venture to undo what had been done. Indeed, the idea of a universal code of commercial law was carried on by most of the governments with the best will in the world. A number of conferences were called, and by the end of the decade a plan had been drawn up, thoroughly worked out and adopted. It has remained up to this very day the legal basis for commercial intercourse. It is true it was not the general decrees of these conferences that gave legal authority to this code, but rather its subsequent acceptance by the governments of the individual states. But the practical result nevertheless was that, in one important branch of law, the same code was in use in all German states. Never before, so long as Germany had had a history, had a codification of private law been introduced by means of legislation into the German states in common; for the first time princes and subjects learned by its fruits the blessing of united legislation. But a few years later they were ready enough to give over to the newly established empire an actual power of legislation: only, indeed, for such matters as were adapted for common regulation, but, so far as these were concerned, so fully and freely that no local territorial law can in any way interfere. What the lawgiver of the German empire an-

nounces as his will must be accepted from the foot of the Alps to the waves of the German Ocean. Thus after long national striving the view had made a way for itself that, without threatening the existence of the individual states, the soil of the empire nevertheless formed a united territorial whole. But not only the soil, its inhabitants also had to be welded together into one organization. The old empire had lost all touch with its subjects—a very much graver evil than the disintegration of its territory. So formidable an array of intermediate powers had thrust itself in between the emperor and his subjects that at last the citizen and the peasant never by any chance any more heard the voice of their imperial master. . . . In three ways the German emperor now found the way to his subjects. Already as king of Prussia the emperor of the future had been obeyed by 19 millions of the whole German population as his immediate subjects. By the entrance of a further 8 millions into the same relationship on the resignation of their own territorial lords by far the majority of all Germans became immediate subjects of the emperor. The German empire, secondly, in those branches of the administration which it created anew or at least reorganized, made it a rule to preserve from the very beginning the most immediate contact with its subjects: so in the army, so in the department of foreign affairs. The empire, finally, even where it left the administration to the individual states, exercised the wholesome pressure of a supreme national authoritative organization by setting up certain general rules to be observed. The empire, for instance, will not allow any distinctions to be made among its subjects which would interfere with national unity. If the Swabian comes to Hesse, the Hessian to Bavaria, the Bavarian to Oldenburg, his inborn right of citizenship gives him a claim to all the privileges of one born within those limits. For all Germany there is a common right of citizenship; and this common bond receives its true significance through numerous actual migrations from one state to another, the right of choosing a domicile being guaranteed. . . . It belongs in the nature of a federative state that it should not claim for itself all state-duties but should content itself with exercising only such functions as demand a centralized organization. In consequence we see the individual states unfolding great activity in the field of internal administration, in the furtherance of education, art and science, in the care of the poor: matters with which the empire as a whole has practically nothing to do. All those affairs of the states, on the other hand, which by their nature demand a centralized administration have been taken in hand by the empire, and the unity of public interests to which the activity of the empire gives utterance is shown in the most different ways. There are certain affairs administered by the empire which it has brought as much under a central organization as ever the Prussian state did the affairs of the amalgamated territories within its limits. With regard to others the empire has preserved for itself nothing more than the chief superintendence; with regard to others still it is content to set up principles which are to be generally followed and to exercise a right of supervision. It would be wrong, however, to imagine that the two last-mentioned prerogatives are only of secondary

importance. The superintendence which the German emperor exercises over the affairs of the army, the chief part of which, indeed, is under his direction as king of Prussia, is sufficient in its workings to make the land-army, in time of war, as much of a unit as is the consolidated navy. . . . Customs matters form a third category, with regard to which the empire possesses only the beginnings of an administrative apparatus: all the same we have seen in the last years how the right of general supervision was sufficient in this field to bring about a change in the direction of centralization, the importance of which is recognizable from the loud expressions of approval of its supporters and also in equal measure from the loud opposition of its antagonists. . . . In the field of finance the empire has advanced with caution and consideration and at the same time with vigor. In general the separate states have retained their systems of direct and indirect taxation. Only that amount of consolidation without which the unity of the empire as a whole would have been illusory was firmly decreed: 'Germany forms one customs and commercial unit bounded by common customs limits.' The internal inter-state customs were abolished. The finances that remained continued to belong to the individual states—the direct taxes in their entirety, the indirect to a great extent. The administration of the customs on the borders even remained in the hands of the local customs-officials, only that when collected they were placed to the general account. But the unconditional right of the empire to lay down the principles of customs legislation gave it more and more of an opportunity to create finances of its own and to become more and more independent of the scheduled contributions from the separate states. . . . Judicial matters are the affair of the individual state. With his complaints and with his accusations the citizen whose rights have been infringed turns to the court established by his territorial lord. But already it has been found possible to organize a common mode of procedure for this court throughout the whole empire; the rules of court, the forms for criminal as well as civil suits are everywhere the same. . . . The general German commercial code and the exchange regulations, which almost all the states had proclaimed law on the ground of the conferences under the confederation, were proclaimed again in the name of the empire and were supplemented in certain particulars. As to criminal law a general German criminal code has unified the more important matters, and with regard to those of less importance, has legally fixed the limits to be observed by the individual states. Work is constantly going on at a civil code which is to be drawn up much on the same lines. The German nation is busily engaged in creating a German legal system according to which the Prussian as well as the Bavarian, Saxon or Swabian judge is to render his decisions. Furthermore, a century-long development in our civilized states has brought it about that a supervision, itself in the form of legal decisions, should be exercised over the legality of judicial sentences. Here again it was in commercial matters that the jurisdiction of a supreme court first showed itself to be an unavoidable necessity. Then it was, however, that after a slumber of seventy years the old imperial court rose again from the dead, not entirely without limitations,

but absolutely without the power to make exceptions. The imperial court at Leipzig is a court for the whole empire and for one and all of its subjects. If we turn to the internal administration it is chiefly matters concerning traffic and intercommunication which call by their very nature for regulation under one system. Although the management of local and to some extent also of provincial postal affairs is left as far as possible to the individual states themselves, the German post is nevertheless imperial, all the higher officials are appointed by the emperor, the imperial post office passes its rules and regulations and sees that they are carried out with reference to the whole empire. . . . What is true of the post is true also of the telegraph, which has come again to be one with it. . . . The railroads stand under the direction or supervisory administration of the individual states, but unity with regard to time-tables, connections, fares, and forwarding has been in so far preserved that differences which might interrupt traffic are avoided as far as possible. The governments of the confederated states are under obligations 'to allow the German railroads, in the interests of general communication, to be administered as one unbroken network.'

GERMINAL, The month. See FRANCE: A. D. 1793 (OCTOBER).

GERONA, Siege of. See SPAIN: A. D. 1809 (FEBRUARY—JUNE).

GERONTES.—Spartan senators, or members of the Gerusia. See SPARTA: THE CONSTITUTION, &c.

GERONTOCRACY. See HAYTI: A. D. 1804–1880.

GEROUSIA. See GERUSIA.

GERRY, Elbridge, and the framing of the Federal Constitution. See UNITED STATES OF AM.: A. D. 1787.

GERRYMANDERING.—"In the composition of the House of Representatives [of the Congress of the United States] the state legislatures play a very important part. For the purposes of the election a state is divided into districts corresponding to the number of representatives the state is entitled to send to Congress. These electoral districts are marked out by the legislature, and the division is apt to be made by the preponderating party with an unfairness that is at once shameful and ridiculous. The aim, of course, is so to lay out the districts 'as to secure in the greatest possible number of them a majority for the party which conducts the operation. This is done sometimes by throwing the greatest possible number of hostile voters into a district which is anyhow certain to be hostile, sometimes by adding to a district where parties are equally divided some place in which the majority of friendly voters is sufficient to turn the scale. There is a district in Mississippi (the so-called Shoe-String District) 250 miles long by 30 broad, and another in Pennsylvania resembling a dumb-bell.' . . . This trick is called gerrymandering, from Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts. . . . In 1812, while Gerry was governor of that state, the Republican legislature redistributed the districts in such wise that the shapes of the towns forming a single district in Essex county gave to the district a somewhat dragon-like contour. This was indicated upon a map of Massachusetts which Benjamin Russell, an ardent Federalist and editor

A separate Imperial Railroad Bureau watches over the fulfillment of this agreement. Nothing, however, has given clearer expression to a unified system of intercommunication in Germany than the equalization of the coinage. . . . Still worse than with regard to coined money . . . did the want of unity show itself in the matter of paper money. Not only did the various states have different principles on which they issued it, and a different system of securities in funding it, but one and the same state would continue to use its old paper money even when issuing new on another principle. . . . Founded thus on a system of firm finances, on the uniform administration of justice in all lands, on an internal administration which, however varied, nevertheless fulfills the necessary demands of unity, the German empire shows a measure of consolidation, the best outward expression to which is given by its army. Among the two million men of Teutonic blood on land and on sea who are ready to protect the Fatherland's boundaries there is not one who has not sworn fidelity to his imperial master."—I. Jastrow, *Geschichte des deutschen Einheitstraumes und seiner Erfüllung* (trans. from the German), pp. 285–303.

of the 'Centinel,' hung up over the desk in his office. The celebrated painter, Gilbert Stuart, coming into the office one day and observing the uncouth figure, added with his pencil a head, wings and claws, and exclaimed, 'That will do for a salamander!' 'Better say a Gerrymander!' growled the editor; and the outlandish name, thus duly coined, soon came into general currency."—J. Fiske, *Civil Gov't in the U. S.*, pp. 216–218.


ALSO IN: J. W. Dean, *The Gerrymander* (*N. Eng. Hist. and Genealogical Reg.*, Oct., 1892).

GERSCHHEIM, Battle of. See GERMANY: A. D. 1866.


GERTRUYDENBERG: Prince Maurice's siege and capture of. See NETHERLANDS: A. D. 1588–1593.

Conferences at. See FRANCE: A. D. 1710.

GERUSIA, OR GEROUSIA, The.—"There is the strongest reason to believe that among the Dorians, as in all the heroic states, there was, from time immemorial, a council of elders. Not only is it utterly incredible that the Spartan council (called the gerusia, or senate) was first instituted by Lycurgus, it is not even clear that he introduced any important alteration in its constitution or functions. It was composed of thirty members, corresponding to the number of the 'obes,' a division as ancient as that of the tribes. . . . The mode of election breathes a spirit of primitive simplicity: the candidates, who were required to have reached the age of sixty, presented themselves in succession to the assembly, and were received with applause proportioned to the esteem in which they were held by their fellow-citizens. These manifestations of popular feeling were noted by persons appointed for the purpose, who were shut up in an adjacent room, where they could hear the shouts, but could not see the competitors. He who in their judgment had been greeted with the loudest plaudits, won the prize—the highest dignity in the commonwealth next to the throne."—C. Thirlwall, *Hist. of Greece*, ch. 8 (v. 1).







LARNED, J.N.

History for ready reference.

D

9

.L32.

v.2

